

Developing a Scale for University Citizenship Behavior: Thai and U.S. Academic Contexts¹

Panupong U-thaiwat², Numchai Supparerkchaisakul³,
Kanu Priya Mohan⁴, and Ken Fansler⁵

The purpose of this study was to develop dimensions, a definition, and a newly-proposed scale for University Citizenship Behavior (UCB) among Thai and U.S. undergraduate students. The exploratory sequential mixed-methods design was selected for this study to describe behaviors typically associated with UCB and to develop a scale for UCB which can be used in both Thailand and the U.S. This study was comprised of two phases. The qualitative method was used in phase one to develop dimensions, a definition, and create items for a newly-proposed scale for UCB. The in-depth interview technique was used to survey experts to confirm that UCB could be reasonably developed from Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Then, the in-depth interview technique was undertaken with undergraduate students from both Thailand and the U.S. in order to elicit which behavioral indicators reflected UCB. All indicators were subsequently integrated as dimensions, a definition, and items for the developed scale for UCB. The results showed UCB as having seven dimensions and the definition was clarified. Phase two consisted of the development of a scale for UCB. After the scale was developed, the quantitative method was used to validate this scale. The results showed that the developed scale was reliable and valid for measuring undergraduate students in Thailand and the U.S. Implications for application and future research were discussed.

Keywords: university citizenship behavior, cross-cultural research, exploratory sequential mixed-method research, Thai and U.S. undergraduate students, UCB scale

This study focused on positive contributions that students exhibit during their years at university referred to as University Citizenship Behavior (UCB). Academic institutions are the places where young people's minds and behaviors are cultivated. During this time, embedding desirable behaviors such as UCB is important because UCB perhaps forms a foundation and framework of positive habits and can also assist students with their academic and future work careers. Students learn from a broader perspective that helps prepare them to become productive members of society and prepares them for their future roles (Henslin, 2008). Students with UCB may benefit the organizations where they will work in the future and may also positively affect society as a whole (Khalid, Rahman, Madar, & Ismail, 2013). A lack of desirable behaviors in the university setting may lead to and amplify social problems in the future because these students may go on to play significant roles at organizations and in society and will bring the behaviors they learned at university with them. Hence, attainment and

¹ Part of a Ph.D., Dissertation in Applied Behavioral Science Research, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand

² Ph.D., Student in Applied Behavioral Science Research, Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand, E-mail: ut.panupong@gmail.com

³ Lecturer, Ph.D., Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand

⁴ Assistant Professor, Ph.D., Behavioral Science Research Institute, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand

⁵ Lecturer, Ph.D., College of Education, Illinois State University, U.S.A.

success in academic performance, aligned with creating positive values, ethics, and behaviors such as UCB are important for students in higher education (Khalid et al., 2013).

In prior research, many UCB studies adapted OCB to be employed in an academic setting by retaining the original definitions. This was accomplished by replacing the context in the definition, dimensions, and questionnaires from organizational to one that focuses on the academic institution (Gore, Tavis, Spaeth, Bauer, Loveland & Palmer, 2014; Khalid et al., 2013). The concept of UCB in this study was drawn from the concept of OCB. OCB focuses on behaviors of employees which are discretionary and not directly or explicitly recognized by formal rewards in organizations as defined by Organ (1988). In parallel, UCB might be defined as a student behavior which is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by earning credits or extra scores from their academic institution. This seems logical, but since the original variable is constructed for an organizational context, applying it to an academic context may require some further alterations.

From the review of literature, it seems that UCB has not been clearly defined. An accurate and a reliable scale for measuring UCB has also not been developed. To fill these gaps and gain insight into UCB, this study used a mixed-method to develop dimensions, a definition, and create a newly-proposed scale for UCB. This study was conducted in both the Thai and U.S. academic contexts to reveal the shared perceptions of UCB in both countries. There were a few reasons that these specific countries were chosen. Thailand was chosen because it is where the researcher is based. The U.S. was considered because the number of Thai students choosing to study abroad in the U.S. has increased dramatically in recent years. Statistics from The Office of the Civil Commission of Thailand (2013) show that the U.S. was the top-ranked foreign country in which Thai students chose to study (35 percent in 2012-2013). Another important reason for this choice involved cultural differences. The U.S. learning style allows for an abundance of creativity because teachers allow students to be more open and encourage students to freely voice their opinions (Keller, 2003). Furthermore, U.S. teachers have the freedom to encourage their students to be more creative by establishing programs that encourage students to engage in classroom dialogues and discussions (Kim, 2005). U.S. students are typically taught in a way that encourages sharing feelings (McMarty, Weisz, Wanitromanee, Eastman, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit, & Band, 1999). In contrast, the responsibility of Thai universities is to set goals for students' personality and social development (Ounjit (Laila), 2012). In Thai culture, in general, young people are taught to restrain their feelings and doubts around authority or elders. These cultural characteristics can perhaps apply to the academic setting as well. It could be assumed that UCB in each country might be different. Hence, generating a neutral concept of UCB and applying it to the development of a scale for UCB was investigated in this study. This was done in order to develop one scale that would be reliable and valid for undergraduate students in both countries.

