Published in final edited form as:

Am J Community Psychol. 2015 June ; 55(3-4): 347–358. doi:10.1007/s10464-015-9708-0.

Engagement & Disengagement in Mutual-Help Addiction Recovery Housing: A Test of Affective Events Theory

Christopher R. Beasley, Ph.D.^a and Leonard A. Jason, Ph.D.^b

Christopher R. Beasley: crbeasley@gmail.com; Leonard A. Jason: ljason@depaul.edu

^aWashington College, Department of Psychology, 300 Washington Ave, Chestertown, MD 21620

^bDePaul University Center for Community Research, 990 W. Fullerton Avenue, STE 3100, Chicago, IL 60614

Abstract

Engagement and disengagement in addiction recovery settings are important for these communities and their members. This study tested an Affective Events Theory (AET) model of these constructs in the Oxford House network of recovery homes. Residents' congruence with their home (P-E fit) was hypothesized to directly influence behavior that supported the house and other residents—citizenship behavior. We further hypothesized P-E fit would be related to member intentions to leave, with attitudes toward the home mediating that relationship. To assess this, we administered a cross-sectional national survey to 296 residents of 83 randomly selected Oxford Houses. Although the AET model demonstrated good fit with the data, an alternative model fit better. This alternative model suggested an additional indirect relationship between P-E fit and citizenship mediated by attitudes. Results suggested affective experiences such as feeling like one fits with a community may influence engagement and disengagement. There appears to be a direct influence of fit on citizenship behavior and an indirect influence of fit through recovery home attitudes on both citizenship and how intentions to leave the home. We conclude affective experiences could be important for community engagement and disengagement but AET may need to integrate cognitive dissonance theory.

Keywords

Affective Events Theory; Person-Environment Fit; Commitment; Satisfaction; Citizenship Behavior; Tenure

Although a wide range of such services have been developed, including inpatient and outpatient services (Jason, Olson, & Foli, 2008), only about 11% of those with substance addictions reach any type of substance abuse treatment (SAMHSA, 2010), and those that are treated evidence high rates of premature drop outs and future substance use (Dutra et al., 2008). While certainly not a panacea for addiction recovery, mutual-help communities may increase retention and long-term success rates of professional services (Majer, Jason, Ferrari, Venable, & Olson, 2002; Timko & DeBenedetti, 2007). As a stand-alone intervention, these

mutual-help communities appear about as effective as professional services (Ferri, Amato, & Davoli, 2009).

Effectiveness and availability of these supports may depend on the degree to which members are engaged in the communities though. For example, the depth to which one is involved in mutual-help addiction recovery programs appears to be more strongly related to abstinence than simply being a member (Weiss et al., 2005). Additionally, research suggests member recovery is enhanced by service to these organizations and fellow members (Pagano, Friend, Tonigan, & Stout, 2004; Zetmore, Kaskutas, & Ammon, 2004).

Furthermore, Mutual-help systems are typically run by volunteers and funded mostly by members with relatively little taxpayer financing needed to support or maintain the organizations (McCready & Miller, 1993; Olson et al., 2006). As voluntary organizations, members are generally not financially compensated for their work, so members likely rely on motivators other than employment to contribute. Although there is sparse empirical knowledge about mechanisms for voluntary helping behaviors, research suggests such behavior is critical for survival of these groups. For example, committed leaders and member helping behaviors have been found to be essential to the continuance and success of mutual-help groups (King, Stewart, King, & Law, 2000; Wituk, Shepherd, Warren, & Meissen, 2002).

Conversely, mutual-help programs may be less available and effective if members are disengaged and/or leave the setting. For example, disengaged members would not benefit from outcomes associated with involvement, helping others, and being of service. Additionally, the ultimate form of disengagement is exit from the setting, and prior inquiry has shown length of membership in 12-step groups to be related to abstinence (Moos & Moos, 2006). Similarly, length of stay in mutual-help recovery housing may be related to abstinence, with a 6-month stay seen as a minimum dosage for benefitting from these settings (Jason, Davis, & Ferrari, 2007).

Inquiry into mechanisms for community engagement can employ transdisciplinary perspective to incorporate theoretical and empirical literature from domains other than communities and mutual-help groups. For example, industrial/organizational psychology has examined voluntary behaviors that support fellow organizational members and the setting itself (citizenship behavior) as well as member disengagement such as leaving the setting.

Organizational engagement is a psychological enmeshment with the organization that can be manifested through either psychologically or behaviorally (Kahn, 1992). Psychological engagement includes constructs such as attachment to the setting; while behavioral engagement includes involvement, citizenship behavior, and other forms of helping. Disengagement can be viewed as a lack of psychological enmeshment and behavioral withdrawal from the setting. Affective Events Theory (AET) suggests both engagement and disengagement are influenced by events in the workplace and resulting affective states (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). AET differentiates behaviors as either judgment-driven or affective ones. Judgment-driven behaviors (e.g. leaving a setting) are those most strongly associated with cognitive assessments about the organization and situation; while affective

behaviors (e.g. citizenship) result from an emotional reaction. Following these assumptions, AET posits affective behaviors are directly related to affective experiences while judgment-driven behaviors are indirectly related to affect through attitudes (e.g. satisfaction and commitment) formed by such experiences.

