CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

This chapter introduces the PhD thesis entitled “An Empirical Study of Citizenship and Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigating Mediating Effects of Job Stress” and the research study reported herein. Section 1.1 Introduces the study and Section 1.2 provides the background for theoretical issues and literature review. Section 1.3 introduces the research problem and research objectives. Section 1.4 provides the conceptual framework and hypothesis development adopted to achieve research objectives and address the research problem. Section 1.5 and section 1.6, respectively presents the significance and boundaries of the study. Section 1.7 describes the research methodology. Section 1.8 gives the necessary context of the research organization in which this study was undertaken. The structure of this thesis with chapter scheme is presented in the section 1.9. Finally section 1.10 summarizes the chapter 1.

1.1 Introduction

Organizational behavior (OB) is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups and structures have on behavior within an organization for the purpose of applying such knowledge towards improving an organization's effectiveness. It is an interdisciplinary field that includes sociology, psychology, communication, and management; and it complements the academic studies of organizational theory (which is focused on organizational and intra-organizational topics) and human resource studies (which is more applied and business-oriented). It may also be referred to as organizational studies or organizational science. The field has its roots in industrial and organizational psychology. (Robbins 2004)

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) has been studied since the late 1970s. Over the past four decades, interest in these behaviors has increased substantially. Organizational behavior has been linked to overall organizational effectiveness, thus these types of employee behaviors have important consequences in the workplace. Dennis Organ is generally considered the father of OCB. Organ expanded upon Katz's (1964) original work. Organ (1988) defines OCB as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”. Organ’s definition of OCB includes three critical aspects
that are central to this construct. First, OCBs are thought of as discretionary behaviors, which are not part of the job description, and are performed by the employee as a result of personal choice. Second, OCBs go above and beyond that which is an enforceable requirement of the job description. Finally, OCBs contribute positively to overall organizational effectiveness.

Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) is employee behavior that goes against the goals of an organization. These behaviors can be intentional or unintentional and result from a wide range of underlying causes and motivations. It has been proposed that a person-by-environment interaction can be utilized to explain a variety of counterproductive behaviors. For instance, an employee who steals from the company may do so because of lax supervision (environment) and underlying psychopathology (person) that work in concert to result in the counterproductive behavior. Counterproductive work behavior is a topic of research in industrial and organizational psychology (Durando 2007).

Most of the workplaces today are highly regulated. But still there are some employees that show behavior with more discretionary activities. These discretionary behaviors include organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). OCBs are discretionary activities that contribute to the organizational, social and psychological context of the workplace, such as volunteering to acclimate new employees or enhancing the reputation of the organization (Borman & Motowidlo 1993). Conversely, CWB refers to intentional acts that are harmful to the organization, such as taking unnecessary breaks, stealing, or aggression (Fox & Spector 2005).

Due to this presence of similarity of being voluntary behavior, researchers in OB have started to develop models that describe or explain OCB and CWB (Kelloway, Loughling, Barling & Nault: 2002; Lee & Allen: 2002; Miles, Borman, Spector & Fox: 2002; Spector & Fox: 2002). In these models OCB & CWB are shown to be outcomes of complex relationships between Organizational environment, Organizational attitudes, Employee emotions and Employee personality traits. But none of these models have received unequivocal support. The OB researchers who developed these models have recommended further in depth study of needful constructs (Fox & Spector 1999).

Occupational stress is stress involving work. Stress is defined in terms of its physical and physiological effects on a person, and can be a mental, physical or emotional strain. It can also be a tension or a situation or factor that can cause stress. Occupational stress can occur when there is a discrepancy between the demands of the environment/workplace and an
individual’s ability to carry out and complete these demands (Henry & Evans 2008). Often a
stressor can lead the body to have a physiological reaction which can strain a person
physically as well as mentally. A variety of factors contribute to workplace stress such as
negative workload, isolation, extensive hours worked, toxic work environments, lack of
autonomy, difficult relationships among coworkers and management, management bullying,
harassment and lack of opportunities or motivation to advancement in one’s skill level.
(Colligan, Thomas & Higgins 2006).

Basically, stress is divided into eustress and distress. Eustress is positive or good stress,
whereas distress is the stress reactions to those events or actions appraised as being negative.
Stress-related disorders encompass a broad array of conditions, including psychological
disorders (e.g., depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder) and other types of
emotional strain (e.g., dissatisfaction, fatigue, tension, etc.), maladaptive behaviors (e.g.,
aggression, substance abuse), and cognitive impairment (e.g., concentration and memory
problems). In turn, these conditions may lead to poor work performance, higher absenteeism,
less work productivity or even injury. (Schultz & Schultz, Duane 2010). Job stress is also
associated with various biological reactions that may lead ultimately to compromised health,
such as cardiovascular disease, or in extreme cases death. (Sauter, Hurrell, Murphy, Levi
1997).

Stress is a prevalent and costly problem in today's workplace. About one-third of workers
report high levels of stress. (NIOSH 1999). One-quarter of employees view their jobs as the
number one stressor in their lives (Colligan, Thomas & Higgins 2006). Three-quarters of
employees believe the worker has more on-the-job stress than a generation ago (Princeton
Survey Research Associates 1997). Evidence also suggests that stress is the major cause of
turnover in organizations. (NIOSH 1999). With continued stress at the workplace, workers
will develop psychological and physiological dysfunctions and decreased motivation in
excelling in their position (Colligan, Thomas & Higgins 2006). The Kenexa Research
Institute released a global survey of almost 30,000 workers which showed that females
suffered more workplace stress than their male counterparts. According to the survey,
women's stress level were 10% higher for those in supervisory positions, 8% higher stress in
service and production jobs than men, and 6% higher in middle and upper management than
men in the same position (Schultz & Schultz, Duane 2010).
There is presence of a very limited previous investigation of job stressors in OCB and CWB, but it is suggested that future research in this area of occupational stress could beneficial (Miles et al. 2002). To be more specific, there has been only preliminary testing of the role of job stress in OCB and CWB. The lack of research in the area may be due to a specific research that has concluded that employee performance and well-being are conflicting organizational goals (Fox & Spector 2002). A recent theory has implicated employee well-being in organizational outcomes such as task performance (Judge, Thoresen, and Bono & Patton 2001) and counterproductive work behaviors (Fox, Spector & Miles 2001).

The purpose of the present study is to extend this research by developing a model of the job stressors in OCB and CWB, based on previous empirical and theoretical investigations. Researcher proposes to use a rigorous research design using longitudinal testing. The current study will propose a model of OCB and CWB in which Job Stressors mediate the relationship between Personality variables and these voluntary behaviors. These Mediational relationships will be tested using bootstrapped Sobel tests and Structural equation modeling to test model fit.

1.2 Theoretical Background and Review of Literature

Although many workplace activities are highly regulated, some employee behaviours allow for more discretion. These more discretionary behaviours include organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB). OCBs are actions that contribute to the organizational, social, and psychological context of the workplace, such as volunteering to acclimate new employees or enhancing the reputation of the organization (Borman and Motowidlo 1993). For the most part, OCB is thought to benefit the organization (Bolino, Turnley and Niehoff 2004). Conversely, CWB refers to intentional acts that are harmful to the organization, such as taking unnecessary breaks, stealing, or aggression (Fox and Spector 2005).

Because these constructs are both considered voluntary work behaviours, researchers have begun to develop models that describe or explain OCB and CWB (Kelloway, Loughling, Barling and Nault 2002); (Lee and Allen 2002);(Miles, Borman, Spector and Fox 2002); (Spector and Fox 2002). These models explain OCB and CWB as a function of organizational environment, organizational attitudes, emotion, and personality traits, but none have received unequivocal support. Previous studies have stressed the importance of further developing these models in an attempt to better understand these constructs (Fox and Spector
The purpose of the present study is to extend this research by developing a model of the role of job stressors in OCB and CWB, based on previous empirical and theoretical investigation.

Prior investigation of job stressors in OCB and CWB is limited, but suggests that future research in the area would be beneficial (Miles et. al. 2002). Specifically, there has been only preliminary testing of the role of job stress in OCB and CWB, and research in this area could be much improved through more rigorous design (e.g. longitudinal testing). The lack of research in the area may be due to research that has suggested that employee performance and well-being are conflicting organizational goals (Fox and Spector 2002). However, more recent theory has implicated employee well-being in organizational outcomes such as task performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton 2001) and counterproductive work behaviours (Fox, Spector, and Miles 2001). The current study will propose a model of OCB and CWB in which job stressors mediate the relationship between personality variables and these voluntary behaviours.