Literature Overview

UCB in prior research

UCB has been investigated from two different perspectives. The first perspective, UCB in educators, seems to be adaptable with no argument about transferring organizational variables to the academic context. This is because they are employees who work in academic organizations (Dipaola & Hoy, 2005; Burns & Carpenter, 2008). The second perspective from which UCB has been investigated is that of the students. This has been defined as “academic citizenship behavior” (Gore et al., 2014; Petrella & Gore, 2013; Gore, Kiefner & Combs, 2012), “university citizenship behavior” (Zettler, 2011; Ehtiyar, Alan & Omuris, 2010), “undergraduates’ organizational citizenship behavior” (Khalid et al., 2013), “college student organizational citizenship behavior” (LeBlanc, 2014), and “organizational citizenship behavior” (Popescu & Deaconu, 2013; Schmitt, Oswald, Kim, Imus, Merritt, Friede & Shivpuri, 2008). This second perspective may require some alterations since students are not employees of their academic institutions and therefore may have different goals and motivations.

The general concept of UCB may be seen in Popescu and Deaconu’s (2013) research. These researchers aimed to analyze OCB among high school students. This research attempted to define a five-factor model of OCB in schools by changing the context in definition and dimensions. This is similar to Ehtiyar et al. (2010) who examined the role of OCB on university students’ academic success. These researchers gave parallel examples of actions in the five dimensions of OCB in both high school and university contexts. First, “altruism” represents the behaviors where students help their classmates with school work and support the education process. Second, “civic virtue” is the behaviors where students volunteer in school and are highly involved in school activities. Third, “conscientiousness” illustrates the behaviors where students participate in class discussion and activities. Fourth, “courtesy” represents the behaviors where students inform teachers or friends when they cannot attend classes or meetings. Finally, “sportsmanship” represents the behaviors where students do not act negatively when unpleasant situations occur at their schools or universities. Gore et al. (2014) illustrated these differently by using only four dimensions. “Academic consideration” resembles “altruism” because it involves the behavior where students assist each other in doing homework, lecturing and studying for exams without hope of rewards. “Conscientiousness” remains a similar concept and is defined as “attending class and keeping workload.” “Sportsmanship” reflects students’ behaviors such as being adjustable in inconvenient situations without complaining. The highlight of this research is presented as “academic civic virtue.” Gore et al. (2014) seems to specifically shape this dimension as a morally concerned behavior which overlaps “courtesy.” This dimension consists of following rules regarding cheating and plagiarism, and following the classroom policies about assignments and exams. This is also distinct from prior research’s concept of “civic virtue.” Moreover, the voluntary behavior regarding participating in institutional activities is not found.

It’s clear in reviewing these previous studies that the construct of UCB diverges in definition and dimensions amongst them. In other words, OCB was studied in the

academic setting in a wide variety of ways. Hence, this research was concerned with closing this gap of knowledge by developing dimensions, a definition, and a newly-proposed scale for UCB.

Design

The purpose of this study was to develop dimensions, a definition, and a newly-proposed measurement for UCB among Thai and U.S. students. Thus, the exploratory sequential mixed-methods design was employed in this research. According to Creswell and Clark (2007), the exploratory sequential design is a design where the results of the first method (Qualitative) can help develop or inform the second method (Quantitative). This design is based on the premise that an exploration is needed because a measurement is not available or a variable is unknown. This design was selected for use in this study because the definition of UCB has not been made explicit and the current measurement for UCB is inadequate. This design helped develop the definition, and helped investigate the behavioral indicators of UCB by using a qualitative method. The generalization of the scale was then tested by using a quantitative method to ensure that the developed scale was reliable and valid.

Method

This study was comprised of two phases. The first phase was a qualitative phase which aimed to develop dimensions, a definition, and create the items for a newly-proposed scale for UCB. The second phase was a quantitative phase which aimed to validate the developed scale.

Phase 1 (Qualitative Method)

Procedure. In this phase, the study included two parts. This study started by reviewing OCB's concept in order to understand the meaning and dimensions of this variable. Previous OCB studies performed on students in university and school settings were reviewed to help gather information to develop the UCB construct. Next, a qualitative methodology was used to collect data by interviewing experts independently in depth to avoid bias. The primary concept of UCB was then summarized and conceptualized by integrating data from both literature reviews and the interviews. These results were used as a guideline to create the semi-structured questionnaire for the student in-depth interviews to be administered during the next stage of this study. The semi-structured questionnaire consisted of open-ended questions, arranged in a reasonably logical order, and covered the basis required (Richards & Morse, 2013). Some examples of topics in the semi-structured questionnaire were: a) "Do students think that they are good citizens of their university? Why?", and b) "What activities or behaviors do students exhibit to serve their university without compulsion?"

The students were interviewed independently by using an in-depth interview technique with the previously mentioned semi-structured questionnaire. The main ideas and significant data gathered from the interviews were analyzed by employing the

Constance Comparative Analysis Method (CCA) of Strauss & Corbin (2008). The gathered data was then coded. The coded data was compared for similarities and differences. The codes were then grouped together by using higher-level descriptive concepts if they conceptually reflected the same main idea (Strauss & Corbin, 2008; Saldana, 2009). This technique was selected because it allows the researcher to distinguish one category from another. This makes it easy to identify dimensions specific to each category (Strauss & Corbin, 2008; Saldana, 2009). Finally, the construct of UCB was developed into dimensions and its definition.

