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ABSTRACT

Following the previous studies on ‘extra-role behavior’, this study focuses especially on ‘promotive extra-role behavior’ as well as ‘positive work behavior’, and explores of ethical ideologies on them. On that framework, this paper aims to achieve the effect of ‘ethical ideologies’ (idealism and relativism) on promotive extra-role behaviors (helping and voice) and positive work behavior. Moreover, we examine the impact of being high and low idealist personality as well as high and low relativist personality on level of ‘helping extra-role behavior’, ‘voice behavior’, ‘extra-role behavior’, and ‘positive work behaviors’ that individuals exhibit. This paper also aims to explore the influence of demographic variables on helping, voice, and positive work behavior. In order to achieve the goals mentioned, we collected data from 356 MBA students, and used the ordinal logistic regression analysis. Results indicate that idealism significantly correlates to helping, voice, and positive work behavior.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Individuals organize their behaviors in terms of their values, beliefs, ideologies, previous experiences etc. In addition to positive behaviors, extra-role behavior of individuals is vital for organizations because that kind of behavior is exhibited voluntarily for the benefit of organizations (McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Lynch, Eisenberger & Armeli, 1999). Under the positive behaviors subject, promotive extra-role behaviors is investigated as helping and voice behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), and positive work behavior is expressed voluntarily by employees (Lehman & Simpson, 1992).

Organizational behavior literature comprises many studies investigating individuals’ unfavorable behaviors and explaining those by means of various concepts, such as Machiavellianism (Winter,
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Stylianou & Giacalone, 2004), organizational politics (Meisler & Vigoda-Gadot, 2014), ethics perception of individuals (Caswell, 2003) etc. while affirmative behavior of individuals are explained with job satisfaction, organizational commitment (Williams & Anderson, 1991), perceived organizational support (Lynch, Eisenberger & Armeli, 1999) etc. Previous literature on positive behaviors of individuals and ethical ideologies are relatively scarce in comparison to negative behaviors. In this study, we evaluated individuals’ ethical ideologies as key determinants of their helping, voice, and positive work behaviors. In order to explain them, ethical ideologies are examined as idealism and relativism put forward by Forsyth (1980) who distinguishes low and high level idealist and relativist individuals and structured taxonomy of ethical ideologies. Investigating high-medium-low level idealists and relativists as well as their behaviors, especially helping, voice and positive work behavior, this study also contributes to the taxonomy of ethical ideologies and their influence on extra-role behavior literature field.

Ethical ideologies are frequently investigated on business students in the literature (Zgheib, 2005; Longenecker, McKinney & Moore, 1989). This study further investigated MBA students’ ethical inclination, and its influence on individuals’ helping behavior, voice behavior, and positive work behavior. Furthermore, idealism, relativism, helping behavior, voice behavior and positive work behavior are analyzed in terms of demographic characteristics in this study.

2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.01 ETHICAL IDEOLOGIES (IDEALISM AND RELATIVISM)

Personal moral philosophy is crucial to comprehend ethical judgments and behaviors. As a moral system integration, the concept of ethical ideology comprises of beliefs, values, standards, and self-images that individuals position themselves for two sides of the same coin as right and wrong (Schlenker, 2008). Ethical ideologies are defined with different concepts and dimensions in the literature. For example, Schlenker (2008) defines ethical ideologies under two headings; principle ideologies and expedient ideologies. On the other hand, Forsyth (1980) differentiates the ethical ideologies based on individual’s idealist or relativist attitude.