While an ecological perspective is not currently integrated into AET, one would expect various ecological factors and cross-level interactions to elicit affective responses and, thus, influence judgment and affective behavior through the AET process. For example, when people perceive congruence between themselves and organizations they belong to (person-environment fit), they appear to experience a positive emotional response (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). In the current study, we integrated this ecological perspective into AET with person-environment fit (P-E fit) as an affective experience. We hypothesized such fit would directly influence the citizenship behavior while being indirectly related to tenure intentions through residents' attitudes toward their recovery home.

Methods

Sample

The sample was derived from a national survey of Oxford House recovery home residents. We mailed 641 surveys to 96 houses and received 306 surveys back from 83 houses. Thus, the house and survey response rates were 86% and 48% respectively. After exclusion of unusable data, 296 participants from 83 houses remained in the study. The sample consisted of 59% men, 75% European-Americans, 17% African-Americans, 4% Hispanics, 2% Native-Americans, 1% Asian-Americans, and 1% Pacific Islanders. Additionally, 54% were single, 28% were divorced, 9% were separated, 4% were married, 3% were widowed, 2% were in lifelong committed relationships, 9% identified as LGBT, and 39% had been to prison. Furthermore, 50% had at least some college education, 6% completed trade school, 33% completed high school or received a GED, and 12% had less than a high school education. On average, participants had actively used psychoactive substances for 17.83 years ($SD = 10.58$), had been sober for 17.39 months ($SD = 19.34$), and lived in their current Oxford House for 10.51 months ($SD = 16.67$). Participants were treated according to APA recommendations for responsible research.

Measures

Person-environment fit—The Cable and DeRue (2002) measure of P-E fit was used to examine all components of fit except interpersonal similarity, which this instrument does not assess. This 9-item, 7-point Likert-type (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) self-report scale measures the perceived congruence between employees and the organization they work for (value congruence), individuals' ability to meet the demands of their job (demands-abilities fit), and the sufficiency of a job in meeting the needs of individuals (needs-supplies fit). Higher scores indicated a greater degree of fit with regard to each component. The instrument is reliable ($\alpha = 0.84$ to 0.93) and has been validated by both the authors (Cable & DeRue, 2002) and others (Hinkle & Namok, 2009). The language used in this measure is specific to employment settings, so it was modified by replacing "job" and

“organization” with “Oxford House” and work-related actions with recovery home-related actions, such as by replacing “work” with “live.” Items were then averaged to create summary scores. We found the measure to be reliable for both the individual and house-level components of each component (See Table 1).

To assess interpersonal similarity, we used the Interpersonal Similarity subscale from the General Environment Fit Scale (GEFS; Beasley, Jason, & Miller, 2012). The GEFS was originally developed as a 15-item, 4-point Likert-type measure of P-E fit; however, the authors recommended using the measure using a 5-point Likert-type response option in the future, and this guidance was followed for the current study. The GEFS was intended as a measure of P-E fit for use in a variety of settings but was developed using an Oxford House resident and alumni population. The Interpersonal Similarity subscale demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = 0.78$) and concurrent construct validity. Although the GEFS also contains subscales for value congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit, the Cable and DeRue (2002) subscales were used because their psychometric qualities were superior to the equivalent GEFS subscales. Items were then averaged to create a summary score. Interpersonal Similarity demonstrated good internal consistency for the current study (see Table 1). P-E fit scholars have argued fit is a multidimensional latent construct in which various types of perceived congruence with a single target converge into an overall perception of fit with that target (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). The current study similarly defined fit in this fashion.

Resident attitude toward recovery home—As with P-E fit, latent constructs have been proposed for attitudes. For example Organ (1997) proposed a latent construct of morale in which views toward a setting converge into an overall attitude toward the target. Two aspects he proposed were satisfaction and affective commitment.

Satisfaction: Resident satisfaction with their recovery home was assessed using a slightly modified version of Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh’ (1983) job satisfaction subscale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. This 3-item 7-point Likert-type (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) self-report subscale assesses employees’ satisfaction with their job. Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction with the target. It has been shown to be both valid and reliable ($\alpha = 0.67$ to 0.95 ; (Hochwarter, Perrewé, Ferris, & Brymer, 1999;)). The measure of job satisfaction has also been shown to be distinct from other organizational constructs (Sanchez, Kraus, White, & Williams, 1999). This measure of satisfaction was modified by replacing “job” with “Oxford House.” Items were then averaged to create a summary score. We found the measure to have good reliability in the current study (See Table 1).

Affective commitment: Resident commitment to their recovery home was assessed using a slightly modified version of the affective commitment subscale from Meyer and Allen’s (1997) 18-item 7-point Likert-type (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) self-report measure of employee commitment to the workplace. This subscale measures the strength with which individuals feel emotionally attached to their organization. Higher scores indicate greater affective commitment to the target organization. The subscale is widely used in organizational literature and has been shown to be reliable and valid ($\alpha = .85$;). This instrument was modified by replacing work-related actions with recovery home-related ones

and changing the target to Oxford House. Items were then averaged to create a summary score. We found the measure to be reliable in the current study (see Table 1).

