CHAPTER- I

INTRODUCTION

“No employee in any organization is indispensable, every employee’s efforts to become indispensable brings foreword the citizenship”- Kaur (2011)

The global village has become the arena of hard-hitting competition. It revolves around the epithet of the Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest. We are like a part of a giant ocean constituting the little drops that make the mighty ocean. Every single drop eventually determines the fate of the depth of this mighty ocean. Similarly employees are the archetype of these water droplets which play significant role in predicting the growth of the company. Today the organizations very well recognize the human resource are critical at each stage of development. Nichols (2006) emphasized that, “employees are like a fulcrum – they can have a tremendous effect on sales and profitability, both positive and negative”. The vital nature of the human resource for the success of the organization calls for concrete endeavors for their recruitment, retention and utilization. Prescribed work behaviors of the employees may assure the desired state and volatile environment. The subsequent changes need to be adapted by the organization in terms of flexibility and advancement. In due course employees may be asked to perform behaviors that do not constitute the part of their formal roles. These behaviors are not rewarded by formal system but contribute to organization’s effective functioning. Such behaviors are termed as “organizational citizenship behavior”.

1.1 Precursors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The proliferation of studies attempts to measure Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and its relationship to other variables empirically started from about 1980. However the construct OCB is of recent vintage but it has been reminiscent by most important and influential organizational theories for 70 years or more. Following are the particular known figures as organizational theorist who articulated concepts, perspectives, propositions and assumptions
about something in which the roots of the OCB has been appeared, are acknowledged for their contributions towards the development of understanding of OCB.

**Barnard**: One can find roots of OCB in the concept of *willingness to cooperate* explained by Chester Barnard (1938). Barnard noted organizations as *associations of cooperative efforts* and emphasized the “indispensability of the *willingness* of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system” (p.84). To Barnard willingness did not merely refer to the performance of tasks for contractual compensations, nor did he define it as an intention to perform assigned task in a neatly defined role. Contrary, he referred it as human disposition that entails spontaneous behaviors to encourage and maintain a stream of cooperative actions in a group of employees. He posited that *willingness* is “something different from effectiveness, ability, or value of personal contributions......means self-abnegation” (Barnard, 1938, p.84). Thus, Barnard’s exposition ‘willingness to cooperate’ exhibits the foundation of OCB, suggest the significance of the spontaneous cooperative endeavors that go beyond contractual obligations, legitimated authority and calculated economic exchanges in terms of remuneration for the benefit of all.

**Roethlisberger and Dickson**: They are the well known forbearers of Human Relations School of Management and Organization Theory because of their popular chronicle *Management and the Worker* of various studies and one of them is ‘Hawthorne Studies’. The study enlighten that the formation of an informal group by the operators having its own structure and norms promptly increase productivity. The implications of the research point the substantial significance of the “informal organization and collaborative efforts” pertaining to it. The essence of OCB lies in the aforementioned terms together. They contended that “Informal organizations at the executive level, just as at the work level, may either facilitate or impede purposive cooperation and communication. In either case, at all levels of the organization informal organizations exist as a necessary condition for collaboration”. (p.562)
Thus, it can be aptly said that informal social organizations developed out of a cohesive group; exist in every plant at all levels to facilitate effective collaboration which sometimes aids the functioning of the formal organization (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939, p.559).

**Katz and Kahn:** Katz and Khan (1966) have done detailed Analysis on behaviors in organizations which is based on *Open System Model*. According to them there are three essential patterns of behaviors that organizations need to elicit from the members of the organization: (i) attracting and retaining employees within the organizational system; (ii) ensure the performance of dependable role in a reliable manner and preferably beyond certain qualitative and measurable standards; (iii) induce ‘innovative and spontaneous behaviors’ that go beyond the specific formal roles and enhance the effectiveness of organizational functioning. The third category resembles to OCB which suggests every successful organization must include cooperative activities, courteous actions, teamwork, altruism, support and gestures that endorse favorable climate in the organization.