Following the moral issues, Forsyth (1980) explores into moral decision-making and develops Ethic Position Scale (EPC) to measure it on an organizational level (Winter, Stylianou & Giacalone, 2004). Forsyth (1980) claims that the taxonomy explains individuals’ adaptation as one of ethical perspectives to make ethical judgements. In addition, Forsyth classifies two distinct concepts to explain two different judgments of individuals’ about moral issues; idealism and relativism. Making judgments or answering moral questions, some people obey the universal moral rules, and they idealistically desire to do the right action. On the contrary, others deny the rules in favor of relativism (Forsyth 1980: 175-176; Forsyth, O’Boyle & McDaniel, 2008). Therefore idealism is identified as “desire to avoid harming others” while relativism is identified as “the tendency to disregard universal moral rules” (Winter, Stylianou & Giacalone, 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idealism</th>
<th>Relativism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>的情况主义者</td>
<td>情况主义者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>具有理想主义倾向的人; 支持个人主义分析方法; 相对主义者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absoluteists</td>
<td>Assumes that the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>低</td>
<td>高</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>主观主义者</td>
<td>主观主义者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals based on personal values and perspective rather than universal moral principles; relativistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionists</td>
<td>Moral absolutes guide judgement but pragmatically open to exceptions to these standards; utilitarian.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forsyth (1980; 2008) classifies the two ethical ideologies, idealism and relativism, as high and low categories. Therefore individuals' both idealism and relativism levels are classified into four distinct
ethics; situationists, absolutists, subjectivist, and exceptionists (Table 1). When high ideалиsts also become to be high relativists they are entitled as ‘situationist’. Situationist individuals endeavor to get best outcome as long as they can, yet moral rules do not govern in all situations. Therefore, situationists organize their behaviors or strategies relating to specific context after a moral evaluation based on convenience. High idealist and low relativist individuals are called ‘absolutists’, and they desire the best consequences like situationists. Nevertheless, they obey the moral rules and make decisions according to ethical absolutes (Forsyth, O’Boyle & McDaniel, 2008). On the other hand, low idealist and high relativist individuals are named ‘subjectivist’. They reject the moral rules, and accomplishing humanitarian goals are not of importance for them. They organize their behaviors using moral decisions subjectively, and they do not objectively evaluate related issues even if an action harms others (Caswell, 2003). The last ethical idealists are ‘exceptionists’ who share low idealism and low relativism personalities. Exceptionists also endorse moral rules, but they tend to balance the positive outcomes against negative impacts of an action (Forsyth, O’Boyle & McDaniel, 2008).

Both positive (principle, idealism) and negative (expedient, relativism) sides of ethical ideologies are evaluated in the literature (Davis, Anderson & Curtis, 2001; Schlenker, 2008). One of the positive outcomes of ethical ideologies is stated as “stronger personal commitment to a moral identity that facilitates positive social activities and helps resist the temptation of illicit activities” (Schlenker, 2008). Additionally, previous studies find moral disengagement negatively relates to helping and cooperative behavior (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara & Pastorelli, 1996; Trevino, Weaver & Reynolds, 2006). A study that investigated the relationship between emotional manipulation and ethical position of the individuals indicates that ethical idealism and emotional manipulation are negatively related. On the contrary, the relationship between ethical relativism and emotional manipulation is not significant (Grieve & Mahar 2010). Schlenker (2008) also claims that ethical principles and voluntarily helping behavior of individuals are significantly related.

On the other hand, a study was conducted to explain the matters affecting managers in their decisions by Arnett and Hunt (2002). They achieve such results that high idealist and low relativist individuals are less adversely affected in their decisions. They are high in cognitive moral development and less competitively irrational. Thus, the following hypotheses are developed in this study:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a significant influence of idealism on a) helping extra role behavior, b) voice extra role behavior, c) positive work behavior.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a significant influence of relativism on a) helping extra-role behavior, b) voice extra role behavior, c) positive work behavior.

**Hypothesis 3:** High idealist individuals exhibit higher level of a) helping extra-role behavior than low idealist individuals, b) voice extra-role behavior than low idealist individuals, c) positive work behavior than low idealist individuals.

**Hypothesis 4:** High relativist individuals exhibit higher level of a) helping extra-role behavior than low relativist individuals, b) voice extra-role behavior than low relativist individuals, c) positive work behavior than low relativist individuals.

### 2.02 PROMOTIVE (HELPING AND VOICE) EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIOR

A number of studies claim that employees exhibit in-role and extra-role behaviors in the workplace (Katz, 1964; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Williams & Anderson, 1991; Pekdemir & Turan, 2014). In-role behaviors refer to employees’ traditional performance that is prescribed in their job descriptions; on the contrary, extra-role behaviors represent employees’ voluntary actions for the benefit of organizations and are not prescribed (McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Lynch, Eisenberger & Armeli, 1999). Typology of extra-role behaviors are classified as promotive or prohibitive; and affiliative or challenging in the literature (Van Dyne, Graham & DiCesare, 1994; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Promotive behaviors are proactive whereas prohibitive behaviors are relatively reactive and protective. On the other hand, affiliative behaviors include cooperating and participating whereas challenging behaviors include sharing and developing new opinions and processes. Using these classifications, Van Dyne & LePine (1998) generate four general types of extra-role behaviors; helping, voice, stewardship, and whistle-blowing (Table 2). Out of the four
stated categories in extra-role behaviors, this paper focuses on promotive ones: helping and voice behaviors.