In addition, cultural differences were also considered in this section. Since this research aimed to create a newly-proposed scale for UCB which could be used to measure undergraduate students in both Thailand and the U.S., the data gathered from the interviews of Thai and U.S. students were first coded separately for each country. The codes from the two countries were then compared for similarities. All codes that both countries had in common were selected to be analyzed in order to develop UCB's dimensions, definition, and create a newly-proposed scale for UCB.

Key informants. The key informants included participants in two separate groups. The first group consisted of three experts from Thailand and three experts from the U.S. The experts selected were educators who have worked in fields involving students' activities, Industrial Organizational Psychology, experience in the OCB variable, have knowledge about OCB, or have published research related to this variable. The second group consisted of 12 students from Thailand and the U.S. It included five Thai students who were enrolled at a Thai university and seven U.S. students who were enrolled at university in the U.S. The criteria for choosing the students were the students had to be sophomores, juniors or seniors and all had to be actively engaged in volunteer groups. They had to participate in out-of-class activities without compulsion and were also all recommended by teachers. Participants were coded for anonymity. The code TE and AE represented Thai expert and U.S. expert respectively. The code TS represented Thai student and the code AS represented U.S. student.

Reliability and Validity. In both stages of interview, the data was tested for accuracy with the member checking method. The drafts of the interviews were sent to the interviewees for confirmation of accuracy and for comments (Stake, 2010). The triangulation method was used to confirm the findings. The researcher checked for accuracy of data with key informants' peers, and teachers. The results were then double-checked with another expert in the field to confirm the reliability of the data analysis. The triangulation method using data source was also examined in the process of the interviews to confirm data accuracy (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Phase 2 (Quantitative Method)

Procedure. After the dimensions and definition of UCB were clearly defined, the scale was developed by employing the items from previous scales (Gore et al., 2014; Schmitt et al., 2008) which were congruent to the results in this study. Also, this study used the interview data to create additional items for a new scale. The items were

reviewed by five experts and tested for content validity. Index of item-objective congruence (IOC) by Rovinelli and Hambleton (1977) was examined. Next, the items were revised again according to the experts' recommendations. The scale was developed in English first and then translated to Thai by using a back translation technique (Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin & Ferraz, 1998). The scale was then tested with undergraduate students in Thailand and the U.S. Internal consistency, reliability, and item discrimination were tested to validate the final UCB scale. Students were asked to rate their UCB on a five-point Likert scale (extremely true to not true at all). The sample for this pilot test came from 35 students from a Thai university and another 35 students from a U.S. university. These students were all majoring in education.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the results and discussion of phase one (qualitative phase) followed by phase two (quantitative phase) respectively to be aligned with the design of this study. The results from phase one include expert interviews and student interviews. This was done in order to develop dimensions, a definition, and create items for a newly-proposed scale for UCB. The results from phase two presents evidence for validity and reliability of the scale. Since phase one was a qualitative phase, results and discussion are presented together. Phase two was a quantitative phase so the results and discussion are presented separately.

Phase 1 (Qualitative Phase)

Expert interviews. This study began with a primary discussion of UCB development. Experts were interviewed in order to confirm if it was logical to develop UCB from OCB. They were asked about the possibility of developing UCB from OCB and about what factors should be taken into consideration in this development.

The results from the expert interviews revealed five significant main ideas. First, in general, the context of university and organization are mostly the same. There is a difference between both contexts which is the goals of students and employees, but in fact, trading occurs in both contexts. They viewed universities nowadays as a reflection of their capitalistic society. People ultimately do things to get things in return. It could be implied that there were no crucial differences in organizations and universities, in general, in this regard.

“The world nowadays is a capitalist system. In both university and organization it’s all about trading. They just partake in different kinds of trading. So, I don’t think it is different from the business organization setting. Students come to university and exchange for something... same as in organization.” TE1

Second, both at university and in organizations if members have the same feelings and perform positively in the same way, such as going above and beyond and giving back to their institutions, these behaviors could be defined as citizenship behavior.

“In some ways, yes, I do believe they are the same because once a student comes to a university they are proud of that university. Even after they graduate they are promoting the university, they are talking about it ... they're very proud of their university so they're willing to go above and beyond.” AE6

All of this points to the fact that it was reasonable that most of this definition worked well in both contexts. However, some points needed to be revised which could be seen in the third main idea. This third idea explored the fact that in organizations the compensation employees get is in the form of money and rewards. On the other hand, students get grades and scores as the outcomes for their behaviors at universities. Hence, it was reasonable that modifying UCB's definition to include “extra grades or scores” instead of “monetary incentive and rewards” was acceptable.

“At university level and environment, it should not be a business benefit. Yes the monetary incentive or rewards should be transformed as extra grades or scores in the university context.” TE1

Fourth, this main idea reflected what should be added in the newly-proposed concept of UCB. According to the data, when students exhibit UCB, it generally allows them to gain more skills directly and indirectly. It could be said that students tend to gain more knowledge and social skill when they exhibit UCB. Hence, this idea could be included in the new overarching definition of UCB in this study.

“I think it's a student who seeks opportunities for learning and for advancing the learning of others both academically and socially. You know they learn specific types of knowledge in the classroom... So they are learning from people outside of... just the instructor. So it's a way to gain more knowledge and meet various people.” AE5

The last point that should be added to this proposed new definition of UCB was illustrated that in performing behaviors to benefit their university the students should be cognizant that their actions do not harm others. Blindly following their ambition when it comes to forwarding their studies could trample other students and end up harming the university community.