OCB and CWB are discretionary actions by employees that affect organizations in a variety of ways. OCBs are employee activities that support the social, psychological, or environmental context of an organization, but are not part of the formal job requirements (Borman and Motowidlo 1993). OCBs do, however, contribute to the organization’s productivity by allowing the company to adapt to change and its workers to cooperate (Podsakoff and MacKenzie 1997). Many researchers suggest that OCB has two factors based on the target of the behaviour (LePine, Erez, and Van Dyne 2002); (Organ 1997); (Williams and Anderson 1991). For example, organizationally-targeted behaviours, such as enhancing the reputation of the organization, are referred to as OCB-Organizational (OCB-O), whereas interpersonally-targeted OCB, such as helping to acclimate a new employee, are referred to as OCB-Interpersonal (OCB-I).

Conversely, CWB consists of acts that harm or are intended to harm organizations or people in organizations (e.g., aggression, hostility, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal). CWB is potentially a serious organizational problem, given that 75% of employees report having stolen from their employers at least once and CWB can cost $6 to $200 billion annually (Aquino, Lewis, and Bradfield 1999). Similar to OCB, CWB can be differentiated according to the target of the behaviour. The target of CWB can be either the organization (CWB-O) or other employees (CWB-I) (Berry, Ones, and Sackett 2007).
In a factor analysis assessing the overlap between OCB, CWB, and task-related behaviours, a three factor solution (OCB, CWB, and task behaviours) fit better than a two factor model that combined any of the constructs or a four factor model that included a common method factor (Kelloway et. al. 2002). In another study, (Rotundo and Sackett 2002) concluded that contextual performance and counterproductive performance represent distinct dimensions of job performance. This supports the view of OCB and CWB as distinct, correlated constructs.

Although OCB and CWB appear to be opposite ends of a voluntary behaviour spectrum, meta-analytic research has found only a moderate negative correlation (r = -.27); (Dalal 2005). Thus, it appears that OCB and CWB are not opposing ends of a continuum of voluntary behaviours. Furthermore, OCB and CWB appear to have differential relationships with other variables, including personality traits and organizational attitudes (Dalal 2005). Consequently, the current study focuses on developing a model of OCB and CWB, based on the premise that there are both similarities and differences between the constructs.

Prior research has investigated the antecedents of OCB and CWB, including organizational attitudes and individual differences. Several studies have identified organizational attitudes that are consistently related to both OCB and CWB. In one such study, a dominance analysis was used to investigate previously established correlates of OCB and CWB concurrently (Williams and Anderson 1991). This study indicated that job satisfaction, organizational support, and organizational justice received support as antecedents to both OCB and CWB. Results from a meta-analysis support this finding, showing that high job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational justice are among the organizational attitudes that have the most support as theoretical antecedents of increased OCB and decreased CWB (Dalal 2005).

Fewer individual difference variables have received consistent testing as antecedents to OCB and CWB. Consequently, there are fewer consensuses regarding what individual difference variables relate to OCB and CWB. For example, one study found that lower positive effect, as well as higher negative affect and trait anger were related to more CWB, but only positive affect was related to more OCB (Miles et. al. 2002). Another study found that positive affect was related to OCB-I and OCB-O, but neither positive nor negative affect was related to CWB (Lee and Allen 2002). A qualitative review of the literature identified conscientiousness, positive effect, and negative affects the individual difference variables consistently linked to OCB and to CWB; however, magnitudes of these relationships ranged
from .10 to .41 (Dalal 2005). In another review of the literature, conscientiousness, trait anger, and locus of control were found to be the most supported correlates of OCB and CWB (Williams and Anderson 1991). The overall lack of consensus regarding which individual differences are related to OCB and CWB may be partially due to a relatively limited selection of personality variables that has been studied in terms of OCB (Borman, Penner, Allen, and Motowidlo 2001). Furthermore, the study of individual difference variables related to CWB has focused on specific CWB behaviours (e.g., theft, sabotage, organizational retaliatory behaviour, turnover, alcohol abuse), making it difficult to generalize study results to overall CWB.

In summary, previous research has been able to identify some shared antecedents of OCB and CWB. Although there seems to be little dispute that organizational attitudes are correlated with OCB and CWB, there is less consensus regarding which individual differences are correlated with OCB and CWB, and to what degree these individual differences are related to OCB and CWB. Furthermore, very little research has looked at the role of job stressors in OCB and CWB. In order to address this gap in the literature, the current study aims to examine the relationship between a broader range of correlates of OCB and CWB, including individual differences and job stress.

The effectiveness of an organization depends on the well-being of its employees, as unhealthy, stressed, or injured workers are likely to be less efficient and productive (Sauter, Lim, and Murphy 1996). One particularly salient health factor is job stress. Researchers have documented many negative consequences (strains) that result from job stressors such as workplace aggression, job dissatisfaction, and negative emotion (Hershcovis et al. 2007); (Miles et al. 2002). However, research investigating OCB and CWB as strains has been limited. Whereas CWB has been studied as a strain, decreased OCB has received little attention as an outcome of job stressors. Consequently, one potential way to improve our understanding of how employee well-being relates to organizational effectiveness is to investigate the relationship between job stressors and voluntary work behaviours.

There are several reasons job stressors may lead to decreased OCB and increased CWB. For example, rational processing may be deferred under situations of stress, according to cognitive reasoning theory and self-regulation theory (Martinko, Gundlach, and Douglas 2002). Specifically, a person may use the majority of his or her cognitive resources in order to cope with a job stressor, making it impossible to attend to additional demands, such as
rational processing (e.g., avoiding aggression). Alternatively, interpersonal stressors, such as interpersonal conflict or low interactional justice (the degree to which a person is treated with politeness, dignity, and respect), may deter employees from engaging in OCB while encouraging CWB through social exchange theory. Social exchange theory posits that people use of a subjective cost benefit ratio in their relationships, so that when a person perceives the costs of a relationship as outweighing the perceived benefits, the person will choose to leave the relationship. This may be evidenced as decreased willingness to help the other person (less OCB), increased withdrawal (a form of CWB). Furthermore, interpersonal stressors have been shown to lead to aggression or retaliation in response to perceived attacks (Spector and Fox 2005). Another job stressor that may result in decreased OCB and increased CWB is organizational constraints. Restrictive organizational constraints may be perceived as a violation of the psychological contract, which can potentially lead to the desire for retaliation (Aquino, Tripp, and Bies 2001), abuse towards co-workers (Hoobler and Brass 2006), or other strains. Work overload is another job stressor that may lead to decreased opportunities to engage in OCB, and increase the amount of job withdrawal. Work overload may make it necessary to withhold effort in order to cope with job demands. In summary, the job stressors of interpersonal conflict, interactional justice, organizational constraints, and job demands may relate to OCB and CWB.

Previous studies have implicated the role of job stressors in the voluntary behaviours of OCB and CWB. For example, it has been hypothesized that job stressors and other environmental characteristics are appraised by employees and can lead to an emotional response, which in turn leads to OCB and CWB, depending on several other factors (e.g., personality) (Spector and Fox 2002). In a partial test of this model, one study found that certain job stressors (interpersonal conflict, interactional justice, organizational constraints, work overload) are related to increased CWB, and surprisingly, increased OCB (Miles, Borman, Spector and Fox 2002). Although the authors suggest this counterintuitive relationship exists because job stressors allow the opportunity to persevere, this finding may instead be a function of the particular items included in the OCB measure used. Specifically, some of the OCBs included in this study may simply be more likely to occur under conditions of stress. For example, employees may not have to “suggest ideas for improvement” or “willingly sacrifice their own personal interests for the good of the team” if they are satisfied with interactions with co-workers and the organizational environment.
Although this study and others (Bolino and Turnley 2005) have found a positive relationship between OCB and job stress, there is also contradictory evidence. Specifically, there is support that job stressors, such as interpersonal conflict, interactional justice, work overload, and organizational constraints, are related to decrease OCB and increased CWB. For example, one study found that interpersonal conflict can lead to decreased OCB-I and OCB-O (Zellars, Tepper, and Duffy 2002). Prior theory has also supported the role of job stressors in OCB. In situations of interpersonal stressors, for example, employees may not perceive social support from co-workers. According to social exchange theory, these employees may be less likely to provide OCB to their peers (Adams 1965). Likewise, when the organization does not prevent work overload or organizational constraints, this may be perceived as a violation of the psychological contract and lead to less OCB (Coyle-Shapiro and Conway 2005).