Table 2: Typology of extra-role behavior (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliative</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotive</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
<td>Stewardship Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helping behavior in organizations is identified as “voluntary behavior that promotes interpersonal harmony and boosts coworkers to solve or avoids work-related problems” (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). Additionally, it is a code-of-conduct which is beneficial to other employees or groups as a whole (Deckop, Cirka & Andersson, 2003; Sparrowe, Soetjipto & Kraimer, 2006). Furthermore, helping behavior enhances the relationship among employees, and develops harmony within the organization (Wolfson, 1981; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

The concept of voice behavior put forward by Hirschman (1970) is about employees’ speaking up their opinions to alter operations and procedures that are not effective in an organization rather than accepting them (Parker & Collins, 2008). Van Dyne & LePine (1998) define voice behavior as “promotive behavior that emphasizes expression of constructive challenge intended to improve rather than merely criticize.” Furthermore, voice behavior facilitates the constant development in dynamic environment conditions (Staw & Nemeth, 1989), and gives an opportunity to open communication climate in an organization (Gorden, 1988; Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995). Maynes and Podsakoff (2014) classify voice behavior as supportive, constructive, defensive, and destructive.

2.03 POSITIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

Positive work behavior is defined as employees' voluntarily contribution to organization where they work for. Once individuals are willing to do additional work, work overtime, endeavor to improve, and participate in developing the job; they exhibit positive work behavior (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). Positive work behavior studies in the literature have used combination of affirmative concepts such as job satisfaction, job commitment etc. similar to the concept of positive work outcome (Shapiro, 2004; Schlenker 2008; Jackson, Rothmann & Van de Vijver, 2006). However, in this study, positive work behavior refers to the conceptualization by Lehman & Simpson (1992).

Grieve and Mahar (2010) find females’ ethical idealism scored significantly higher than males’. In addition, people tend to more ethical as they grow older (Chiu, 2003; Peterson, Rhoads & Vaught, 2001), although some studies indicate that younger people obey the ethical rules more than older ones (Ede, Panigrahi, Stuart & Calcich, 2000; Vitell et al., 2007). This result is convenient for women, so they strictly obey ethical rules rather than men (Marta, Singhapakdi, & Kraft, 2008). On the other hand, high education level individuals incline not to obey the ethical rules (Fullerton, Kerch & Dodge, 1996), but many studies indicate that ethical ideology and education level are not in relation significantly (Serwinek, 1992; Swaidan, Vitell & Rawwas, 2003). Some researchers claim experience level of individuals has positive relationship between obeying ethical rules (Kidwell, Stevens, & Bethke, 1987; Weeks et al., 1999); on the contrary, Chiu (2003) reports work experience and obeying ethical rules are negatively related to each other (Pan & Sparks, 2012). According to Kidder (2003), women are more likely to exhibit positive and helping behavior than men. Supporting that result, Schlenker (2008) concludes that women volunteer to help others rather than men. On the other hand, Sparrowe, Soetjipto and Kraimer (2006) indicate that gender difference, race difference, and tenure do not associate with helping behavior. One of the studies investigating individuals’ promotive behavior (helping, voice) concludes that education level is related to voice behavior but not helping behavior. Also, tenure, sex, and age are not in significant relation to helping as well as voice behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Following the results of previous studies relating to demographic variables, we formulate the Hypothesis 5.
Hypothesis 5: Individuals’ age, gender, work experience, college major, and whether they took an ethics course during their university education have significant influence on a) idealism, b) relativism, c) helping extra-role behavior, d) voice extra role behavior and e) positive work behavior level that they exhibit.

Figure 1: Proposed research model

In this study we aim to achieve the effect of ethical ideologies (idealism and relativism) on promotive extra role behaviors (helping and voice) as well as positive work behavior. On this framework, we examine the impact of being high and low idealist as well as high and low relativist personality on level of helping extra role behavior, voice extra role behavior and positive work behaviors that individuals exhibit. Furthermore, this paper also aims to explore the influence of demographic variables on helping, voice and positive work behavior. Thus, research model of this study is constituted as seen Figure 1 (above).

3.0 METHOD

3.01 SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION

Ethical ideologies are frequently studied on business students in the literature (Zgheib, 2005; Longenecker, McKinney & Moore, 1989). We focused on the MBA students graduated from different departments of universities, working in a job and receiving MBA education in a public university in Istanbul. Collecting the data from 356 individuals, we tested reliability and validity of the measurement instrument. After that, we discriminated low and high idealist individuals because they are within the scope of the study. Then correlation as well as ordinal logistic regression analyses were conducted to attain the effects of idealism and relativism on helping behavior, voice behavior, extra role behavior, and positive work behavior. Finally, helping, voice and positive work behavior were analyzed with demographic variables.