“UCB is a human behavior that involves something in a proper way and should be accepted by people surrounding them. For me, it should not negatively affect anyone and has to benefit the university.” TE1

According to prior studies, OCB has been employed in academic settings based on the premise that OCB could be applied in the academic context. Zettler (2011) Ehtiyar et al. (2010), and Khalid et al. (2009) described UCB as voluntary behaviors of students which benefit and are not required by an academic institution. In considering these explanations, the authors viewed UCB through the lens of OCB.

This study aimed to confirm that this idea was practical hence the expert interview was conducted first. The result of this part strengthened the idea that this was practical. The experts placed importance on the similarities, differences, and contextual characteristics of academic and business settings. In the end, they agreed that UCB

could be drawn from OCB because employees and students could exhibit the same type of behaviors at their respective institutions. Although there was a difference between these contexts, it did not necessarily affect employing OCB in the academic setting. In conclusion, this part of the study confirmed that OCB needed to be adapted and could possibly be applied in the university context and defined as UCB.

The developed definition of UCB was explicit. The prior definition was not clear in regards to the formal rewards. By examining the expert interviews, this study helped to clarify that “formal rewards” in the organizational context could be converted to “extra grades and scores” in the academic context. Therefore, this concept of rewards was added to the newly-proposed definition. The developed definition of UCB also included main idea four and five as stated earlier.

Student Interviews. After the data from the expert interviews suggested that UCB could be developed from OCB, students were interviewed in order to explore the behaviors and indicators representing UCB in both cultures. The behaviors and indicators found from these interviews were used to create items for a newly-proposed scale for UCB. Cultural differences were also considered at this juncture. In some codes and categories students from different countries did not report the exact same behaviors. However, they were merged under the same code because they reflected similar types of behaviors. To strengthen this idea, this part of the study presents some samples of quotations from both Thai and U.S. students to support each category while refining the dimensions of UCB. The CCA and coding technique were employed from Strauss & Corbin (2008) and Saldana (2009) for this purpose. The dimensions of UCB were defined by grouping the 25 codes found, which represented similar ideas, together into eight sub-categories. The two sub-categories which could be merged further were merged and defined as a category. The six sub-categories which could not be condensed or merged further were then defined as categories.

The first sub-category was “help others.” It was comprised of “Help students study,” “Help teachers,” and “Help in non-academic work.” It represented any type of help students provide in their lives at university to others.

“We create a study group or when dealing with a difficult subject we will help each other study before taking a test. Plus, we always encourage each other when in class.” TS1

“I don’t like watching people fail. So if they need help and I can and I have the capability to do that I would definitely help. Yes, because I think we’re honestly all here for the same thing so why not help each other out in the process.” AS4

The second sub-category was labeled “be involved.” Included in this group was “feel as if a part of the university,” “be proud,” “join clubs/classes outside of the classroom,” and “have a positive attitude.” The behaviors included in this group reflected a sense of students being involved with their university and not just going to class and studying. Students perform to be closer to their university by doing more than what their university academically requires.

“You can’t only come to university and study. When you join any kind of activities it affects the university as a whole. Some activity affects the faculty and yes the faculty is a part of university as well. You just do it.” TS4

“I think being a good citizen of the campus would be to be involved... I just think that being involved in more than just your classes widens your experience as a student and as I said it opens your mind. You have a lot to learn. There’s a lot outside your classroom.” AS5

The third sub-category, “give back,” included the behaviors “give back to community,” “uphold the university’s reputation,” “volunteer,” and “take care of surroundings.” These four were grouped together because they fell under the umbrella of giving back. When students uphold the university’s reputation, volunteer when their university needs help, and take care of their university’s surrounding it shows that the students care and give back to their university in the form of good deeds and actions.

“To be a citizen of the community you have to give back. You don’t just take from where you live you always give back to people. Like I said, I think if you’re gonna [sic] be a good part of the community you’re gonna [sic] need to give back to it.” AS5

“We have to integrate our experiences to give back to our community. Moreover, this kind of project, volunteer, firstly you can find out more about yourself. Secondly, you learn more than you learn in class because it’s more real. When we go out and volunteer, when we contact them, they know where we are from. It is about the reputation of our university.” TS3

“Participate in class,” “pay attention in class,” and “don’t get distracted/stay focused” were next merged into the fourth sub-category. These are the activities demonstrating that students value the knowledge they get while in the classroom. Students know that class is of the utmost importance to them. Hence, the group “give importance to class” was defined.

“Firstly, it has to be two-way communication. When my teacher asks me questions or asks me to give an example, I always answer if I know. If I don’t know I will listen. Being quiet is not the best thing to do when the class needs participation.” TS1

“Participate... When you come to class and you have some students who will just sit in class and you never hear them speak the whole semester. I will not necessary classify that as a good citizen. I think definitely expressing your point of views, giving your opinion of other people’s point of view. That is not just important to becoming a good citizen but in order to learn and it’s important for the learning process.” AE5

The fifth sub-category was “be concerned about one’s actions.” The codes falling under this category were “inform involved parties,” “respect teachers,” and “dress properly.” The comments from the participants suggested that these three are all actions that if students are not aware of them, they may negatively affect them at their university. For instance, if students know that they cannot come to class and they do not

inform someone, learning or activities might not be accomplished. If the students do not respect teachers the learning processes might not be complete because the teachers cannot entirely play their role. Dressing properly might not directly impact the learning process but it affects the image of the university and reflects on the student's professionalism as seen in the interviews.