Previous research investigating the relationship between job stressors and CWB has shown that, for example, interpersonal conflict has been studied in various forms (e.g., incivility, bullying, perceived victimization) and has been shown to be positively related to CWB. Specifically, increased CWB is correlated with bullying experienced (Ayoko, Callan, and Hartel 2003), perceived victimization (Aquino, Tripp, and Bies 2001); (Jockin, Arvey and McGue 2001), and low interactional justice (Aquino, Galperin, and Bennett 2004); (Skarlicki and Folger 1997). Other types of job stressors have been linked to CWB. For example, previous research has linked work overload to job withdrawal, a form of CWB (Spector and Jex 1998). Likewise, organizational constraints have been related to increase CWB (Penney and Spector 2005); (Storms and Spector 1987). In general, job stressors such as interpersonal conflict, poor interactional justice, organizational constraints, and job demands are well supported antecedents to CWB.

In summary, job stressors have been implicated as an antecedent to OCB and CWB, but this relationship has not been tested extensively. Prior theory and empirical testing has suggested interpersonal conflict, interactional justice, organizational constraints, and job demands as potential antecedents of OCB and CWB. Consequently, the current study aims to extend the literature by further investigating the relationship.

Prior research suggests that the antecedents of OCB and CWB may be related to the target of the behaviours. In other words, OCB-I and OCB-O, as well as CWB-I and CWB-O, may have different antecedents. A meta-analysis suggests that job stressors will be related to
different types of OCB and CWB, based on target (Hershcovis et. al. 2007). Specifically, interpersonal stress may lead to decreased OCB-I and increased CWB-I, consistent with social exchange theory. Furthermore, organizational stress, including work load and organizational constraints, has been shown to be related to decrease OCB-O and increased CWB-O (Hershcovis et. al. 2007). This is consistent with research on the psychological contract, because prior research shows a relationship between violation of the psychological contract and voluntary behaviours (Coyle-Shapiro and Conway 2005); (Hoobler and Brass 2006).

Individual differences have been shown to be related to reports of job stressors (Chen and Spector 1991). Trait emotion, for example, has been implicated as the mechanism responsible for the relationship between job stressors and OCB/CWB in prior theory (Spector and Fox 2002) and empirical investigations (Lee and Allen 2002); (Miles et. al. 2002). Consequently, one avenue for exploring the relationship between individual differences and job stressors is trait emotion. Trait emotion represents a person’s baseline level of a particular emotion and the likelihood or threshold that much be reached in order to react to a particular stimulus with that emotion (Lord, Klimoski, and Kanfer 2002). In other words, people high in a trait emotion will be more likely to feel that emotion on average and also more likely to perceive a stimulus as causing that emotion. Trait negative emotion may increase a person’s baseline level of negative arousal, such that he/she will be more likely to perceive stress. For example, negative affectivity has received extensive support as a correlate of job stressors (Penney and Spector 2005); (Spector and O’Connell 1994). The relationship between negative affectivity and job stressors have been well established, but specific trait emotions have received less empirical scrutiny as a correlate of job stress.

Although no specific trait emotion has received a great deal of testing as a correlate of job stress, overall, trait hostility and trait anger have been implicated as potential correlates of job stress. Trait anger represents the average amount or baseline level of anger that a person experiences. For example, prior research has shown that trait anger is correlated with reports of job stressors (Bongard and al’Absi 2005); (Brondolo et. al. 1998); (Fox, Spector, and Miles 2001). Trait hostility, another negative trait emotion, is the average amount of negative beliefs about others, including suspiciousness and cynicism, and is a facet of aggressiveness. Aggressiveness and hostility have also been related to perceiving interpersonal conflict, a job stressor (Hutri and Lindeman 2002); (Kiewitz and Weaver 2001).
Other individual differences, such as attributional style, may also be relevant to job stress. Attribution theory states that people are constantly aware of their environment and forming attributions regarding many aspects of events that occur in their lives (Weiner 1980). In the workplace, such attributions have been linked to many organizational outcomes. For example, attributions of unfairness have been linked to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour, job withdrawal, and task performance (Cohen-Charash and Spector 2001); (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson and Porter 2001). Because attributions have been shown to be related to organizational outcomes, trait attributional style may be relevant to organizational outcomes. Furthermore, previous research has shown evidence that trait attributions may be relevant to perceived job stress.

For example, external locus of control has been shown to be related to reports of job stressors (Spector et. al. 2002). External locus of control is an individual difference that describes the degree to which people attribute consequences in their lives, both good and bad, to themselves (internal locus of control) versus other people or fate (external locus of control). Because the Job Demands-Control model (Karasek 1979) has suggested that events perceived as outside of a person’s control may be more stressful than events within his or her control, general attributions about control will probably be related to the reporting of stressors. Although the synergistic effect of job demands and personal control proposed in the Job Demands-Control model has received inconsistent empirical confirmation, a main effect of external locus of control on increased reporting of job stressors has been empirically supported (Fox, Spector, and Miles 2001); (Perrewe 1986); (Spector and O’Connell 1994).

Likewise, equity preference may influence how fair an employee perceives his/her environment. Equity preference describes how much a person desires outcomes (e.g. pay) in a relationship (Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles 1987). People who are more entitled prefer a higher amount of a reward in return for their efforts than do benevolent, which generally prefer to give more than they receive. Consequently, people who are more entitled will be more likely to perceive an exchange as unfair, and because unfairness can be a job stressor (Fox, Spector, and Miles 2001); (Francis 2003); (Zohar 1995), entitled employees may be more likely to perceive and report job stress.

The current study extends previous research by investigating the role of specific trait emotion and attributional style in job stress. Although these individual differences have been implicated as correlates of job stressors, they have not received extensive testing. Because the
majority of these studies focus on interpersonal conflict, interactional justice, job demands, and organizational constraints as stressors (Fox, Spector, and Miles 2001); (Spector and O’Connell 1994), these constructs were included in the current study. Specifically, it is expected that trait hostility, trait anger, locus of control, and entitled equity preference will be related to reports of job stress.

Building a model of OCB and CWB is important to furthering our understanding of these workplace behaviours. Previous models of OCB and CWB have focused on job affect and job cognitions (Lee and Allen 2002) or emotion (Spector and Fox 2002). Neither study has received overwhelming empirical support. For example, one study used data from 149 registered nurses and their co-workers to study the relationship between job attitudes (intrinsic satisfaction, procedural justice, pay cognitions, and work schedule load) and OCB-I, OCB-O, and CWB (Lee and Allen 2002). None of the job attitudes were related to OCB-I, intrinsic satisfaction and procedural justice related to OCB-O, and pay cognitions related to CWB. Several of the discrete emotions predicted OCB-I, OCB-O, and CWB. However, only two of the six relationships between trait affectivity and voluntary behaviours were significant (positive affect was correlated with OCB-I and OCB-O). In general, this model was not supported, but does indicate that future research should consider a broad range of individual differences and specific emotion when investigating a model of OCB and CWB.

Other previous theory has focused on the mediating role of emotion in the relationship between job stressors and voluntary behaviours (Spector and Fox 2002). However, such research has not received extensive empirical support. A test of portions of this model was generally supportive, except that OCB unexpectedly correlated positively with job stressors. Job stressors (interpersonal conflict, interactional justice, organizational constraints, and job demands) were related to OCB and CWB, and trait affect (anger, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity) accounted for unique variance above and beyond the job stressor variables. This model provides some evidence that job stressors and trait emotion may be related to OCB and CWB. However, the study tested a relatively narrow set of individual differences and suggested that future research include more varied individual differences. Consequently, the current model aims to expand the individual differences studied in OCB and CWB research.