3.02 MEASURES

Measuring idealism, relativism, helping behavior, voice behavior, and positive work behavior constructs, we utilized a questionnaire that comprises of totally 38 items, and six open ended questions related to demographic information of respondents. Idealism and relativism scale were taken from the ethical ideologies taxonomy put forward by Forsyth (1980). Forsyth’s scale comprises 10 items to measure idealism and 10 items for relativism. This scale carries out 5 point likert scale anchored from 1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. We also utilized Van Dyne and LePine’s scale (1998) to measure helping and voice behavior as well as Lehman and Simpson’s (1992) on-the-job behavior scale to measure positive work behavior. The instrument has 7 items to measure helping behavior, 6 items voice behavior, and 5 items positive work behavior. Scaling procedures of behaviors were applied as 5 point rated scale anchored from 1= never to 5=always in this study.
We applied Drory and Glukinos’s (1980) methodology in which interval data set transforms into ordinal nature to compare the edge of the scores. This is implemented by allocating the total scores below %25, from %25 to %75 and above %75. Below %25 of the total scores is entitled low, from %25 to %75 medium and above %75 high related construct. For example idealism has 10 items and its total score changes from 10 to 50. Total scores of any observations that are below 20 are entitled low idealist individuals, from 21 to 39 medium idealist and above 40 are entitled high idealist individuals in this study.

Similar to idealism, Drory and Glukinos’s (1980) methodology was used understanding for relativism. It has 9 consistent items* and its total score vary from 9 to 45, thus; we identified below 18 of total scores as low relativist, from 19 to 35 as medium relativist and above 36 as high relativist individuals. Helping behavior has 7 items and its total scores differentiate from 7 to 35, so we allocated below 14, from 15 to 27 and above to 28, as low, medium and high level helping behavior that individuals exhibit, respectively. Likewise voice behavior has 6 items and total scores alter from 6 to 30. Therefore, we defined below 12 of total scores as low level voice behavior that individual conduct, from 13 to 23 as medium and above 24 as high. In addition, positive work behavior has 5 items and total scores change from 5 to 25, so we differentiated the scores below 10, from 11 to 19 and above 20 entitled low, medium and high level of positive work behavior of individuals, respectively.

3.03 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

First of all, we conducted item total correlation analyses for idealism, relativism, helping behavior, voice behavior, and positive work behavior one by one. One item of relativism has under 0.20 correlation coefficients, so it is dropped. Then, explanatory factor analyses were realized each scale of idealism, relativism as well as helping, voice and positive work behavior, separately. Consequently, items of idealism, helping behavior, voice behavior and positive work behavior were gathered in their single relevant factor, as previous studies in the literature. On the other hand, relativism was divided into three factors different from the literature. We entitled relativism factors as “variability in situation”, “variability in relation” and “lying”. In addition addition idealism scale was explained by 52,159 % variances, with 0.895 Crombach’s alpha; relativism 63.449 % with 0.767; helping behavior 72.763 % with 0.937; voice behavior 63.126 % with 0.882; positive work behavior 64.594 % variances with 0.862 Crombach alpha’s (Table 3).

Table 3: Validity and reliability scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Mean thoughtful</th>
<th>Variance explain(%)</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDEALISM (10 Items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forsyth (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For me it is important that one should not perform an action which might in any way threaten the dignity and welfare of another individual.</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>4.0324</td>
<td>52.159</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For me it is important that the existence of potential harm to others is always wrong, irrespective of the benefits to be gained.</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For me it is important that one should never psychologically or physically harm another person.</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. For me it is important that deciding whether or not to perform an act by balancing the positive consequences of the act against the negative consequences of the act is immoral.</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For me it is important that if an action could harm an innocent other, then it should not be done.</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. For me it is important that it never necessary to sacrifice the welfare of others.</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For me it is important that the dignity and welfare of people should be the most important concern in any society.</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An item of relativism scale was dropped because of its low item-total correlation coefficient (under 0.20), and the following analyses (explanatory factor analysis, correlation, linear regression and ordinal logistic regression) were conducted with remaining 9 items.
2. For me it is important that risks to another should never be tolerated, irrespective of how small the risks might be.
10. For me it is important that moral actions are those which closely match ideals of the most "perfect" action.
1. For me it is important that a person should make certain that their actions never intentionally harm another even to a small degree.