"First of all I know most of my professors get worried if you don't show up for class. They think that maybe something bad happened to you. So I think it's just common courtesy to let them know that... yeah... maybe I am sick but I'm fine. I'm just not feeling right or something came up and I can't be there." AS5

"If somebody is going to be absent we have to know. It affects teachers. They may prepare some activities that we have to work on as a group. It ruins a teaching plan and also the person missing class will have to follow up and ask you." TS1

The sixth sub-category was "be reasonable and patient." It was recoded from "understand an inconvenient situation." The new code illustrated the actions of students explaining how they act if they understand an inconvenient situation.

"So I wouldn't necessarily blame it on them because it kind of falls back on me. Cause as a student there's something that I could have done differently. There's much more than just blaming the professor." AS6

"When an inconvenient situation occurs you should inform somebody who is in charge to take care of it. You should not blame or curse. It doesn't help." TS1

"Be willing to try something new," "take advantage of opportunities," "focus on/set goals," and "have an open mind" were grouped together and defined as "be interested in academic work." These four codes illustrated the behaviors that students typically exhibit when they are interested in attaining new knowledge and when they are planning on studying. Based on the results of this study, students tend to gain knowledge by getting out of their comfort zone to try something new and by taking advantage of what their university provides. Students with open minds can take in more knowledge than those who are close minded. Students who have a goal always know what direction they should be going in which can be a sign that they care about academia.

"Try a new club to gain experience. I know it depends on one's lifestyle as well but learning outside the classroom is important. Learning is not limited. Your brain can take a lot of things. It's not like you can only take 10 or 100 stories for your whole life." TS1

"Even if you don't like the club, I went to bee keeping club once. It wasn't my thing but I went there just to see if it was. If it was then I would have stayed. The more open you are the more opportunities may present themselves to you." AS1

The eighth and final sub-category was labeled as “build inter-personal relationships.” It was merged from “create a relationship with teachers,” “create a relationship with friends/be friendly,” and “make connections.” These all reflected situations where students use their interpersonal skills in order to create relationships with the people or organizations surrounding them. Moreover, students learn how to interact with the both people and organizations. This idea mainly focuses on the relationships between students, other people, and their surroundings.

“I think that activities where I can make connections to an organization outside the university positively affect the university... There is a chance that we can exchange knowledge. Each university has its own character. Students can learn from the good things about each other.” TS1

“I think it will make you become a good citizen when you create relationships with others students because that helps you to figure out... just like yourself and keeps you happy and might help you find new things that you can do.” AS7

Cultural differences and similarities were also considered. In some codes students in both cultures expressed the same sense. For example, in the “uphold the university’s reputation,” they had the same feeling that they gained something from university so they gave back. This sense can be explained by Naito and Washizu’s (2015) research which indicated that this type of feeling is universal. A sense of appreciation is felt when people receive something valuable. In contrast, some codes revealed the different sense. In the “be concern about one’s action” sub-category, the quotation from the U.S. student showed a closer relationship with their teachers. They were concerned that their teachers would get worried if they were not informed when students could not come to class. For the Thai student, the quotation showed more concern about group norm and how it would affect their teachers in terms of the teaching process. It showed a large distance between Thai students and teachers. These can be explained by Hofstede’s (1984)’s finding which revealed that Thai culture showed large power distance whereas U.S. culture illustrated small power distance in classrooms. More evidence can be seen from Liberman’s (1994) study. The author stated that U.S. professors and students are more likely to see themselves on the same level (as equals) therefore students are more comfortable in engaging their professors in honest discussion and open debate. U.S. students are less intimidated when it comes to approaching professors. In contrast, Asian teachings mainly instill in students a respect of group norm and culture (Organ, Podsakoff & MacKemzie, 2006; Steward & Bennett, 1991). However, they were similar enough to be grouped under the same code.

To finalize the categories of UCB, the “give back” and “give importance to class” sub-categories were merged again and coded as “perform morally.” They represented the behaviors where students performed better than they were required in class and in academic settings. They also involved giving something back to the university. In contrast, the other groups couldn’t be condensed any further. Hence, the other groups were all relabeled as categories.

To transform all categories to dimensions, all categories were integrated with the dimensions of OCB and defined as UCB’s dimensions. This study reasonably compared

its findings with the OCB concept of Organ (1988) in order to make it more understandable through the lens of OCB. This was done because the results from the expert interviews confirmed that UCB could be drawn from OCB by Organ (1988).

According to Organ (1988), in an organization, “altruism” is the voluntary behaviors where employees help their co-workers. The findings from this study showed that in the university context, Help others includes any type of help that students provide in both academia and non-academia. Therefore, “help others” in this study seems to have a broader scope than in an organization. However, it does reflect a sense of helping, so it could be reasonable to define “help others” as “altruism.”

“Civic virtue” refers to the behaviors that employees exhibit when they act as a part of an organization and positively respond to their organization in various ways. It reflects a sense that employees are involved with their organization and do not just go to work. When it comes to UCB, “be involved” reflects the behaviors where students do more than just go to class. They respond and are involved with their university. Hence, “be involved” was defined as “civic virtue.”