Prior research and theory has suggested that certain individual differences are related to OCB and CWB (Aquino, Tripp, and Bies 2001); (Hershcovis et. al. 2007); (Neuman and Baron
Trait hostility and trait anger are emotions that have been implicated as correlates of OCB and CWB (Miles et al. 2002; Spector and Fox 2002). Furthermore, OCB and CWB may be related to attributional style, including locus of control (Bennett 1998; Borman et al. 2001; Fox and Spector 1999) and equity preference (Kickul and Lester 2001; Kwak 2006; Liu 2006; Mason and Mudrack 1997; Shore, Sty, and Strauss 2006). Consequently, certain individual differences will likely be related to OCB and CWB.

Although previous models of OCB and CWB have received some empirical support, an extensive investigation is necessary to provide further evidence for these models. For example, prior theory of the role of job stressors in OCB and CWB has viewed emotion as an outcome of stress, thereby leading to OCB and CWB (Spector and Fox 2002). Other research has suggested that individual differences, including trait emotion, may predispose a person to report job stressors (Fortunato and Harsh 2006; Spector and Fox 2002). Negative emotion and attributional style have been shown to affect the way people perceive their environments, and may consequently lead to perceived job stressors in various ways (e.g., directly or by affecting people’s views of their environments) (Spector, Zapf, and Chen 2000).

This relationship has not received adequate empirical scrutiny despite theoretical and empirical support. Furthermore, these analyses used cross-sectional data. Cross-sectional data has been shown to generate biased estimates of longitudinal mediation parameters, even under ideal circumstances (Maxwell and Cole 2007). Due to the lack of extensive testing of a job stress model of OCB and CWB, future testing of the mediating roles of these variables would benefit from a longitudinal study design. This type of scrutiny will allow researchers to rule out other alternatives and establish a temporal precedence (although temporal precedence does not, by itself, imply causality).

Furthermore, separation of the predictor and criterion helps establish stability of the effect by removing the daily effects of mood. Based on previous empirical support and prior theory, it is likely that individual differences will lead to reported job stressors, which will in turn influence employee engagement in OCB and CWB.

Previous research on OCB and CWB has shown support for target-based distinctions of these behaviours (Dalal 2005). For example, meta-analytic research has shown that OCB-I and OCB-O, as well as CWB-I and CWB-O, have differential relationships with certain antecedents (Dalal 2005). Furthermore, a meta-analysis of job stressors and CWB has shown
that certain types of job stressors may be related more strongly to certain types of CWB (Hershcovis et. al. 2007). Specifically, interpersonal conflict was more strongly related to CWB-I than to CWB-O, and organizational stressors were more strongly related to CWB-O than to CWB-I. This previous empirical research shows support for a target-based model of job stressors as related to OCB and CWB.

Furthermore, there is theoretical evidence that a target-based model of OCB and CWB would provide better fit than an overall model of OCB and CWB. Specifically, social exchange theory would suggest that employees will engage in OCB or CWB towards co-workers (i.e. interpersonally directed) when they have been affected by other co-workers. Consequently, interpersonal stressors may be related to decreased OCB-I and increased CWB-I. Conversely, breach of the psychological contract, including excessive job demands or organizational constraints, may relate to retaliation against the organization or decreased motivation to help the organization. An employee who has had a psychological contract breach may engage in less OCB-O or more CWB-O. Consequently, the target based model of OCB and CWB may provide greater insight into these relationships.

1.3 Research Problem and Research Objectives

This research study intends to address a research problem, i.e. can we develop a Job Stress Model of OCB and CWB which could identify and further relate Employee Personality Variables with OCB and CWB.

In order to study this research problem, the research work empirically tries to find answers to the following questions:

1. Does job stress affect OCB and CWB?

2. Do the employees with different personalities display different work behaviour under stress?

3. Does job stress mediate the relationship between employee personality variables and OCB/CWB?

This research study intends to address the above research problem by developing and testing an amalgamated Job Stress Model of OCB and CWB which could identify and further relate employee personality variables with selected voluntary work behaviours. The proposed model integrates key constructs from the OB research stream into the theoretical frame of the
Job Stress Model. The results of the present study are expected to contribute literature on voluntary organizational behaviours and how stress influences the employee behaviour. By addressing the above stated research problem, this study aims to achieve the following four objectives.

1. To study the effects of job stressors on selected voluntary work behaviours i.e. OCB and CWB of employees.

2. To study the effects of job stressors on personality variables of employees.

3. To study whether job stress mediates the relationship between personality of employees and their selected voluntary work behaviours i.e. OCB and CWB.

4. To develop a job stress model of OCB and CWB.

5. To test the empirical validity of the proposed research model with special reference to one selected respondent organisation.

1.4 Conceptual Framework and Development of Hypotheses

Drawing on the findings of literature review presented in earlier section, a theoretical framework was developed for this research study and it is presented in this section. So far, the researcher has presented the literature relevant to Stressor-Strain Model of OCB and CWB. In addition, the researcher has also provided discussion on the need for identification of additional factors that might be important in the study of OCB and CWB with special reference to Job Stress perspective. Moreover, the context of the current study with reference to earlier studies on the understanding of OCB and CWB in general and Job stress perspective in particular has also been discussed. In this sub section, the constructs identified in previous section are discussed in greater detail. In particular, from the theories discussed in the previous section, the researcher develops and presents a model that identifies a number of factors, which can possibly influence OCB and CWB in a job stress perspective.

Given the findings of literature review, the researcher considers developing a stressor strain model to be more appropriate to study OCB and CWB. In addition, the reviewed literature showed that the focus of empirical studies has been on the models of OCB and CWB which have a job stress perspective. On this basis the researcher proposed the following model in figure 1.1
The research model proposed by the researcher extends the prior research on OCB and CWB. The model posits that Job stressors (in the form of Interactional Justice, Interpersonal conflicts, Organizational Constraints and Job Demands) mediate the relationship between Employee Personality variables (in the form of Locus of Control, Entitled Equity Preference, Trait Anger, Trait Hostility and Mental-Physical Stress) and OCB & CWB (both Interpersonally Targeted behavior and Organizationally Targeted behavior).

This model emphasizes that, how an employee voluntarily behaves and displays OCB and CWB is jointly determined by the effects of and his/her experiences with Interactional Justice, Interpersonal conflicts, Organizational Constraints and Job demands at workplace. Table 1.1 presents constructs and their proposed hypothesized relationships.

Table 1.1 Constructs and Hypotheses with Causal Path Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Causal Path Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC Locus of Control</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>H2.1 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; IJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2.2 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2.3 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2.4 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H3.1 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; OCB-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H3.2 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; CWB-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H3.3 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; OCB-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H3.4 LOC</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; CWB-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEP Entitled Equity Preference</td>
<td>EEP</td>
<td>H2.5 EEP</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; IJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2.6 EEP</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H2.7 EEP</td>
<td>&lt;------&gt; OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anger</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>H2.9</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.10</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.11</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.12</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.9</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.10</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.11</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.12</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Hostility</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>H2.13</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>&lt;------</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.14</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.15</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.16</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.13</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>OCB-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.14</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>CWB-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.15</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>OCB-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.16</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>CWB-O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental &amp; Physical Stress</th>
<th>MPS</th>
<th>H2.17</th>
<th>MPS</th>
<th>&lt;------</th>
<th>IJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.18</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.19</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.20</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.17</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>OCB-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.18</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>CWB-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.19</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>OCB-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.20</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td>CWB-O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.1 Dependent Variables – OCB and CWB

A recent study stated that Employees who report more stressors, report less OCB and more CWB. In the same study, it was found that Employees with greater trait anger, trait hostility, and external locus of control and equity preference will report more job stressors and will also be related to less OCB and CWB. It further stated that Job stressors mediate the individual differences and OCB/CWB (Spector & Fox 2008). Thus, this research considered the target based model of Interpersonal OCB-I & CWB-I and Organizational OCB-O and CWB-O as the dependent variables.

1.4.2 Factors & Constructs of Job Stress Model of OCB and CWB

1.4.2.1 Locus of Control (LOC)

Locus of Control refers to the extent to which individuals believe they can control events affecting them (Rotter 1954).

In another study (Greenberg 1990) a strong negative correlation was identified between Locus of Control and Interactional justice. According to the findings in this study, when an employee perceives that he does not get just, fair and equitable treatment by his colleagues at work place, he feels that his ability to control the events around him has reduced...
considerably. This in turn leads to lowering of his emotions related to Locus of control. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

\( H_2.1 \) Locus of Control will have a significant negative effect on Interactional Justice as an interpersonal job stressor.