### RELATIVISM

**Factor 1: Variability in Situation (4 Items)**

| 30. What is ethical varies from one situation and society to another. | Forsyth (1980) |
| 31. Moral standards should be seen as being individualistic; what one person considers to be moral may be judged to be immoral by another person. | 3.1265 |
| 29. There are no ethical principles that are so important that they should be a part of any code of ethics. | 6.449 |
| 32. Questions of what is ethical for everyone can never be resolved since what is moral or immoral is up to the individual. | 0.767 |

**Factor 2: Variability in Relation (3 Items)**

| 34. Ethical considerations in interpersonal relations are so complex that individuals should be allowed to formulate their own individual codes. | Forsyth (1980) |
| 35. Rigidly codifying an ethical position that prevents certain types of actions could stand in the way of better human relations and adjustment. | 3.3811 |
| 33. Moral standards are simply personal rules which indicate how a person should behave, and are not to be applied in making judgments of others. | 2.9508 |

**Factor 3: Lying (2 Items)**

| 37. Whether a lie is judged to be moral or immoral depend upon the circumstances surrounding the action. | Forsyth (1980) |
| 36. No rule concerning of lying can be formulated; whether a lie is permissible or not permissible totally depends upon the situation. | 3.0567 |

### HELPING BEHAVIOR (7 Items)

| 16. I help others in this group learn about the work. | Van Dyne and LePine (1998) |
| 13. I attend functions that help this work group. | 4.1949 |
| 14. I assist others in this group with their work for the benefit of the group. | 72.763 |
| 15. I get involved to benefit this work group. | 0.937 |
| 12. I help orient new employees this group. | 26. I make attempts to change work conditions |
| 11. I volunteer to do things for this work group. | 27. I negotiate with supervisor to improve job |
| 17. I help others in this group with their work responsibilities. | 28. I try to think of ways to do job better |

### VOICE BEHAVIOR (6 Items)

| 19. I speak up and encourages others in this group to get involved in issues that affect the group. | Lehman and Simpson (1992) |
| 18. I develop and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group. | 4.0281 |
| 23. I speak up in this group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures. | 63.126 |
| 22. I get involved in issues that affect the quality of work life here in this group. | 0.882 |
| 21. I keep well informed about issues where his/her opinion might be useful to this work group. | 3.7731 |
| 20. I communicate his/her opinions about work issues to others in this group even if his/her opinion is different and others in the group disagree with him/her. | 64.594 |

### POSITIVE WORK BEHAVIOR (5 Items)

| 26. I make attempts to change work conditions | Lehman and Simpson (1992) |
| 27. I negotiate with supervisor to improve job | 3.7731 |
| 28. I try to think of ways to do job better | 64.594 |
| 24. I do more work than required | 0.862 |
25. I volunteer to work overtime  .745

4.0  RESULTS

Sample of this study has high and medium level idealist individuals, but it has not low level individuals. In addition, it has high, medium, and low relativist individuals. Taking ethical ideologies taxonomy (Forsthy, 1980) into account, % 5 of our sample are situationists (both high idealist and high relativist individuals) and 3 % are absolutists (high idealist and low relativist individuals). However, we did not attain subjectivist and exceptionist individuals in the sample (Table 4).

| Table 4: Frequency of ethical ideologies (Relativism x Idealism) |
|------------------|------------------|
|                   | Relativism       |
|                   | High  | Low  |
| Idealism          |       |      |
| High   | Situationists   | Absolutists    |
| 5%     | 0     | 0    |
| Low    | Subjectivists   | Exceptionists  |
| 0      | 0     | 0    |

Idealism has 4,0713, relativism has 3,1295, helping behavior has 4,2097, voice behavior has 4,0440, and positive work behavior has 3,78 mean scores. According to this result we could say our sample consists of mostly idealist as well as fairly relativist individuals, and they could incline to conduct helping, voice and positive work behavior in the workplace (Table 5).

| Table 5: Descriptive statistics and correlations among variables |
|------------------|------------------|
|                   | Mean  | Std. Deviation | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| 1. Idealism       | 4.0713| 0.58611        | 1  |    |    |    |    |
| 2. Relativism     | 3.1295| 0.68807        | 1  |    |    |    |    |
| 3. Helping Behavior| 4.2097| 0.66460        | .313**| .27 | 1  |
| 4. Voice Behavior | 4.0440| 0.65851        | .246**| .28 | .673**| 1 |
| 5. Positive Work Behavior | 3.7848| 0.76885       | .221**| .61 | .526**| .555**| 1 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.01  THE IMPACT OF IDEALISM ON HELPING, VOICE, AND POSITIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

There is a significant relationship between idealism and helping behavior (r=0.313, p=0.00< 0.01). Idealism also explained 9.6 % variances in helping behavior, so we could say being one unit increase in idealism score, helping behavior score increases 0.313(B1) (Table 6). In addition, idealism and voice behavior relation is significant, and idealism explained 5.8 % variances in voice behavior with 0.246 correlation coefficient. Furthermore, idealism and positive work behavior have significant relationship (r=0.221) and idealism explained 4.6 % variances in positive work behavior. So 1a, 1b and 1c hypotheses were supported. On the other hand, the effect of relativism on helping behavior is non-significant (p=0.61). Moreover the influence of relativism on voice behavior (p=0.60), and positive work behavior is not significant (p=0.25). Thus, we rejected 2a, 2b and 2c hypotheses.