Citizenship behavior—Resident citizenship behaviors in their recovery home was assessed using a slightly modified version of the helping subscale from Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) 13-item 7-point Likert-type (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) measure of extra-roles behavior in the workplace. The helping subscale assesses small acts of consideration toward others and has been shown to be highly reliable ($\alpha = 0.89$). This subscale was selected, because such helping is one behavior nearly universally agreed upon as a component of citizenship (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006). Higher scores indicate a greater tendency to engage in that particular component of citizenship behavior. The measure was modified by replacing the work-related actions with recovery home-related actions and changing workplace targets to Oxford House. Items were then averaged to create a summary score. We found the measure to be reliable in the current study (see Table 1).

Tenure—Length of future stay in Oxford House was estimated using Kelloway, Gottlieb, and Barham's (1999) 4-item 5-point Likert-type (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) measure of turnover intentions. The instrument assesses turnover intentions by asking about plans for looking for a new setting, asking others about opportunities, and thoughts about leaving. The measure was found to have high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.92\text{--}0.93$; Kelloway et al., 1999). Higher scores indicate greater intention to leave the organization. The measure was modified by replacing the work-related actions with recovery home-related actions and changing workplace targets to Oxford House. Items were then averaged to create a summary score. We found the measure to be reliable in the current study (see Table 1).

Socially desirable response tendencies—Social desirability was assessed using the Version C of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS-C; (Reynolds, 1978). The MCSDS-C is a 13-item True-False self-report measure of socially desirable response tendencies. Higher scores indicate greater tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. It has been shown to be related to valid, reliable ($\alpha = .89$; Fischer & Fick, 1993), and highly correlated with the full MCSDS ($r = 0.93$; Reynolds, 1978). We found the measure to be reliable in the current study (see Table 1).

Analyses

Data screening—Before conducting primary analyses, we examined the extent of missing data, reliability of measures, univariate and multivariate normality of score distributions, degree of dependency due to the nested sample, and inter-scale correlations. The extent of missing data was assessed at the individual item level as well as the summary score level. Reliability was assessed at both the within- and between-group level by calculating omega at each. Univariate skewness and kurtosis were assessed by dividing the associated statistics by their standard error to standardize them. Those exceeding an absolute value of 3.29 were considered a violation of the normality assumption for regression-based analyses. Multivariate normality was examined using Mardia's standardized coefficient. Multivariate outliers were then identified using Mahalanobis distance. Dependency was examined by calculating the interclass correlations for each variable to. Inter-scale correlations were

assessed at both the within- and between-group levels to identify potential collinearity and multicollinearity.

Model testing—Our primary analyses used a Multilevel Structural Equation Modeling framework in *Mplus* version 7.11. These analyses examined the measurement and structural models in Figure 1, with each endogenous variable regressed onto social desirability to control for such response patterns. We also examined a competing model in which citizenship behavior was indirectly related to the affective experience of perceived fit through the recovery home attitude latent variable. To minimize the risk of local optima, we requested that *Mplus* examine 1000 sets of parameter starting values and test the best set with 250 random sets. Fit was assessed using the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) using acceptable fit cutoffs of CFI .95, RMSEA .08, and SRMR .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Such fit was assessed separately for the within-group level using a partially saturated approach in which the between-group level was saturated to limit bias from misfit in the latter (R Ryu, 2014). However, parameter estimates for direct and indirect effects were derived from a simultaneous estimation of the within and between-group effects.

Representativeness check—We also conducted representativeness checks comparing these demographics to data available from Oxford House, Inc. These included the annual Oxford House report of their demographics, which is a non-random sample of residents (Oxford House, 2012) as well as their database of household characteristics, which is a complete population database (Oxford House, 2011).

Results

Data Screening

Missing data—Only 1.2% of total observations were missing. Given that there was less than 5% missingness, methods of redressing this issue were unlikely to bias statistical analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2006). Data from participants who completed at least 3/4 of items on each measure in the battery were used for the proposed study. After creating summary scores, 2.1% of the data were missing. The Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) feature in *Mplus* 7.11 was used to estimate these missing data from that which was present.

Reliability—Internal consistency ranged from good to excellent for all measures at the within-group level and were all excellent at the between-group level (see Table 1).

Normality—Univariate normality analyses indicated citizenship behavior and satisfaction violated this assumption (see Table 1), and Mardia's tests of skew (10.77, $p < 0.001$) and kurtosis (114.13, $p < 0.001$) suggested multivariate non-normality. Three cases were identified as multivariate outliers on the 8 variables with Mahalanobis distance in excess of 26.13 ($p < 0.001$) and were excluded from further analyses. After removal of these cases, Mardia's test continued to indicate excessive skew (9.01, $p < 0.001$) and kurtosis (107.44, $p < 0.001$), but no further multivariate outliers were found so subsequent analyses used a robust estimator to account for potential biases in standard errors (Yuan & Bentler, 2000).