In a research study (Spector 1988) it was found that Interpersonal conflict correlated positively with Locus of control. Thus, when an employee feels that he cannot control events affecting him, his conflicts with others at work place increase significantly and vice versa. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

\( H_2.2 \) Locus of Control will have a significant positive effect on Interpersonal Conflict as an interpersonal job stressor.

Hershcovis, M., et al. (2007) stated that most of the times, supervisors feel that they are not able to help the subordinates and juniors as they feel that someone else controls the events in the workplace and they act simply as directed. This low feeling of locus of control leads them to thinking that there exist Organizational constraints in their path to work with freedom and autonomy. This leads to workplace aggression. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

\( H_2.3 \) Locus of Control will have a significant positive effect on Organizational constraints as an organizational stressor.

In another study (Hoobler & Brass 2006) it was identified that high job demands and work overload leads to increase in one’s expectancy that while working things should to in direct control of persons responsible for the results related to that work. This research was conducted on those with leadership roles. Thus it was found that for a leader, the feeling that he can control the things around his workplace plays an important role in his ability to meet high job demands. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

\( H_2.4 \) Locus of Control will have a significant positive effect on Job demands as an organizational stressor.

Hutri & Lindeman (2002) stated that locus of control negatively affects organizational citizenship behavior. Furthermore, this study found that, employees always desire to control things in and around them when at workplace. This increases their feeling of job security, which in turn leads to enhanced citizenship behavior. Thus it may be hypothesized that,
H3.1 Locus of Control will have significant positive effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

H3.3 Locus of Control will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

In a research study (Jockin, Arvey, & McGue 2001) it was found that certain counterproductive work behaviors like workplace aggression, conflict and victimization, were caused due to the feeling that labors could not bargain with the management and had very less control on the event affecting them at workplace. It was concluded in this study that one of the best ways to reduce CWB was by increasing the Locus of Control of labours by practices like workers participation in management decision making, etc. Deducting from this research it can be hypothesized that,

H3.2 Locus of Control will have a significant negative effect on the individually targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

H3.4 Locus of Control will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

1.4.2.2 Entitled Equity Preference (EEP)

Equity preference describes how much a person desires outcomes in a relationship (Huseman, Hatfield and Miles 1987).

A recent study conducted on job satisfaction stated that employees perceive just, fair and equitable treatment by co-workers as the most important factor affecting their interpersonal behavior (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton 2001). In this study it was found that interactional justice and entitled equity preference are positively related to each other. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

H2.5 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant positive effect on Interactional Justice as interpersonal job stressors.

Another study related to Equity sensitivity (Kickul & Lester 2001) stated that the main factor for increase in interpersonal conflicts is the low levels of Equity preference that employees experience at workplace. It was found that when employees get what they desire from a
relationship with co-worker, they quarrel less at workplace and vice versa. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

**H2.6 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant negative effect on Interpersonal conflict as interpersonal job stressor.**

In his model of Job design, Karasek (1979) stated that entitled equity preference is a source of perceived organizational constraints. It was found that when an employee feels that an outcome from a relationship is not as desired, he/she perceives it as organizational constraint. Employee blames the human resource practices as an organizational constraint on his/her productivity. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

**H2.7 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant negative effect on Organizational Constraints as Organizational job stressor.**

Empirical research conducted by Liu (2006) has found that job demands and work overload correlated negatively with Equity preference. This study stated that when employee gets what he/she desires then his /her perception towards job demands & work overload remain affirmative. Conversely, when the work outcome is not as desired, the employees perceive the task at hand as unmanageable and thus the feeling that the job demands are beyond their capacity to perform increase. Thus greater the equity preference lower are the perceived job demands and vice versa. Hence it may be hypothesized that,

**H2.8 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant negative effect on Job Demands as Organizational job stressor.**

In a research work related to OCB and CWB (Kelloway, Loughling, Barling, & Nault 2002) it has stated that Entitled equity preference relates to both OCB and CWB. In this study the construct of entitled equity preference has been identified as differentiating construct between OCB and CWB. Using this construct, the researcher differentiates between OCB and CWB. It has been found that EEP affects OCB and CWB but in exactly opposite effects. EEP has strong negative effect with CWB and EEPs positively effects are seen on OCB. It has been found that when an employee gets the outcomes of his work as desired by him, his citizenship behavior increases and counterproductive behavior reduces. Thus it may be hypothesized that,
H3.5 Entitled Equity Preference will have significant positive effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

H3.6 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant negative effect on the individually targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

H3.7 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

H3.8 Entitled Equity Preference will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

1.4.2.3 Trait Anger (TA)

Trait anger represents the average amount or baseline level of anger that a person experiences.

Brondolo, E., et al. (1998) conducted an empirical research amongst city traffic agents and in this research it was concluded that Trait anger is an important determinant of job stressors at work. It was stated that people who display high levels of Trait anger are often involved in Interpersonal conflicts. They also experience high levels of organizational constraints which make it impossible for them to control and exhibit the anger experienced by them. People with high levels of Trait Anger report low levels of interactional justice. They often feel that their colleagues don’t treat them with just and fair interpersonal behavior. Based on the this empirical evidence we can hypothesize that,

H2.9 Trait Anger will have a significant negative effect on Interactional Justice as interpersonal job stressor.

H2.10 Trait Anger will have a significant positive effect on Interpersonal Conflict as Interpersonal job stressor.

H2.11 Trait Anger will have a significant positive effect on Organizational Constraints as Organizational job stressor.

In another study (Bongard & al'Absi 2005) it was found that Trait Anger and Job demands are positively related. When job demands increase, employees experience job stress. Their blood pressure levels increase and this result in increase in the feeling of anger expression in an occupational setting. Thus it may be hypothesized that,
H2.12 Trait Anger will have a significant positive effect on Job Demands as Organizational job stressor.

Trait Anger has been considered as a major predictor of organizational citizenship behavior (Borman, Penner, Allen & Motowidlo 2001). In this study a strong negative correlation has been found between TA and OCB. This study states that an angry employee hardly displays any citizenship behavior. Thus it may be hypothesized that,

H3.9 Trait Anger will have significant negative effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

H3.11 Trait Anger will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Bennett, R. J. (1998) in his research on dysfunctional behavior stated that employee deviance is a result of perceived powerlessness which leads to increase in levels of displayed trait anger in employees. This research has found that trait anger and counterproductive work behavior are directly proportional to each other. On the basis of this finding it may be hypothesized that,

H3.10 Trait Anger will have a significant positive effect on the interpersonal Counter Productive Work Behavior.

H3.12 Trait Anger will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

1.4.2.4 Trait Hostility (TH)

As per the earlier review of literature, it is observed that Trait Hostility is a negative trait emotion. It is the average amount of negative beliefs about others.

In a study examining exchange relationships and psychological contracts, it has been stated that trait hostility has negative correlations with interactional justice (Coyle-Shapiro, & Conway 2005). It has been found in this study that employees who have negative inhibitions about certain other employees (due to their past interactions) do not treat them fairly. This leads to an interpersonal stressor of interactional justice. Higher the negativity lower is the just and fair behavior between such persons. In this study it has also been found that Trait hostility correlates positively with interpersonal conflicts, organizational constraints and job
demands. This research states that when people have inherent negative beliefs about other, they invariably conflict with each other. Similarly, the negative belief regarding supervisor leads to a feeling in minds of juniors that they are allotted work greater than others at workplace. This trait hostility leads to a perception that job demands are high and there is work overload. Thus it is hypothesized that,

_H2.13 Trait Hostility will have a significant negative effect on Interactional Justice as interpersonal stressor._

_H2.14 Trait Hostility will have a significant positive effect on Interpersonal Conflicts as interpersonal job stressor._

_H2.16 Trait Hostility will have a significant positive effect on Job Demands as organizational job stressor._

Fortunato & Harsh (2006) in their research work have found a positive effect between negative affectivity and organizational job stress. It has been stated that when an employee feels that his/her productivity is getting reduced due to organizational constraints, his/her feeling of negative beliefs about others at workplace start increasing and such employees feels the job stress. Thus it is hypothesized that,

_H2.15 Trait Hostility will have a significant positive effect on Organizational Constraints as organizational job stressor._

In a study of CWB, it has been found that employees who report greater hostility are often found to report higher levels of counterproductive work behavior (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001). This study identified a strong positive effect between Trait hostility and citizenship behavior. Thus it is hypothesized that,

_H3.14 Trait Hostility will have a significant positive effect on the interpersonal Counter Productive Work Behavior._

_H3.16 Trait Hostility will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior._

In an empirical research in OCB, it has been stated that assumptions regarding the negative effects of hostility on citizenship behavior are proved to be statistically significant (Bolino,
Turnley & Niehoff 2004). In this study, it has been found that negative trait emotion correlates inversely with organizational citizenship behavior. Thus it is hypothesized that,

**H3.13 Trait Hostility will have significant negative effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

**H3.15 Trait Hostility will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

1.4.2.5 Mental Physical Stress (MPS)

Mental Physical Stress assesses physical, somatic mental health symptoms thought by stress researchers to be associated with psychological distress.