**Blau:** Peter Blau elaborated the perspective on social and interpersonal relationships as the function of a exchange history in *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (1964). He defined that exchange at the workplace can be of two types economic and social. The exchange of economic nature emerges out of contractual obligation and that’s why each party to the exchange has specified knowledge of what will be exchanged and when the exchange will take place. Example of an economic exchange that occurs between the organization and its member in the employment relationship is the enactment of certain specified duties for a predefined basic pay, benefits and facilities. On the other hand in the social exchange parties do not explicit what will be exchanged and the time of occurrence of exchange is also not specified. In the organization, patterns of social exchange develop as well when members begin to interact with their coworkers, supervisors, customers and other related parties. An employee who perceives inducements from the organization that is going beyond what was contractually specified; evoke
to reciprocate by contributing in a manner that will be beyond what was contractually promised. Such contributions on the part of employees generally encourage OCB.

**Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory:** Dansereau, Graen, and Hoga (1975) acknowledged that leader’s style is determined by abilities and attitudes of his team members. Thus, the leader is not supposed to exhibit only one particular style, rather a leader’s style should be consistent with his different subordinates who may vary in abilities and attitude and therefore, should be instructed and supervised accordingly. Leaders require their subordinates to contribute beyond minimally required and enforceable tasks to fulfill their responsibilities. The extra contribution includes much of what we define as OCB. This type of exchange is subjective and ambiguous as the exchange depends on trust of both parties (Leader and Subordinate) in each other. Research by Settoon, Bennett, and Liden (1996) posited that there is strong correlation between quality of LMX and subordinates’ perceived organizational support. In other words, the subordinates would be willing to contribute beyond transactional specifications to pay-back the high perceived support from organization.

**Williamson and Transaction Cost Economics:** Williamson (1975) discussed the concept of market exchanges’ transaction costs, forbidden under certain circumstances. The same concept can be applied to the employment relation and construed three major categories of contribution of an employee: First, contractual obligations in terms of defined job ascertained by a fixed salary; Second, contributions that are not bound under contractual boundaries and might be asked by the supervisor in future can be monitored through *metering* and third includes the spontaneous contributions which are the voluntary efforts made by the employee thus these are neither contractually specified nor ordered by the supervisor. The third category of contribution falls under the rubric of OCB.

**Ouchi:** William Ouchi (1980) has extended the work of Williamson on *Markets and Hierarchies* by advocating *Clan* which is a practical form of united actions where individual’s
contributions cannot be pre-defined contractually. The value of the contribution also can not be assessed reliably. A group of persons tied through relationships defined by kinship called Clan. The parties found compliance in their individual interests which are concordant with the collective interest. Their objective is to promote each other’s interest so as to promote the collective interest of the community and vice versa. The same pattern of explanation for collectives is given by Graham and Organ (1993) called covenantal organizations. In such collectives, one might find the essence of OCB as members are not strictly directed to perform only finite duties, rather any contribution enacted for the welfare of the community collective interest will comprise their job.

The above noted works show that the concept of OCB had its presence in varied ideologies given in last few decades. The historic sources are carefully selected to discover OCB as construct and OCB-related phenomenon such as its determinants, circumstances prompt it and countervailing cost of such circumstances.

1.2 Definition and Dimension of the Terms

The terms organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), organizational commitment (OC), job satisfaction (JS), and occupational role stress (ORS) have been understood in the light of their formal definition and different dimensions explicated by the researchers.

1.2.1 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Organ explicated citizenship behaviors in the organization as an “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” (p.4). The term discretionary represents the not mandatory nature of the behaviors such that omission of it would not cause punishment. It is not an implied behavior because of its nature of extra-role which is not prescribed formally. The citizenship behavior is not rewarded formally but over time, the steady recognition of such gestures can be rewarded informally by supervisors or
coworkers through salary increase and promotion. At last, the definition indicates that OCB is a positive behavior that likely to result in positive outcomes. Aggregation of such actions of person(s) significantly contributes to the effective functioning of the organization.