Dependency—Interclass correlations ranged from 0.02 to 0.14 (see Table 1), suggesting 2% to 14% of the variance in each could be attributed to a clustering effect. The ICC only exceeded 0.10 for two variables. Thus, there is likely to be some dependency in the error terms but not enough for stable estimates of between-group models, particularly given the limited number of level two units (Preacher, Zhang, & Zyphur, 2011). To account for the dependency without creating instability in models, we estimated house-level means to partition off the between-group variance components of all variables, but did not model relationships between those components.

Inter-scale correlations—Within-group correlations ranged from -0.01 to 0.73 (see Table 2), suggesting sufficient but not extreme collinearity. Between-group correlations ranged from -0.01 to 0.95 , suggesting potential multicollinearity at this level; however, no between-group model was specified.

Model Testing

Measurement model—The measurement model with four facets of P-E fit as indicators of a latent perception of fit demonstrated good fit with the data, $\chi^2_{SB}(8) = 17.02$, $p = 0.03$; CFI = .99, RMSEA = 0.06; SRMR = 0.03. This suggested such latent factors could be used in a structural model.

Structural models—Although hypothesized AET model similarly demonstrated good fit with the data, $\chi^2_{SB}(22) = 36.31$, $p = 0.03$; CFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.05; SRMR = 0.03, the competing model demonstrated good fit as well [$\chi^2_{SB}(21) = 30.57$, $p = 0.08$; CFI = .99, RMSEA = 0.04; SRMR = 0.03] and was significantly better than the AET model [$\chi^2_{SB}(1) = 5.74$, $p = 0.02$]. Furthermore, the additional direct and indirect effects were significant and meaningful. Therefore, the alternative model was retained. Overall, the model explained 33% of the variance in citizenship behavior ($R^2 = 0.33$, $p < 0.001$), 30% of tenure intentions ($R^2 = 0.30$, $p < 0.001$), and 70% of recovery home attitude ($R^2 = 0.70$, $p < 0.001$).

Direct effects—Standardized parameter estimates and magnitude of effect for direct and indirect effects are displayed in Table 3. All parameters supported by AET were significant. However, counter to the theory, for each standard deviation increase in perceived fit, there was a 0.24 standard deviation increase in citizenship behavior, and 6% of citizenship was explained by this predictor. For each standard deviation increase in perceived fit, there was a 0.83 standard deviation increase in recovery home attitude, and 69% of such attitude was explained by this predictor. For each standard deviation increase in recovery home attitude, there was a 0.65 standard deviation decrease in intentions to leave the Oxford House, and 42% of such intentions was explained by this predictor. Lastly, one parameter was incongruent with AET—citizenship behavior was related to recovery home attitude. For each standard deviation increase in such attitude, there was a 0.35 standard deviation increase in citizenship behavior, and 13% of such behavior was explained by this predictor.

Indirect effects—Similarly, the indirect effect suggested by AET was significant—recovery home attitude mediated the influence of P-E fit on residents' intentions to leave. Such perceptions of fit explained 29% of the variance in tenure intentions through fit's

relationship with attitude. However, as with the direct effects, an indirect effect was found in addition to those suggested by AET—recovery home attitude mediated the relationship between P-E fit and citizenship behavior. Such perceptions of fit explained 4% of the variance in citizenship through fit's relationship with attitude.

Representativeness—There were a greater proportion of women (41%) participants than is found in non-random Oxford House data (25%). There were also a greater proportion of White participants (74.5%) than is found in Oxford House data (56%), $\chi^2(1) = 26.72, p < 0.001$. Additionally, there were a greater proportion of unemployed participants (10.8%) than is found in Oxford House data (8%). Furthermore, there were a greater proportion of single (54.1%) and married (5.8%) participants but lesser proportion of separated (12.6%) and divorced (27.6%) participants than is found in Oxford House data (45%, 4%, 18%, and 33%). Although the average age of participants was similar to that found in national Oxford House data [$t(285) = 1.71, p = 0.09$], participants had been in recovery longer [$t(284) = 2.52, p = 0.01$], lived there longer [$t(288) = 2.73, p = 0.01$], and attended fewer 12-step recovery meetings per week [$t(278) = -10.49, p < 0.001$] than is found in Oxford House data.

These house-level data indicated a potential reason for the overrepresentation of women in the sample. Even though there was no gender difference in likelihood of houses being selected for the study [$\chi^2(1) = 0.50, p = 0.48$], women's houses were more likely to have returned surveys [$\chi^2(1) = 8.69, p = 0.003$]. The house-level data also indicated the sample of Oxford Houses were in regions similar to that of the population of Oxford Houses in the U.S. [$\chi^2(3) = 5.10, p = 0.17$] as were those that returned surveys, $\chi^2(3) = 2.79, p = 0.43$.

Discussion

Prior research suggests member engagement and disengagement in addiction mutual-help programs likely improves individual and setting outcomes. However, relatively little is known about the processes of engagement and disengagement. Affective Events Theory (AET) suggests affective experiences are directly related to affective behaviors (e.g. citizenship) but indirectly related to judgment behaviors (e.g. leaving) through attitudes (e.g. satisfaction and commitment). The current study examined an AET model, with the ecological factor of perceived person-environment fit (P-E fit) as an affective experience.