Zohar (1995) stated in his research on justice perspective of job stress, that interactional justice is a major interpersonal job stressor. This construct correlates negatively with Mental Physical stress experienced by employees. On the basis of this evidence we can hypothesize that,

**H2.17 Mental Physical Stress will have a significant negative effect on Interactional Justice as interpersonal job stressor.**

Fox, & Spector (1999) have created a model of work frustration-aggression in which Physiological distress has been identified as a dependent variable and Interactional justice, Organizational constraints and work overload are amongst the independent variables. In this research work, it has concluded that Interactional justice, Organizational constraints and Job demands have positive significant effect on Physiological stress. Thus consistent with prior research, it is hypothesized as follows:

**H2.18 Mental Physical Stress will have a significant positive effect on Interactional Conflict as interpersonal job stressor.**

**H2.19 Mental and Physical Stress will have a significant positive effect on Organizational Constraints as organizational job stressor.**

**H2.20 Mental and Physical Stress will have a significant positive effect on Job Demands as organizational job stressor.**
In another research work, by Kiewitz & Weaver (2001), Mental and Physical stress recorded has been identified as directly proportional to incidences of counterproductive work behavior. In this study it has been identified that respondents who experienced greater physiological stress were found to be involved in incidences of media violence. Thus consistent with prior research, it is hypothesized as follows:

*H3.18 Mental and Physical Stress will have a significant positive effect on the interpersonal Counter Productive Work Behavior.*

*H3.20 Mental and Physical Stress will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.*

Sauter, Lim & Murphy (1996) stated in research study on OCB that physiological stress is a construct that shows negative correlations with OCB. Furthermore, it is stated that greater the physiological stress experienced by the employees lower are the instances of citizenship behavior displayed by them. On the basis of this evidence we can hypothesize that,

*H3.17 Mental and Physical Stress will have a significant negative effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.*

*H3.19 Mental and Physical Stress will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.*

1.4.2.6 Interactional Justice (IJ)

Interactional justice refers to the treatment that an individual receives as decisions are being made. It reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities and third parties involved in executing procedures and outcomes (Colquitt 2001).

In a recent study examining effects of organizational justice (Scott & Colquitt 2007) it has been found that interactional justice has positive correlations with organizational citizenship behavior. It was stated in this research that when employees feel that they are treated just, fair and equitably by other co-workers, there is significant enhancement in organizational citizenship behavior. This finding brings researcher to propose hypothesis that
H1.1 Interactional Justice will have a significant positive effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Aquino, Lewis & Bradfield (1999) proposed a model of CWB in which justice constructs were under study and there effects on CWB were identified. This model received an empirical testing in which it was found that when interaction justice experienced by employees lowers, the instances of counterproductive work behavior increases. Thus there is a inverse negative relationship between Justice and CWB. Based on this finding it can be hypothesized that,

H1.2 Interactional Justice will have a significant negative effect on the Interpersonal Counter Productive Work Behavior.

1.4.2.7 Interpersonal conflict (IC)

As reviewed in the earlier section, Interpersonal conflict has been shown to be one of the most frequently reported job stressors (Keenan & Newton 1985). In a study it was found that when respondents don’t get along with others at work, specifically getting into arguments with others, such situations interfere with their task performance (Peters and O’Connor 1980).

Ayoko, Callan & Hartel (2003) stated that workplace conflicts lead to bullying and CWB. It was further found that Interpersonal conflicts act as job stressors leading to CWB. Inferring from this finding we may hypothesize that,

H1.4 Interpersonal Conflict will have a significant positive effect on the Interpersonal Counter Productive Work Behavior.

In another study related to OCB, it was found that, interpersonal conflicts when reduced led to an increase in OCB (LePine, Erez & Johnson 2002). In light of the reported evidence from prior research, the following hypothesis is suggested:

H1.3 Interpersonal Conflict will have significant negative effect on the Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

1.4.2.8 Organizational Constraints (OC)

Organizational Constraints are situations or things that interfere with the Task performance (Peters and O’Connor 1980).
In first of its kind research of OCB and CWB, it was found that situational constraints and work outcomes are highly correlated constructs (Peters & O'Connor 1980). In this research work, it is stated that when employees perceive less organizational constraints, their citizenship behavior gets enhanced. Similarly when the employees experience more organizational constraints there counterproductive work behavior increases. Thus an inverse relationship was identified in the study. Based on this finding it can be hypothesized that,

H1.5 Organizational Constraints will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

H1.6 Organizational Constraints will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

1.4.2.9 Job Demands (JD)

Job demands are the assessment an employee makes of the amount or quantity of work in a job & the level of difficulty he faces to work in an organization (Spector and Jex 1998).

Spector & Jex (1998) has stated that work overload experienced by employees leads to deviant behavior. It is the perception of employees about what job demands from them that leads to the intention to either perform OCB or perform CWB. Thus when employees perceive high job demands, they perform CWB and when they perceive low job demands they display OCB. Based on this finding it can be hypothesized that,

H1.7 Job demands will have a significant negative effect on the organizationally targeted Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

H1.8 Job demands will have a significant positive effect on the organizationally targeted Counter Productive Work Behavior.

1.4.3 Conceptual framework for Mediational Hypothesis

Although precious models of OCB and CWB have received some empirical support, an extensive investigation is necessary to provide further evidence for these models. For example, prior theory of the role of job stressor in OCB and CWB has viewed emotion as an outcome of stress, thereby leading to OCB and CWB (Spector & Fox 2002). Other research has suggested that individual differences, including trait emotion, may predispose a person to report job stressors (Fortunato & Harsh 2006, Spector & Fox 2002). Negative emotion and
Attributional style have been shown to affect the way people perceive their environments, and may consequently lead to perceived job stressors in various ways (e.g. directly or by affecting people’s views of their environment; Spector, Zapf, & Chen 2000).

This relationship has not received adequate empirical scrutiny despite theoretical and empirical support. Furthermore, these analyses used cross-sectional data. Cross sectional data has been shown to generate biased estimates of longitudinal mediation parameters, even under ideal circumstances (Maxwell & Cole 2007). Due to lack of extensive testing of a job stress model of OCB and CWB, future testing of the mediating roles of these variables would benefit from a longitudinal study design. This type of scrutiny will allow researchers to rule out other alternatives and establish a temporal precedence (although precedence does not, by itself, imply causality).

Furthermore, separation of the predictor and criterion helps establish stability of the effect by removing the daily effects of mood. Based on previous empirical support and prior theory, it is likely that individual differences will lead to reported job stressors, which will in turn influence employee engagement in OCB and CWB.

**Hypothesis 4a: Job Stressors (interactional justice and interpersonal conflict, organisational constraints and job demands), will mediate the relationships between individual differences (trait hostility, trait anger, external locus of control, entitled equity preference and mental-physical stress) and OCB/CWB.**

Previous research on OCB and CWB has shown support for target-based distinctions of these behaviours (Dalal 2005). For example, meta-analytic research has shown that OCB-I and OCB-O, as well as CWB-I and CWB-O, have differential relationships with certain antecedents (Dalal 2005). Furthermore, a meta-analytic of job stressors and CWB has shown that certain types of job stressors may be related more strongly to certain types of CWB (Hershcovis et al. 2007). Specifically, interpersonal conflict was more strongly related to CWB-I than to CWB-O, and Organisational stressors were more strongly related to CWB-O than to CWB-I. This previous empirical research shows support for target-base model of job stressors as related to OCB and CWB.