| Table 6: Regression analyses results |
|------------------|------------------|
| Model | Dependent Variable | Predictors | R | Adjusted R² | Beta | Std.Coeff. (Beta) | t | Sig. | ANOVA/ Sig. |
| 1     | Helping Behavior  | Constant    | .313 | .096 | .355 | .313 | 11.670 | .000 | F= 38.122/ |
| 2     | Voice Behavior    | Constant    | .246 | .058 | .276 | .246 | 4.744 | .000 | F= 22.504/ |
| 3     | Positive Work Behavior | Constant    | .221 | .046 | .290 | .221 | 4.242 | .000 | F= 17.992/ |
4.02 THE INFLUENCE OF LEVEL OF IDEALISM ON HELPING, VOICE, AND POSITIVE WORK BEHAVIOR LEVEL

In this study, we purpose to evaluate low, medium, and high idealist individuals’ helping, voice, and positive work behaviors that they exhibit. Before running the ordinal logistic regression (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2004; Field, 2009; Nilsson, 2008), the dependent variable helping behavior, voice behavior, and positive work behavior were divided into three categories one by one (high-medium-low); in addition, the independent variable idealism was grouped into three categories, as mentioned before. However, our data set did not contain low level idealist individuals. So we used medium and high level idealist individuals to conduct logistic regression analyses.

Model 1 represents a good overall fit as it is significant (X² (1, N= 356) = 13,934; p=0.00). For ordinal logistic regression models, it is not possible to compute the same R² statistics as in linear regression, so two approximations are computed instead, entitled pseudo R² measures Cox & Snell R², Nagelkerke R² as seen in Table 7. The pseudo R² measures are the proportion of variance for the dependent variable explained by the predictors (National Centre for Research Methods, 2011). Here, the pseudo R² shows that Idealism explains a relatively small amount of variation of individuals’ helping behavior. (3.9 % - 5.4 % as seen in Cox & Snell R²/ Nagelkerke R² in Model 1). Actually this result is expected because there are many characteristics affecting individuals’ helping behavior.

**Table 7. Results of ordinal logistic regression (Used Logit Link Function)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>EXP(Estimate)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Test of Parallel Line (Chi-Sq./ Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism-&gt;Helping Behavior</td>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low – Medium</td>
<td>-5.423</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.896 / p= 0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium – High</td>
<td>-0.389</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Idealism (High)</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idealism (Medium)</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice Behavior</td>
<td>X² (Model Fit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.320 / p= 0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism-&gt;Voice Behavior</td>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low – Medium</td>
<td>-4.802</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium – High</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Idealism (High)</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idealism (Medium)</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Work Behavior</td>
<td>X² (Model Fit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.161 / p= 0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism-&gt;Positive Work Behavior</td>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low – Medium</td>
<td>-3.974</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium – High</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Idealism (High)</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idealism (Medium)</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a This parameter is set zero because it is redundant. EXP: Exponent, Est: Estimate.

Test of parallel lines was done because ordered logistic regression estimates one equation over all levels of the response variable. When we accept the null hypothesis in parallel lines test, we can conclude that line shows a single relation for two categories that are paralleled with other two categories (low - medium and medium – high). One equation is enough to explain all pair of group and dependent variable relationship (Norusis, 2005; Nilsson, 2008). Coming back to the results of Table 7, test of parallel lines score are not significant (p= 0.169), so we can say one equation model is valid for proportional odds tests (an equation for medium level helping behavior versus low level helping behavior, and an equation for...
high level helping behavior versus low level helping behavior could be explained as a single equation). As seen in Table 7, idealism has significant influence on how much individual’s exhibit helping behavior. For one unit increase in idealism (going to medium idealist to high idealist), the odds representing high helping behavior versus the combined middle and low helping behavior categories are 2.42 times greater, given that all of other variables in the model are held constant. Likewise the odds representing combined high and middle helping behavior categories versus low is 2.42 times greater. In the other words, high idealist individuals 2.42 times more likely to exhibit high level helping behavior with regard to middle and low level helping behavior than medium idealist individuals. Similarly, high idealist individuals are 2.42 times more likely to exhibit high and medium level helping behavior with regard to low level helping behavior than medium idealist individuals (test of parallel lines result allow to compare high category and combination of medium and low category as well as combination of high and medium category and low category). Briefly, high idealist individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level helping behavior than medium idealist individuals. Consequently, hypothesis 3a was supported.