As expected, the measurement model suggested the hypothesized latent constructs of perceived P-E fit and recovery home attitudes fit the data well. These latent variables support conceptualizations of morale (Organ, 1997) and P-E fit (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012) as unobserved multidimensional constructs. As expected, the AET model demonstrated good fit with the data, thus providing some support for the theory. However, an alternative model fit the data better. The model included an additional path between attitudes and citizenship behavior as well as a mediation in which attitudes explained the relationship between fit and citizenship. These findings support much of AET in that affective experiences like perceived fit appear to be directly related to affective behaviors like citizenship and indirectly related to judgment-driven intentions to leave the recovery home (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). As expected, there was a strong relationship between residents' perceived fit with their recovery home and attitude toward that home. This is consistent with AET and prior inquiry into fit's

influence on satisfaction and commitment (Verquer, Boehr, & Wagner, 2003). Also consistent with AET, our hypothesis, and prior investigations (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006), was the relationship between fit and citizenship. Furthermore, the expected strong relationship between attitudes and expected tenure is concordant with AET, our hypotheses. Lastly, expected strong indirect influence of fit on tenure through attitudes is congruent with AET.

However, the findings also suggest that, contrary to AET, attitudes had a moderate influence on citizenship, and there was a small partial mediation in which attitude toward the recovery home partially explained the relationship between residents' perceived fit and engagement in citizenship behavior. These effects supports Organ's (1997) model in which morale was related to citizenship behavior. Both his and our findings are concordant with cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). According to this theory, people seek to minimize psychological discomfort by maintaining congruence between their attitudes and behaviors. If someone feels positively toward a setting, they would be expected to behave in ways that are favorable to the setting. However, if individuals feel negatively toward a setting, they would be expected to refrain from positive behaviors or engage in counter-productive ones. One such positive feeling is the experience of positive affect in an Oxford House, which prior inquiry suggests would result from perceptions of P-E fit (Yu, 2009). If such fit produces positive affect, residents would likely engage in behaviors congruent with the attitude. These behaviors would likely be actions most closely associated with the target of the attitude. The Oxford House recovery home system is closely associated with 12-step groups and these groups emphasize service to others and the organization (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001). Therefore, positive attitudes toward these houses would likely lead to greater service behavior like citizenship.

There were a number of limitations to the study. For example, it is unclear how representative the sample is to that of the Oxford House population. Analyses comparing our data to Oxford House demographics indicated limited generalizability with regard to several variables. However, comparison data were derived from the Oxford House annual report of demographics (Oxford House, 2012), which is a non-random sample of residents. Comparisons to population-level data indicated similar geographic locations for houses in our sample but disproportionately more women's houses returned surveys. Another potential limitation is the self-report nature of the survey. Although self-reports of citizenship behavior are seen as relatively accurate indicators of this construct (Khalid & Ali, 2005) and meta-analyses have found consistency between behavioral intentions and actual behavior (Kim & Hunter, 1993), there is always a potential for bias in such self-reporting. For example, context may influence the execution of behavioral intentions (Steel & Ovalle, 1984; Webb & Sheeran, 2006). The survey was anonymous and included a measure of socially desirable response tendencies to limit self-report bias but did not examine contextual influences. Lastly, the cross-sectional non-experimental design of the study limits inferences of the temporal sequence of constructs as well as directionality and causal nature of relationships found.

Even in light of these limitations, the current study has the potential to advance P-E fit and engagement inquiry as well as practice related to these concepts. For example, findings

suggest AET theory may need to be modified to accommodate cognitive dissonance theory and Organ's (1997) morale model. However, these organizational theories and concepts largely appear to be applicable to organic community systems like mutual-help recovery homes. They also have the potential to help explain other voluntary behavior like community service and civic engagement. They suggest behaviors like engagement and disengagement can be influenced by interactions between persons and their environments. The current research further moves the mutual-help field toward a more complete understanding of behaviors like citizenship that help sustain these communities.

Our findings suggest mutual-help systems may want to attend to member perceptions of fit with the group, because lack of such fit may influence whether members intend to leave their community. Attending to such fit may also help strengthen these groups, because such fit appears to be related to whether members voluntarily engage in behaviors that support their community. These groups could attend to fit by helping members explore ways in which they fit with the community. For example, groups could explicitly communicate their values and resources, so members are better aware of how there may be congruence between values and what needs are being met by the group. Mutual-help groups could also promote shared goals and identities to facilitate perceptions of interpersonal similarity. Lastly, these groups could be structured in ways that are accommodating to varying abilities of members and/or facilitate growth in members to achieve demands-abilities fit.