“Perform morally” was most comparable to “conscientiousness.” “Perform morally” represents the behaviors where students perform more than they are required to in class and academia. They also give back to their university. “Conscientiousness” in an organization reflects a similar idea. It includes the behaviors where employees go beyond minimal requirements and take care of their organization. Hence, this category was defined as “conscientiousness.”

“Be concerned about one’s actions” was compared to “courtesy” in the organization context. They both illustrate behaviors where members are concerned about how their actions may affect people surrounding them. They act in order to prevent possible problems that may occur as a result of their actions. Thus, this category was defined as “courtesy.”

In an organization, “sportsmanship” is the behavior where employees exhibit tolerance when they face problems. In the university context, be “reasonable and patient” is the behavior where students have patience when they face inconvenient situations. Instead of blaming someone else, they focus on finding solutions. These both represent similar ideas. Therefore, “be reasonable and patient” was defined as “sportsmanship.”

“Be interested in academic work” did not parallel with any dimensions of OCB and hence was added as a new idea exclusive to UCB. This category is a behavior that benefits the university and is therefore important to include. Students who are interested in academia have goals. They open their minds, take advantage of opportunities, and are willing to try something new. They hone their skills and expand their vision which helps the learning process to be successful, and helps them get along in their society. The word “enthusiasm” was selected to represent this dimension.

“Build inter-personal relationships” was another new idea which is not directly contained in OCB. Relationships are crucial in the university setting. If students cannot

get along with their peers and in society then it might be difficult for them to excel in their lives at university. Moreover, relationships can also facilitate the learning process which benefits the university. Thus, “build inter-personal relationships” was defined as “interpersonal relations.”

In regards to the results, there were seven dimensions of UCB developed. The newly developed concept of UCB included two more dimensions than prior research. There were slight differences in the details of the five dimensions that were shared with prior research. “Altruism” in prior research only focused on help students provide to their friends and peers in academic situations. “Altruism” in this new study also included help in non-academic settings and help that students provided to their teachers in order to facilitate a learning process. The concept of “civic virtue” was mostly the same with the exception that in this new study it introduced the idea that students should perform these actions with a positive attitude. In prior research “Conscientiousness” included the behavior where students attend class on time. This behavior was not included in this study because at the Thai university, in general, if students do not attend class they will get punished. UCB in this new study did not consider behaviors involving punishment. Moreover, “conscientiousness” in this new study included behaviors students performed outside of the classroom as well. Examples of this are giving back to the community and upholding their universities’ reputation. These ideas were not explored in prior UCB research. In contrast, “courtesy” and “sportsmanship” in prior research and in this study reflected the same concept. In addition, this study found two more dimensions which were not indicated in prior research. These two new dimensions, as explained earlier, were “enthusiasm” and “interpersonal relations.” Hence, the concept of UCB developed in this new study is more expansive and includes more student behaviors than prior concepts.

After the initial findings were explored and the dimensions of UCB emerged, the developed definition of UCB was conceptualized. In summary, UCB encapsulates “behaviors which students willingly perform to benefit their university both directly and indirectly without negatively affecting others. Students gain skills in both academia and non-academia from the behaviors they perform. Neither extra scores nor threat of punishment are explicitly involved.”

Phase 2 (Quantitative Phase)

Results. In this phase, the scale to investigate UCB in students from both Thailand and The U.S. was developed. The items in the newly-proposed scale were generated using two resources. Firstly, the indicators and behaviors discovered in the findings from phase one were utilized in order to create items for a questionnaire. Secondly, questionnaires from prior research representing similar concepts to the UCB in this study were considered.

With regard to the quality of the scale, index of item-objective congruence (IOC) by Rovinelli and Hambleton (1977) was used to test for content validity. The items were reviewed by five experts in this field. The final items had an IOC of more than 0.5. To check for reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and item-total correlation were examined. The measurement was tested on both Thai and U.S.

undergraduate students. In addition, some items were revised in order to make them more understandable.

The scale was initially created with 55 items covering the newly proposed dimensions developed from phase one. The final scale was reduced to 35 items with the overall reliability of 0.929. It included 31 positive items and four negative items. The first dimension, “altruism,” included six items after four items were removed and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.845. “Civic virtue” contained five items after one item was removed. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of this dimension was 0.640. The third dimension was “conscientiousness” which contained seven items. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.730 after five items were removed from the original twelve. There were four items to measure “courtesy” after removing two items and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.685. In “sportsmanship,” only one item was removed leaving four items with the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.640. The dimension of “enthusiasm” included four items after three were removed. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.591. Finally, “inter-personal relations” contained five items after three were removed. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.667.

This newly-proposed scale for UCB aimed to measure the UCB of undergraduate students in seven dimensions using a five-point Likert scale. Students were asked to rate their UCB ranging from 1= Not true at all, 2 = not true, 3 = neutral, 4 = true, and 5 = extremely true. The items are shown in table 1.