Model 2 in Table 7 shows a reasonable fit as it is significant ($X^2 (1, N= 356) = 9.790; p=0.002$) and Cox & Snell R$^2$ is 0.027 and Nagelkerke R$^2$ is 0.036, so we can say overall model is significant and idealism explains approximately 4 % variances in voice behavior. The model assumption of parallel lines is not violated as the test is non-significant ($p= 0.85$). In addition, high idealist individuals 2.01 times more likely to exhibit high level voice behavior with regard to middle and low level voice behavior than medium idealist individuals. Likewise, high idealist individuals are 2.01 times more likely to exhibit high and medium level voice behavior with regard to low level voice behavior than medium idealist individuals (test of parallel lines result allow to compare high category and combination of medium and low category as well as combination of high and medium category and low category). So, hypothesis 3b was supported.

Model 3 displays a good fit ($X^2 (1, N= 356) = 5.003; p=0.025$) and Pseudo R$^2$ values are about 0.014 and 0.018. Consequently, it can be claimed overall model is significant and idealism explains 1.8 % variances in positive work behavior. Parallel lines test indicates non-significant results, so we can say one equation is valid for proportional odds tests. Table 7 shows, for one unit increase in idealism (from medium idealist to high idealist) the odds exhibiting high positive work behavior versus the combined middle and low positive work behavior categories are 1.63 times greater, given that all of other variables in the model are held constant. Similarly, the odds representing combined high and middle positive work behavior categories versus low 1.63 times greater (test of parallel lines support this result). So, it can be said high idealist individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level positive work behavior than medium idealist individuals. Therefore, hypothesis 3c was supported.

On the other hand, the effect of relativism on helping behavior is not good fit with non-significant result ($X^2 (1, N= 52) = 0.018; p=0.89$), on voice behavior is similar ($X^2 (1, N= 52) = 0.151; p=0.69$) as well as on positive work behavior does not produce enough fit value and significant result, too ($X^2 (1, N= 52) = 1.789; p=0.18$). Following those results, we conclude that low and high relativist does not significantly explain individuals’ helping, voice, and positive work behavior. Thus, hypothesis 4 was rejected.

4.03 THE EFFECT OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON IDEALISM, RELATIVISM, HELPING BEHAVIOR, VOICE BEHAVIOR, AND POSITIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

According to individuals’ age, gender, work experience, college major, and whether they took an ethics course during their university education or not, we investigated how these demographic characteristics explain individuals’ idealism, relativism, helping behavior, voice behavior, and positive work behavior level. Ordinal logistic regression analyses show that idealism can be explained with college major with good model fit ($X^2 (8, N= 356) = 19.952; p=0.011$). Table 7 Model 4 indicates that individuals’ major explain about 2.5 % to 4.6 % variance of idealism. So we can say individuals graduated from a major related to social science are 1.77 times more likely to represent high level idealism with regard to middle and low level idealism than individuals graduated from a major related to science. Likewise, individuals graduated from a major related with social science are 1.77 times more likely to exhibit high and middle level idealism
with regard to low level idealism than individuals graduated from a major related to science. Thus, the results could be interpreted that individuals graduated from a major related to social science are more likely to represent upper level idealist personality than individuals graduated from a major related with science. Therefore, hypothesis 5a was partially supported.

None of demographic variables (age, gender, work experience, college major, and whether they took an ethics course) significantly effects on relativism (χ²(8, N= 356) = 10.712; p=0.21), helping behavior (χ²(8, N= 356) = 7.042; p=0.53), and voice behavior (χ²(8, N= 356) = 8.028; p=0.43). So, hypotheses 5b, 5c, 5d were rejected.

### Table 8: Results of Ordinal Logistic regression between Demographic Characteristics and Idealism as well as Positive Work Behavior (Used Logit Link Function)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Odds = Exp(Estimate)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Wald Statis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Dem. -&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major (Social Science)</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major (Science)</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>4.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox&amp;Snell R²/Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>0.025 / 0.046</td>
<td>7.603; p=0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Work Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>-3.868</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>61.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Medium-High)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>7.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Above 30)</td>
<td>-0.451</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Above 30)</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>3.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (up to 36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Demog. --&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (0-5)</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (6-10)</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (11-15)</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Above 16)</td>
<td>0.066 / 0.085</td>
<td>20.737; p=0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Demog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Work Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>-3.868</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>61.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Medium-High)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>7.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Above 30)</td>
<td>-0.451</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Above 30)</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>3.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (up to 36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (0-5)</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (6-10)</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (11-15)</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Above 16)</td>
<td>0.066 / 0.085</td>
<td>20.737; p=0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This parameter is set zero because it is redundant. EXP: Exponent, Est: Estimate. The group that has the least observation was defined as reference category. Dependent variable: Idealism (Model 4), Positive work behavior (Model 5), Independent Variables: Demographics (Ethics Course, Collage Major, Age, Experience, Genders) EXP: Exponent, Est: Estimate, All Demog: All Demographic Variables.