Future studies may want to address limitations of the current research and/or extend findings. For example, further inquiry is needed to cross-validate the model in other Oxford House samples and additional populations. Additionally, qualitative research into the AET process might inform future data collection efforts and extensions of the theory. Furthermore, future research could employ longitudinal methods to assess behavior rather than intentions, temporal sequence of paths in the model, and experimental interventions to assess causality. Such research might also highlight individual, ecological, and cross-level factors related to affective experiences, attitudes, engagement, and disengagement. Two-stage random sampling could improve generalizability for this inquiry, and a census of the Oxford House population would improve assessments of the random selection process.

We conclude that Affective Events Theory is useful for understanding engagement and disengagement in organic communities such as mutual-help addiction recovery homes but may need to be modified to integrate cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). We further conclude organizational and ecological perspectives can further the field's understanding of community engagement and disengagement. The affective experience of perceived fit appears to be directly related to positive attitudes toward these settings and voluntary behaviors to support the communities and their members. Fit also appears to be indirectly related to such behaviors through its influence on attitudes toward the community. In a similar fashion, fit appears to be related to member intentions to leave. These findings have potentially important implications for mutual-help communities, which seek to retain an engaged membership for the good of both the individual and the community. Our results suggest groups may want to attend to member perceptions of fit to enhance promote these goals. However, future inquiry is needed to cross-validate the model, address limitations, and

explore other influences on affect as well as its influence on attitudes toward the community, engagement, and disengagement.

Acknowledgments

Research in this publication was supported by the National Institutes of Drug Abuse of the National Institutes of Health under award numbers DA032195 and DA019935. Award #DA032195 provided support for data collection. Both award #DA032195 and #DA019935 supported analysis and manuscript preparation.

References

- Alcoholics Anonymous. Big Book. 4. New York, New York, USA: AA World Services, Inc; 2001.
- Beasley CR, Jason LA, Miller SA. The general environment fit scale: a factor analysis and test of convergent construct validity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2012; 50(1–2):64–76.10.1007/s10464-011-9480-8 [PubMed: 22071911]
- Cammann, C.; Fichman, M.; Jenkins, D.; Klesh, JR. Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In: Seashore, SE.; Lawler, EE.; Cammann, C., editors. *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc; 1983.
- Cohen A. Nonwork Influences on Withdrawal Cognitions: An Empirical Examination of an Overlooked Issue. *Human Relations*. 1997; 50(12):1511–1536.10.1177/001872679705001203
- Dutra L, Stathopoulou G, Basden SL, Leyro TM, Powers MB, Otto MW. A meta-analytic review of psychosocial interventions for substance use disorders. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2008; 165(2):179–87.10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.06111851 [PubMed: 18198270]
- Ferri, M.; Amato, L.; Davoli, M. Alcoholics Anonymous and other 12-step programmes for alcohol dependence (Review). 2009.
- Festinger, L. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. 1. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; 1957.
- Fischer DG, Fick C. Measuring Social Desirability: Short Forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 1993; 53(2):417–424.10.1177/0013164493053002011
- Hochwarter WA, Perrewé PL, Ferris GR, Brymer RA. Job Satisfaction and Performance: The Moderating Effects of Value Attainment and Affective Disposition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 1999; 54(2):296–313.10.1006/jvbe.1998.1659
- Hoffman BJ, Woehr DJ. A quantitative review of the relationship between person–organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2006; 68(3):389–399.10.1016/j.jvb.2005.08.003
- Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 1999; 6(1):1–55.10.1080/10705519909540118
- Jason LA, Davis MI, Ferrari JR. The need for substance abuse after-care: longitudinal analysis of Oxford House. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2007; 32(4):803–18.10.1016/j.addbeh.2006.06.014 [PubMed: 16843612]
- Jason, LA.; Olson, BD.; Foli, KJ. *Rescued Lives: The Oxford House Approach to Substance Abuse*. New York, NY: Routledge; 2008. p. 272
- Kahn WA. To Be Fully There: Psychological Presence at Work. *Human Relations*. 1992; 45(4):321–349.10.1177/001872679204500402
- Kelloway EK, Gottlieb BH, Barham L. The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: a longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 1999; 4(4):337–46. [PubMed: 10526838]
- Kim MS, Hunter JE. Relationships Among Attitudes, Behavioral Intentions, and Behavior: A Meta-Analysis of Past Research, Part 2. *Communication Research*. 1993; 20(3):331–364.10.1177/009365093020003001