Table 1

The Scale of UCB Developed in this Study

No.	Dimensions / Statements	Item-total correlation	Sources
<i>Altruism (α = 0.85)</i>			
1.	I listen to my friends when they talk about their life problems.	0.59	Newly created
2.	I help my friends when they have problems with their homework.	0.56	Newly created
3.	I help friends with difficult academic lessons.	0.65	Newly created
4.	I give time to help friends when I see that they are struggling.	0.64	Newly created
5.	I provide help to my friends when they ask for it.	0.61	Newly created
6.	I help teachers to facilitate the learning process: passing out papers, preparing computers, etc.	0.57	Newly created
<i>Civic virtue (α = 0.64)</i>			
7.	I participated in the student government or other clubs that potentially make my university a better place.	0.48	Adapted from Schmitt et al. (2008)
8.	I am proud to tell everyone which university I study at.	0.60	Newly created
9.	I stay focused on my goals at university because I value education.	0.56	Newly created
10.	I put a lot of effort in at my university.	0.57	Newly created
11.	I instill my actions at this university with a positive attitude.	0.55	Newly created
<i>Conscientiousness (α = 0.73)</i>			
12.	I help to develop the community outside of my university when they need help	0.53	Newly created
13.	When people from outside my university ask me about my university I always focus on positive aspects and try to give them accurate information.	0.59	Newly created

Table 1 (*Continued.*)

No.	Dimensions / Statements	Item-total correlation	Sources
14.	I take good care of my university's campus and environment: pick up trash, don't litter, keep the campus clean, etc.	0.51	Newly created
15.	I prepare before class by reading and doing homework.	0.60	Newly created
16.	I don't hesitate to raise my ideas and speak my mind when teachers ask.	0.63	Newly created
17.	I don't answer questions in class because there will always be other students who can answer.	0.40	Newly created
18.	I play on my phone when I am in class because it is common nowadays. <i>Courtesy</i> ($\alpha = 0.69$)	0.25	Newly created
19.	I am mindful of how my behavior affects other student's work.	0.65	Gore et al. (2014)
20.	I inform teachers and/or friends in advance when I know I will not be able to attend class or a meeting.	0.45	Newly created
21.	Even if I have a problem with teachers I don't talk negatively behind that teachers' back.	0.52	Newly created
22.	I dress appropriately for attending class. <i>Sportsmanship</i> ($\alpha = 0.64$)	0.38	Newly created
23.	I spend a lot of time complaining and focusing on trivial matters.	0.51	Gore et al. (2014)
24.	When an inconvenient situation occurs, I am patient and take time before saying anything or taking any actions.	0.56	Newly created
25.	When I get bad grades, I always review my work before blaming it on the teacher.	0.43	Newly created
26.	I politely inform someone in charge when there is something broken on campus: the electricity shuts off, water shuts off, a computer is broken, etc. <i>Enthusiasm</i> ($\alpha = 0.59$)	0.42	Newly created
27.	I am willing to try out or join a new club to gain new experiences.	0.49	Newly created
28.	When I don't understand a lesson I look for resources to answer my questions.	0.52	Newly created
29.	I am eager to learn	0.49	Newly created
30.	I listen to other people's ideas and points of view, even if they contradict mine, to help expand my knowledge. <i>Inter-personal relations</i> ($\alpha = 0.67$)	0.38	Newly created
31.	I am social with friends to help maintain my relationships.	0.29	Newly created
32.	I normally am the person who approaches new people to make friends.	0.53	Newly created
33.	I try and make connections with organizations both inside and outside of my university.	0.68	Newly created
34.	I don't always speak politely to university staff.	0.22	Newly created
35.	I always talk to teacher outside of the classroom.	0.61	Newly created

Discussion

This study used the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) of Rovinelli and Hambleton (1977) to test for content validity. According to this technique, five specialists in fields related to this study were asked to rate if the items presented represented UCB in every dimension. Items were removed or revised if they presented IOC below 0.5. The statements in this measurement were congruent with the results

from phase one because they were conducted and applied from the student interviews. Moreover, this study employed some statements from prior research which reported the Cronbach's alpha coefficient between 0.80-0.85. The questionnaire was first written in English and was then translated to Thai by use of the back-translation technique. A bilingual translator translated all items from the English version to the Thai version. Then, this Thai version was translated back into English by a second bilingual translator. After both versions were produced, a third bilingual expert reviewed the final version to ensure that the measurement is equivalent to the original one (Beaton et al., 1998). This was done to ensure that the questionnaire in both versions would reflect the same meanings in each language. After the newly-developed scale was created in both English and Thai, they were tested on both Thai and U.S. students. In addition, some items were revised in order to make them more understandable. A possible reason that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient in the new scale was so high was the homogeneity of the group since all students studied in same field. Moreover, the items in this study seemed more suitable for the university setting because they were generated after investigating actual behaviors of undergraduate students. In accordance with the results, the newly-proposed scale for UCB was and reliable and valid for undergraduate students in Thailand and the U.S.

Limitations and Suggestions

Due to the limited number of participants, this study was just a preliminary investigation of this newly-proposed scale for UCB. Since the Cronbach's alpha was low in some dimensions, the researchers intend to validate this scale by using a higher level of statistics such as a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in future research. A possible reason for the reliability of the scale being low may be due to the back-translation process. The fact that the data gathered from Thai and U.S. students were merged together while testing for reliability may be the cause. The statements in both languages may not have similar enough meanings. Hence, the researchers also intend to replicate this process again.

For usage of the scale in universities, this study exclusively investigated students in the field of education and from two specific universities, each located in Thailand and the U.S. Because of this, it may not be broad enough to generalize this new approach of UCB for use in other universities without testing. Before any universities apply this scale, they may need to test it in order to make sure that the scale will be reliable and valid for students in each university.