On the other hand, Model 5 in Table 8 represents good fit (χ²(8, N= 356) = 20.737; p=0.008) and Pseudo R² values are about 0.06 and 0.09. Results indicate that only age and experience have a significant influence on positive work behavior among the other demographic variables, college major, gender, and ethics course. Overall model is significant, and age and experience explain approximately 9 % variance of positive work behavior. Parallel lines test indicates non-significant results, so we can say one equation is valid for proportional odds tests. We can interpret that individuals in the age of 31-35 are 2.39 times more likely to exhibit high level positive work behavior with regard to middle and low level positive work behavior than individuals in the age of up to 36. Similarly, individuals in the age of 31-35 are 2.39 times more likely to represent high and medium level positive work behavior with regard to low level positive work behavior than individuals in the age of up to 36 (test of parallel lines support this result). In addition, individuals’ experience level from 11 to 15 are 3.53 times more likely to exhibit high level positive work behavior than individuals’ experience level up to 16 years, given that all of other variables in the model are held constant. Consequently, it can be said individuals in the age of 31-35 are more likely to exhibit upper level positive work behavior than individuals in the age of up to 36. Also, individuals’ experience level from 11 to 15 is more likely to exhibit upper level positive work behavior than individuals’ experience level up to 16 years. So hypothesis 5e was partially supported.

### 5.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Emerging stream of existing studies differentiates ethical ideologies as positive and negative. Positive ethical ideologies are identified as ‘principle’ or ‘idealism’, and negative ethical ideologies are identified...
The Influence of ethical ideologies on ...

as ‘expedient’ or ‘relativism’ in the literature (Forsyth, 1980; Davis, Anderson & Curtis, 2001; Schlenker, 2008). Additionally, numerous studies investigating the relationship between ethical ideologies and individuals’ various behaviors could be seen in the literature as well (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara & Pastorelli, 1996; Trevino, Weaver & Reynolds, 2006). Following the theoretical and empirical foundation of the previous studies, we investigated idealism as positive and relativism as negative ethical ideology and their influence on helping behavior, voice behavior and positive work behavior of individuals.

Results of this study show idealism significantly affects helping behavior, voice behavior and positive work behavior. Now that, these kinds of behaviors are exhibited voluntarily, they are appraised as prosocial behavior scope. As noted by Schlenker’s (2008), they can be evaluated as positive social activities. So these results confirm Schlenker’s (2008) study’s implications. On the other hand, relativism has not a significant impact on the helping, voice as well as positive work behaviors. Grieve and Mahar (2010) findings are consistent with the evidence that ethical ideologies effect on the promotive extra role behaviors and positive work behavior in this study.

Forsyth (1980; 2008) discriminates on the grounds low – high level idealist and relativist individuals and structures the ethical ideologies taxonomy. This study also makes this kind of distinction between low, medium and high level idealist individuals. Nevertheless, our data set did not have low level idealist individuals, so we investigated high and medium level idealist individuals and their behaviors. As a consequence, we found that high idealist individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level helping behavior than medium idealist individuals. High idealist individuals are also more likely to exhibit upper level voice behavior than medium idealist individuals. Furthermore, high idealist individuals are more likely to exhibit upper level positive work behavior than medium idealist individuals. Evaluating this study results in terms of the Forsyth’s (1980; 2008) taxonomy, situationists and absolutists are more likely to behave positively especially for helping, voice, and overall positive work behavior.

Implications of the this study indicate that individuals graduated from a major related to social science are more likely to exhibit upper level idealism personality than individuals graduated from a major related to science. Another evidence of this study indicates that individuals in the age of 31-35 are more likely to exhibit upper level positive work behavior than individuals in the age of up to 36. Moreover individuals’ experience levels from 11 to 15 are more likely to conduct upper level positive work behavior than individuals’ experience level up to 16 years. So it could be said the more experienced and older individuals have the least positive work behavior.

This study offers valuable contribution about differences of ethical ideologies taxonomy and their influence on extra-role behavior literature, investigating high-medium-low level idealists and relativist as well as their behaviors especially helping, voice, and positive work behavior. However, this study has some limitations. For instance, research data did not include low level idealists, therefore; we could not interpret subjectivist and exceptionist individuals’ ethical ideologies and their relation with behaviors. Thus, it is better to prove the research implication with different sample. In addition, more studies are needed in this field.
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