- King G, Stewart D, King S, Law M. Organizational Characteristics and Issues Affecting the Longevity of Self-Help Groups for Parents of Children with Special Needs. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2000; 10(2):225–241.10.1177/104973200129118381 [PubMed: 10788285]
- Kinney, J. *Loosening the Grip: A Handbook of Alcohol Information*. 10. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill; 2011. p. 688
- Kristof-Brown AL, Zimmerman RD, Johnson EC. CONSEQUENCES OF INDIVIDUALS' FIT AT WORK: A META-ANALYSIS OF PERSON–JOB, PERSON–ORGANIZATION, PERSON–GROUP, AND PERSON–SUPERVISOR FIT. *Personnel Psychology*. 2005; 58(2):281–342.
- Majer JM, Jason LA, Ferrari JR, Venable LB, Olson BD. Social support and self-efficacy for abstinence: is peer identification an issue? *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2002; 23(3): 209–215.10.1016/S0740-5472(02)00261-1 [PubMed: 12392807]
- McCraday, BS.; Miller, WR. *Research on Alcoholics Anonymous: Opportunities and Alternatives*. McCraday, BS.; Miller, WR., editors. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies; 1993. p. 440
- Moos RH, Moos BS. Participation in Treatment and Alcoholics Anonymous_: A 16-Year Follow-Up of Initially Untreated Individuals. 2006; 62(6):735–750.10.1002/jclp
- Olson BD, Viola JJ, Jason LA, Davis MI, Ferrari JR, Rabin-belyaev O. Chapter 6_: Economic Costs of Oxford House Inpatient Treatment and Incarceration_: A Preliminary Report. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*. 2006; 31(1–2):63–72.10.1300/J005v31n01_06 [PubMed: 16595387]
- Organ, DW. Toward an explication of “morale”: In search of the m factor. In: Cooper, CI.; Jackson, SE., editors. *Creating tomorrow's organizations*. London: John Wiley & Sons; 1997. p. 493–503.
- Organ, DW.; Podsakoff, PM.; Mackenzie, SB. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2006.
- Oxford House. *Oxford House Openings and Closings*. Silver Springs, MD: Oxford House, Inc; 2011.
- Oxford House. *Oxford House, Inc. Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2011*. Silver Springs, MD: 2012.
- Pagano ME, Friend KB, Tonigan JS, Stout RL. Helping other alcoholics in alcoholics anonymous and drinking outcomes: findings from project MATCH. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 2004; 65(6): 766–73. [PubMed: 15700515]
- Preacher KJ, Zhang Z, Zyphur MJ. Alternative Methods for Assessing Mediation in Multilevel Data: The Advantages of Multilevel SEM. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2011; 18(2):161–182.10.1080/10705511.2011.557329
- Reynolds WM. Development of Reliable and Valid Short Forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, (1972). 1978:119–126.
- Ryu E. Model fit evaluation in multilevel structural equation models. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2014; 5:81.10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00081 [PubMed: 24550882]
- SAMHSA. *Results from the 2009 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: National Findings. Substance Abuse. Vol. I*. Rockville, MD: 2010.
- Sanchez JI, Kraus E, White S, Williams M. Adopting High-Involvement Human Resource Practices: The Mediating Role of Benchmarking. *Group & Organization Management*. 1999; 24(4):461–478.10.1177/1059601199244004
- Seong JY, Kristof-Brown AL. Testing multidimensional models of person-group fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2012; 27(6):536–556.10.1108/02683941211252419
- Steel RP, Ovalle NK. A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1984; 69(4):673–686.10.1037/0021-9010.69.4.673
- Tabachnick, BG.; Fidell, LS. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 5. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc; 2006. Retrieved from <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1213888>
- Timko C, DeBenedetti A. A randomized controlled trial of intensive referral to 12-step self-help groups: one-year outcomes. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2007; 90(2–3):270–9.10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2007.04.007 [PubMed: 17524574]
- Van Dyne L, LePine JA. Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1998; 41(1):108–119.10.2307/256902

- Verquer ML, Beehr TA, Wagner SH. A meta-analysis of relations between person–organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2003; 63(3):473–489.10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00036-2
- Webb TL, Sheeran P. Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2006; 132(2):249–68.10.1037/0033-2909.132.2.249 [PubMed: 16536643]
- Weiss HM, Cropanzano R. Affective events theory - A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work.pdf. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 1996; 18:1–74.
- Weiss RD, Griffin ML, Gallop RJ, Najavits LM, Frank A, Crits-Christoph P, ... Luborsky L. The effect of 12-step self-help group attendance and participation on drug use outcomes among cocaine-dependent patients. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2005; 77(2):177–84.10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2004.08.012 [PubMed: 15664719]
- Wituk, Sa; Shepherd, MD.; Warren, M.; Meissen, G. Factors contributing to the survival of self-help groups. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2002; 30(3):349–66. [PubMed: 12054034]
- Yu KYT. Affective influences in person-environment fit theory: exploring the role of affect as both cause and outcome of P-E fit. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2009; 94(5):1210–26.10.1037/a0016403 [PubMed: 19702366]
- Yuan K-H, Bentler PM. Three Likelihood-Based Methods For Mean and Covariance Structure Analysis With Nonnormal Missing Data. *Sociological Methodology*. 2000; 30(1):165–200.10.1111/0081-1750.00078
- Zemore SE, Kaskutas LA, Ammon LN. In 12-step groups, helping helps the helper. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*. 2004; 99(8):1015–23.10.1111/j.1360-0443.2004.00782.x

Figure 1.