For researchers, future studies may be replicated with undergraduate students from different backgrounds, majors, and universities. Moreover, this study focused on participants specifically from Thailand and the U.S. For future research, UCB may be explored in other learning cultures in various countries or provincial parts to reveal in-depth what represents UCB in each culture. This could help develop a wider concept of UCB, which could potentially be applied to all countries. Another concern is that this study compared the developed dimensions with OCB. Future studies may investigate dimensions of UCB by using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in order to consolidate dimensions which may reveal different results.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop dimensions, a definition, and create the items for a newly-proposed scale for UCB among Thai and U.S. students. The first phase was a qualitative phase which aimed to develop dimensions, a definition and create the items. The second phase was a quantitative phase which aimed to validate the developed scale. The results from the first phase confirmed that UCB could be applied from OCB by interviewing experts. Student interviews were conducted in order to elicit behavioral indicators representing UCB. The results presented UCB in seven dimensions and developed a definition of UCB. This study indicated two more dimensions of UCB than presented in prior studies. The developed definition and dimensions were slightly different in their details but reflected the same concept of UCB as prior studies. The second phase revealed a newly-proposed scale for UCB which was valid and reliable. The newly-proposed scale for UCB was created by integrating the findings from the student interviews and from prior scales. It was comprised of 35 items including 31 positive items and four negative items which reflect UCB in seven dimensions. The evidence showed that this newly-proposed scale for UCB was reliable and valid with an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.929. Therefore, this newly-proposed scale for UCB could effectively be used to measure undergraduate students in both Thailand and the U.S.

References

- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (1998). *Recommendations for the Cross-cultural Adaptation of Health Status Measures*. Rosemont, IL: American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons.
- Burns, T., & Carpenter, J. (2008). Organizational citizenship and student achievement. *Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education*, 1, 51-58.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clarks, V. L. P. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*, 88, 35-44.
- Ehtiyar, V. R., Alan, A. A., & Omuris, E. (2010). The role of organizational citizenship behavior on university student's academic success. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 16, 47-61.
- Gore, J. S., Davis, T., Spaeth, G., Bauer, A., Loveland, J. M., & Palmer, J. F. (2014). Subjective well-being predictors of academic citizenship behaviors. *Psychological Studies*, 59, 299-308.
- Gore, J. S., Kiefner, A. E., & Combs, K. M. (2012). Personality traits that predict academic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1-24.
- Henslin, J. M. (2008). *Sociology: A Down to Earth Approach*, 9th ed. United States of America: Pearson.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 389-398.
- Keller, H. (2003). Socialization for competence: cultural models of infancy. *Human Development*, 46, 288-231.

- Khalid, S. A., Rahman, N. A., Madar, A. R. S., & Ismail, M. (2013). Undergraduates' organizational citizenship behavior: the role of religiosity. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3, 572-584.
- Kim, K. H. (2005). Learning from each other: creativity in East Asian and American education. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17, 337-347.
- LeBlanc, C. J. (2014). Characteristics shaping college students organizational citizenship behavior. *American Journal of Business Education*, 7, 99-108.
- Liberman, K. (1994). Asian student perspective on American university instruction. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 18, 173-192.
- McMarty, C. A., Weisz, J. R., Wanitromanee, K., Eastman, K. L., Suwanlert, S., Chaiyasit, W., & Band, E. B. (1999). Culture, coping, and context: primary and secondary control among Thai and American Youth. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40(5), 809-818.
- Office of The Civil Commission. *Statistics of Students Study Aboard*. (2013). Retrieved on 05.05.14 from http://www.ocsc.go.th/ocsc/th/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=80&Itemid
- Miles, M B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expandable Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Naito, T., & Washizu, N. (2015). Note on Cultural Universals and Variations of Gratitude from an East Asian Point of View. *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, 10(2), 1-8.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Nature, Antecedents and Consequences*. CA: Sage Publication.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldiers Syndrome*. MA: Lexington books.
- Ounjit (Laila), W. (2012). Identity and personality development for desirable characteristics of Mahasarakham University graduate students. *Social and Behavioral Science*, 46, 3776-3782.
- Petrella, M. V., & Gore, J. S. (2013). Relational self-construal and its relationship to academic citizenship behavior. *Psychological Studies*, 58, 115-121.
- Popescu, A. M., & Deaconu, A. (2013). High-school, organization citizenship behavior moderator. *Journal of Social and Behavioral Science*, 92, 735-740.
- Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). *Readme First for A User Guide to Qualitative Methods*. The United States of America: SAGE.
- Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1977). On the use of content specialists in the assessment of criterion-referenced test item validity. *Dutch Journal of Educational Research*, 2, 49-60.
- Saldana, Johnny. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Schmitt, N., Oswald, F. L., Friede, A, Imus, A., & Merritt, S. (2008). Perceived fit with an academic environment: attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 317-335.
- Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. New York: the Guildford Press.
- Steward, E. C., & Bennett, M. J. (1991). *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Yarmount, ME. Intercultural Press.

- Strauss, Anselm & Corbin, Juliet. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Zettler, I. (2011). Self-control and academic performance: two field studies on university citizenship behavior and counterproductive academic behavior. *Journal of Learning and Individual Differences, 21*, 119-123.