Furthermore, there is theoretical evidence that a target-based model of OCB and CWB would provide better fit than an overall model of OCB and CWB. Specifically, social exchange theory would suggest that employees will engage in OCB or CWB towards co-workers (i.e.
When they have been affected by other co-workers. Consequently, interpersonal stressors may be related to decreased OCB-I and increased CWB-I. Conversely, breach of the psychological contract, including excessive job demands or organisational constraints, may relate to retaliation against the organisation or decreased motivation to help the organisation. An employee who has had a psychological contract breach may engage in less OCB-O or more CWB-O.

Consequently, the target based model of OCB and CWB may provide greater insight into these relationships.

**Hypothesis 4b:** Interpersonal stressors (interactional justice and interpersonal conflict) will mediate the relationships between individual differences (trait hostility, trait anger, external locus of control, entitled equity preference and mental-physical stress) and OCB-I/CWB-I.

**Hypothesis 4c:** Organisational stressors (organisational constraints and job demands) will mediate the relationship between individual differences (trait hostility, trait anger, external locus of control, entitled equity preference and mental-physical stress) and OCB-O/CWB-O.

### 1.5 Significance of the Study

An organisational behaviour research with a special reference to job stress has the potential to increase employee job satisfaction as well as the performance of the organisations (Pestonjee 2010; Pareek 2009; Rao 2008) and is thus worthy of further research efforts.

Academically speaking, the present study is significant from two points of view. Firstly, this study makes contribution to the research on Job Stress Model as it extends theoretical and empirical research on Stressor Strain model of OCB and CWB. Secondly, the previous research has contributed to the development of literature both theoretical and empirical related to effects of job stress on personality and consequent behaviour. The present study makes a comparison between the results of this study with results of other studies which assist in advancing OB field research to achieve waited goals. For Organisation Management, who are actually using or planning to use tools to increase OCB and reduce CWB, better understanding of critical factors could assist them in achieving the most effective deployment of resources to right sizing the organisational culture. For OB & Psychometric tools designer and developers, understanding the crucial factors related to Stressor Strain model of OCB and CWB will enable them to design more effectively OB tools to enhance OCB and reduce CWB by enabling the employees to positively deal with Job Stress. Finally, this study is also
useful for employee mental health counsellors and OB tools software consultants and vendors as this study provides them a synopsis of very crucial factors which can add or undermine effort of their provision of successful products and counselling services to the clients and customers. The model validated through study can also serve as a diagnostic tool to assist OB practitioners and counsellors in understanding some reasons regarding why some employees behave differently when under stress and exactly which personality variable gets affected when under stress. The cause and affect relationships can also be identified. The results of this study can suggest some crucially key factors. These key factors then could be manipulated in a way they influence employee voluntary behaviour and there response to stress and consequent work performance. In this way, they can achieve an efficient, effective and healthy use of its human resources.

1.6 Research Boundaries

The boundaries of the present study can be described from different angles. First, the area of application under investigation in this study is the Stressor-Strain Model of OCB and CWB. The rationale for selecting this area is explained in section 1.1. Second, the investigation for the acceptance behaviour is limited to special reference to one particular respondent organisation. The choice of the respondent organisation is justified in section 1.6. Although, in general sense, the notion of Job Stress and its impact on voluntary work behaviours is not restricted to any specific part of the world, however, there is a reservation in terms of the practicality and applicability of those OB models that are established in the foreign countries and are applied to Indian context. Moreover, most of the OCB & CWB study research published in the top journals is based on the data from western world (i.e. North America, UK, Australia, and so on). Therefore, investigating the Stressor-Strain Model of OCB and CWB by obtaining data from Indian organisation is worth investigating. Finally, as mentioned earlier data for present study is obtained from a single study that focussed on a specific respondent organisation. Thus, diligence is required when generalising findings of this study to other organisations and contexts.

1.7 Research methodology used in this thesis

The data for present study was collected using a longitudinal design questionnaire survey. The survey approach is considered most appropriate technique, especially in OB research, because this technique is faster, inexpensive, efficient, and can be administered to a relatively large sample (Churchill 1995; Sekaran 2000; Zikmund 2003). The questionnaire was
developed using five-point Likert type scale, ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

A pre-testing of questionnaire was conducted in order to ensure that there was no ambiguity in the questions and that the respondents felt no difficulty in understanding them. Then the instrument was pilot tested for the assessment of the psychometric properties of the measurement items. In the field survey, during Time 1, 5710 questionnaire were returned out of 8145 which resulted in consent rate of 70.10%. After removing the errors and stratifying the sample, final usable sample was 2120 out of 5710 which resulted in final response rate of 37.12%. Similarly, during Time 2, 2120 questionnaire were distributed and 2027 were returned to researcher with a consent rate of 95.25. After removing the errors and stratifying the sample, final usable sample was 1132 out of 2027 with a final response rate of 55.84%.

All of these valid responses were coded into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 for statistical analysis. Two types of data analysis were performed on the data: descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. The latter included exploratory factor analysis and structural equation modelling analysis including confirmatory factor analysis and hypothesis testing. Descriptive analysis and exploratory factor analysis were performed using SPSS while structural equation modelling (SEM) analysis was performed using Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) software version 16.0. A two stage approach was adapted to conduct SEM analysis as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). In the first stage measurement model using confirmatory factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess the reliability and validity of latent constructs. In the second stage, hypotheses related to influential factors were tested. The SEM model fit was determined using goodness-of-fit indices and coefficient parameter estimates, as suggested by (Byrne 2001; Kline 2005; Hair et. al. 2006). Finally the Sobel test was used to test the Meditational hypothesis.

1.8 Context of Study

1.8.1 Company Profile

Walchandnagar Industries limited has been chosen as the respondent organization for data collection in this study. Walchandnagar Industries Limited (WIL) is an ISO 9001: 2008 certified leading Heavy Engineering, Hi Tech Manufacturing and Project Execution Indian Company. W.I.L’s corporate brochure and corporate presentation has been enclosed in Appendix I and II respectively. These appendixes present the company profile. For this
research work, from here on, Walchandnagar Industries limited will be referred as “respondent organization”.

1.8.2 Research Rationale for Choosing the Respondent Organization

The research rationale behind the choice of the respondent organization has been divided in 3 basic reasons:

1. A study on company history indicating behavioral issues associated with stress at workplace.
2. Inferences from focused group interviews with select Management and employee representatives.
3. The stress management program of respondent organization and its link with research design of this research work.

1.8.3 A study on company history indicating behavioral issues associated with stress at workplace.

The respondent organization conducted a study on behavioral issues associated with stress at workplace. The findings of this study were presented in a report titled “An industrial relations report on employee health and safety at workplace with special reference to occupation stress” dated 23rd October 2011. Researcher was permitted by the respondent organization to study this report. The data obtained through this report is identified hereby as secondary data from respondent organization. This secondary data has been presented in Table 1.8.3. On the basis of this data researcher develops the rationale for need of this study and thus is the first reason to select the respondent organization.

A critical analysis of Table 1.8.3 shows that employee absenteeism, turnover, late-coming at workplace have significantly increased from 2001 to 2011. Moreover, workplace conflicts and other misconducts have also shown an increasing trend from 2001 to 2011. The accidents at workplace due to negligence on the part of employees have also shown an increasing trend since 2001 to 2011. A record of incidences where employees have requested counseling sessions to their managers has also shown an increasing trend since 2001 to 2011. A record of reporting of health issues at workplace has also seen an upward trend since 2001 to 2011. This secondary data clearly signifies that employees are experiencing job stress. It has also been mentioned in “recommended action to be taken section” of this report that on basis of this research finding the respondent organization has planned a Stress Management Program.
2012 in which experts will be invited and training programs will be arranged for 3 to 4 months across all plant locations and corporate offices of respondent organization.

On the basis of these findings of the Table 1.2 and a study of secondary data with reference to topic of study, the researcher decided to select the said organization for the survey and data collection.
Table 1.2 Data on Disciplinary Actions Taken on the Employees (from January 2001 to January 2011): Cause – Reference to Effects of Occupational Stress Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Disciplinary Actions Taken</th>
<th>Incidences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Absenteeism</td>
<td>Employee Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Cause of the misconducts reported is with reference to reporting of Stress at workplace only.
1.8.4 Inferences from focused group interviews with select Management and employee representatives.