Affective Events Theory P-E Fit Model. All endogenous variables were regressed onto social desirability to control for socially desirable response tendencies, and Tenure Intentions was regressed onto P-E fit. $\chi^2_{SB}(21) = 30.57, p = 0.08$; CFI = .99, RMSEA = 0.04; SRMR = 0.03. Full standardization for parameter estimates. * $p = .01$;

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Observed Variables	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>	Standard Skew	Standard Kurtosis	ICC	ω_w	ω_b
Social Desirability	292	0.00	13.00	6.67	3.23	0.19	0.12	-2.93	0.02	0.88	0.96
Citizenship Behavior	291	2.43	7.00	5.86	0.96	0.06	-5.37	0.94	0.04	0.74	0.97
Commitment	292	1.83	7.00	5.26	1.10	0.06	-2.41	-1.20	0.11	0.91	0.99
Satisfaction	293	2.33	7.00	6.14	1.01	0.06	-9.75	5.78	0.07	0.77	0.92
Tenure	291	1.00	4.50	1.95	0.82	0.05	3.20	-2.05	0.14	0.91	0.93
Interpersonal Similarity	291	1.00	5.00	3.42	0.96	0.06	-0.90	-2.08	0.08	0.79	0.98
Value Congruence	291	1.67	5.00	3.88	0.76	0.04	-1.76	-1.15	0.03	0.90	0.93
Demands-Abilities	293	1.00	5.00	3.96	0.80	0.05	-4.39	1.13	0.09	0.78	0.97
Needs-Supplies Fit	293	1.33	5.00	4.01	0.70	0.04	-2.28	-0.10	0.05	0.79	0.92

Notes.

Table 2
Bivariate correlations of variable components at within-group and between-group levels

	Within-Group Components									
	SD	CB	Ten	Com	Sat	IS	VC	DA	NS	
Social Desirability	1.00									
Citizenship Behavior	0.04	1.00								
Tenure Intentions	-0.01	-0.22	1.00							
Commitment	0.06	0.44	-0.42	1.00						
Satisfaction	0.10	0.43	-0.40	0.67	1.00					
Interpersonal Similarity	-0.04	0.31	-0.20	0.36	0.37	1.00				
Value Congruence	0.06	0.38	-0.30	0.60	0.57	0.49	1.00			
Demands-Abilities	0.01	0.42	-0.30	0.58	0.61	0.40	0.68	1.00		
Needs-Supplies Fit	0.01	0.46	-0.33	0.53	0.51	0.44	0.68	0.73	1.00	

	Between-Group Components									
	SD	CB	Ten	Com	Sat	IS	VC	DA	NS	
Social Desirability	1.00									
Citizenship Behavior	0.25	1.00								
Tenure Intentions	-0.50	-0.70	1.00							
Commitment	0.34	0.93	-0.68	1.00						
Satisfaction	0.31	0.70	-0.76	0.85	1.00					
Interpersonal Similarity	-0.12	0.77	-0.27	0.58	0.15	1.00				
Value Congruence	0.43	0.93	-0.90	0.88	0.79	0.57	1.00			
Demands-Abilities	0.95	0.30	-0.41	0.34	0.22	0.01	0.44	1.00		
Needs-Supplies Fit	0.56	0.87	-0.63	0.93	0.74	0.51	0.85	0.62	1.00	

Notes.

Notes.

Table 3

Standardized & Unstandardized Parameter Estimates

Parameter	β^a	B	SEB	z	p	95% CI [LB, UB]	r_p^2
PE-Fit							
by Value Congruence	0.83	1.00	---	---	---	---	---
by Demands-Abilities	0.85	1.05	0.07	14.62	<0.001	[0.91, 1.19]	0.72
by Needs-Supplies	0.84	0.90	0.06	14.10	<0.001	[0.77, 1.02]	0.71
by Interpersonal Similarity	0.55	0.81	0.08	10.44	<0.001	[0.66, 0.97]	0.30
Attitude							
by Satisfaction	0.82	1.22	0.09	13.89	<0.001	[1.05, 1.39]	0.67
by Commitment	0.84	1.22	0.09	13.89	<0.001	[1.05, 1.39]	0.71
Attitude on							
Social Desirability	0.08	0.02	0.01	1.73	0.08	[-0.003, 0.04]	0.01
P-E Fit	0.83	0.94	0.10	9.79	<0.001	[0.75, 1.12]	0.69
Citizenship Behavior on							
Social Desirability	-0.003	-0.001	0.02	0.55	0.95	[-0.03, 0.03]	<0.001
Attitude	0.35	0.48	0.17	2.83	0.005	[0.15, 0.81]	0.13
P-E Fit	0.24	0.37	0.17	2.22	0.03	[0.04, 0.69]	0.06
through Attitude		0.45	0.17	2.64	0.008	[0.12, 0.78]	0.04
Tenure Intentions on							
Social Desirability	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.47	0.64	[-0.02, 0.04]	0.001
Attitude	-0.65	-0.72	0.15	-4.69	<0.001	[-1.01, -0.42]	0.42
P-E Fit	0.13	0.16	0.17	0.95	0.35	[-0.17, 0.49]	0.02
through Attitude		-0.67	0.16	-4.15	<0.001	[-0.35, 0.03]	0.29

Notes. $\chi^2_{SB}(21) = 30.57$, $p = 0.08$; CFI = .99, RMSEA = 0.04; SRMR = 0.03. "through" indicates indirect relationship mediated by the third variable.

^aFull standardization