A qualitative research was conducted by the researcher with select Management and employees representatives. In these one-on-one discussions and group discussions as well, researcher tried to ascertain the behavioral issues at workplace. The discussions ranged from interpersonal behavior, experience of stress at workplace, time office policies of respondent organization and the HR practices to work-life balance. The researcher kept a record of suggestions from these focused group interviews. An analysis of these suggestions indicated that Management as well as employees considers that a research on job stress at workplace and its relationship with Organizational behavior is a need of time. Such a research would be beneficial to the organization and employees as well. On the basis of these inferences, researcher selected the respondent organization for the survey and data collection.

1.8.5 The stress management program of respondent organization and its link with research design of this research work.

On the basis of report titled “An industrial relations report on employee health and safety at workplace with special reference to occupation stress” dated 23rd October 2011 Department of Industrial Relations Reference No: IR/2011/01/23; the respondent organization had planned to arrange a “Stress Management Program” for all its employees. This program was planned for a period of 3 months to be conducted on each Saturday (entire day) of the week. The expert trainers in the field of Occupational Health and Safety were scheduled to impart various kinds of trainings to the employees. Behavioral training was also a part of this program. The “Stress Management Program” was scheduled in First half of year 2013 across all plant locations and corporate offices.

As discussed above, on the basis of qualitative research conducted by the researcher with select Management and employees representatives, the researcher decided to apply for permission to conduct survey and data collection in the respondent organization. Researcher discussed the research design with top management authorities of the respondent organization. These authorities were very supportive of the research design. Being a longitudinal design, it was mutually agreed that Time 1 survey may be conducted before the start of “Stress Management Program 2013” at selected plant locations and corporate offices. The Time 2 survey was agreed to be carried out after the completion of “Stress management Program 2013”. The rationale behind this thinking was that, the Time 1 report would help the
trainers of “Stress Management Program” to ascertain the needs of behavioral training and other trainings for stress management. The Time 2 report would then help the Management to ascertain the effectiveness of the “Stress Management Program” and would further help for mapping the intended behavioral change. Considering these aspects, respondent organization felt the usefulness of the research study and hence on the terms that the researcher would work on agreed research design and submit the reports to the organization; the respondent organization gave permission to the researcher to conduct the survey and data collection.

As discussed above, the researcher’s research design and research plans of respondent organization matched satisfactorily. The researcher also got the permission to conduct the research at the respondent organization. Moreover, the respondent organization extended the help in data collection and agreed to finance the material requirements of the survey. This support would have been of great help for the researcher to bear the costs of the survey. On this basis, the researcher decided to select the respondent organization for survey and data collection.

1.8.6 Context of Study and Respondent Organization

This empirical study has been conducted at the respondent organization only. The participants are the employees of the respondent organization across its plant locations and corporate offices. The participant details have been explained in chapter 2. The rationale for selecting the respondent organization has been explained above. This rationale is in agreement with previous studies where it has been mentioned that research in organization behavior and I/O psychology should be conducted in one specific organization only (Robbins 2009). As organizations change, a change in organizational culture takes place; this in-turn changes the research outcomes and bring huge variance in data when analyzed (Babbie 1990). The OB research with multiple organizations used to collected quantitative data brings errors in generalizeability of results (Bryman and Cramer 2005).

The researcher clearly states that, the context of study is with special reference selected respondent organization, hence the research is conducted in voluntary settings; the findings may not therefore be generalized to the mandatory settings. A further limitation to the generalizeability of the results of the study is the use of a sample with reference to one particular organization only. The results thus cannot be generalized to other organizations.
The reason for this has been explained in a recent study stating that “different organizations have different working cultures” and “when a study in organization behavior is carried out in a specific organization then results limit itself to that particular specific organization in which the research is carried out and not to other organizations”. Generalizing the results may lead to erroneous outcomes. (Robbins 2009).

1.9 Structure of the Thesis

This section briefly explains the structure of this thesis. Chapter one introduces the issues related to the topic under investigation i.e. An Empirical Study of Citizenship and Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigating Mediating Effects of Job Stress”.

Chapter one discusses in detail various theories which have been used in explaining the Stressor-Strain model of OCB and CWB. Also, it critically reviews the relevant literature related to the important factors that are likely to establish the cause & effect relationship between personality variables, job stressors and OCB/CWB. The influential factors identified in the literature are five personality variables viz. Locus of control, Entitled equity preference, Trait anger, Trait hostility and Mental Physical stress. There are four Job stressors identified viz. Interactional justice, Interpersonal conflict, Organizational constraints and Job demands. There are four selected voluntary behaviors viz. organizational citizenship behavior – Interpersonal, Organizational citizenship behavior – Organizational, Counterproductive work behavior – Interpersonal and Counterproductive work behavior – Organizational.

Furthermore, drawing on the literature review, Chapter one presents the conceptual stressor-strain model of OCB and CWB proposed in this research. The conceptual model explains forty eight hypotheses to be tested and analyzed.

Chapter two presents the methodology applied to empirically test the proposed conceptual model established in Chapter one. This chapter discusses research paradigms, and research strategy. It also provides the justification of the methodology, discusses the steps taken to collect the data, discusses the sampling issues, explains scale items selected to measure the underlying latent factors, describes development and Operationalisation of the instrument, presents pilot study results, discusses the data analysis techniques, presents reliability and validity of the latent factors, and finally presents the ethical considerations in this research.

Chapter three reports the results of the data analysis undertaken in this study using different data analysis tools, which are explained and justified in Chapter two. Results reported include
descriptive analysis and inferential statistics including structural equation modeling analysis. This chapter also reports the reliability and validity of constructs along with hypothesis testing.

Chapter four and five presents discussion and conclusions of the present study. The chapter four provides an overview of the research and discusses finding related to the results drawn from testing of forty eight hypotheses in this study. The chapter five present’s theoretical and managerial implications drawn from the results reported in Chapter four. Finally, it presents limitations and directions for future research followed by the conclusions.

1.10 Conclusions

Prior research has attempted to develop a model of OCB and CWB, but limited testing remains a problem. The purpose of the current study is to examine OCB and CWB from a job stressor-strain approach. This chapter provided the background of theoretical issues and the research problem for the same. This research study intends to address the above research problem by developing and testing an amalgamated Job Stress Model of OCB and CWB which could identify and further relate employee personality variables with selected voluntary work behaviours.

The proposed model integrates key constructs from the OB research stream into the theoretical frame of the Job Stress Model. This study aims to achieve the following four objectives by studying the effects of job stressors on selected voluntary work behaviours i.e. OCB and CWB of employees. It also aims to study the effects of job stressors on personality variables of employees. In its quest to investigate the meditational effects of job stressors, the researcher aims to study whether job stress mediates the relationship between personality of employees and their selected voluntary work behaviours i.e. OCB and CWB.

This chapter aimed to provide an overview of various theories and models that have been used to understand and investigate knowledge regarding the topic of research. Amongst them the Stressor-Strain model of OCB and CWB has been selected as a base model because of its specific focus on topic of research, parsimony, validity and reliability of measuring instruments. While compared to the related theories, the Job Stress model of OCB and CWB has been believed to be the parsimonious, predictive and robust. The simplicity of the model is its strength, as it is fairly easy to extend the model by adding factors from related research studies. This is shown by the numerous direct determinants and external variables that have
been added to the model. Also, it was pointed out in the literature review the need for broader exploration of factors beyond those suggested by traditional Job Stress Models. Moreover, literature review shows that there is a pressing need for identifying and investigating closely the relationships between personality variables and specific targeted OCB and CWB. The reviewed literature is the basis for developing a model to extend the knowledge regarding affecting factors and to measure the factors that affect CWB and OCB in job stress perspective.

Using the findings of literature reviewed, a theoretical framework has been developed by the researcher for an empirical study in topic of research. In the theoretical framework the researcher incorporate thirteen factors which make the Job stress model of OCB and CWB. The conceptual model of this study proposes four basic hypotheses supported by forty eight causal paths. Finally, this research intends to test the proposed hypothesized model empirically. The results of the present study are expected to contribute literature on voluntary organizational behaviours and how stress influences the employee behaviour. Next chapter discusses the methodology.