Organ (1988) has proposed Five Dimension Taxonomy of OCB. It comprised of Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy and Civic Virtue. Altruism refers to helping behavior in an organizational relevance context, oriented towards other members. Conscientiousness comprises role behaviors that do not performed only for compliance to organization’s rules, regulations and norms rather it contains those instances that go well beyond the minimum required level. Sportsmanship refers to when employees refrain themselves from consuming maximum of their time in complaining of unimportant matters and willingly tolerate the inconveniences and impositions at work. Courtesy, involves taking care of others’ interest while taking any action and preventing the happening of work related problems. Last, Civic Virtue, contains gestures that show employees concern for the organization through participation and involvement in the political life of the organization.

1.2.2 Organizational Commitment (OC)

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) conceptualized it as “the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organization” (p. 493). It represents the extent of individuals’ internalization with the goals, values and attributes of the organization. Thus, commitment of an employee towards his/her organization indicates the level of participation and association with the organization’s goals and its characteristics.

Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed OC’s multidimensional view, comprises three components: affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC) and continuance commitment (CC). “AC entails emotional bonding, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Normative Commitment refers to the employees’ feeling of obligation to stay with the organization. Finally, Continuance Commitment reflects the high cost that an employee associates with leaving the organization, due to lack of availability of alternatives”.
1.2.3 Job Satisfaction (JS)

Locke (1976) propounded a widely accepted meaning of JS as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job and job experience” (p. 1300). In simple words JS can be understood as pleasant state or feeling that comes from positive evaluation of work and work environment by an employee. This feeling motivates him to stay with the organization and work enthusiastically.

Scholars have identified JS as a two facets construct based on the Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory. The job satisfaction is comprised of intrinsic (IJS) and extrinsic job satisfaction (EJS). IJS refers to the degree of satisfaction of an employee from his/her job itself on the other hand extrinsic job satisfaction refers to the extent to which an employee is satisfied from working conditions, rewards and recognition at workplace.

1.2.4 Occupational Role Stress (ORS)

Occupational role stress occurs due to imbalance between demand at work and ability of the worker. An employee experiences feeling of stress when demands at work exceed the capability of the employee to cope with the demands. Tolman and Rose (1985) defined stress as “a hypothetical state that is induced by an environmental force (e.g., stressors) and is manifested by reactions at various physiological, psychological, and social levels (p. 151)”. The literature has contained many studies on various job stressors such as conflict in roles, role ambiguity, work family interface, work overload, resource inadequacy, role isolation, personal inadequacy, job insecurity, and pay & benefits etc.

1.3 Frameworks Analogous to Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The critical literature search introduced many construct which are seemingly analogous to the conceptualization of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) albeit do differ in some way. These constructs are: Extra-role Behavior (ERB), ProSocial Organizational Behavior (PSOB), Organizational Spontaneity (OS), and Contextual Performance (CP). An effort has been made to compare and contrast these constructs to generate deep understanding about OCB
as a construct and how it is different or similar to other analogous constructs. Brief definition of each construct has been discussed below to build basis of comparison among these constructs.

**Extra-role Behavior (ERB):** It is defined as “behavior which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations” (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995; p. 218). This definition highlights the important characteristics of ERB which comprise that first, the behavior must be voluntary that means not prescribed in formal role and so as to neither formally rewarded nor penalized. Second, engagement in behavior must be employee’s decision. Third, behavior must be positive. However authors have cleared that extra-role behavior can be negative but here it is defined pursuing Barnard (1938) and Katz and Kahn (1966) original conceptualization of extra-role behavior. The fourth and last is that the employee engagement in behavior primarily benefit the party or entity other than himself/herself thus the self interest must be subordinated over the others benefit.

**Prosocial Organization Behavior (PSOB):** Brief and Motowidlo (1986) defined Prosocial organizational behavior is a “behavior which is (a) performed by a member of an organization, (b) directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and (c) performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed” (p. 711). As noted, the above said definition does not limit the behavior to be enacted for the benefit of the organization only. PSOB can be directed to benefit anyone- individual, group, organization and all provided that it must be demonstrated in the organizational settings. Nor the definition specifies that the behavior could not be part of prescribed formal role or it must be beyond it.

**Organizational Spontaneity (OS):** The Organizational Spontaneous behavior is defined as “extra-role behaviors that are performed voluntarily and that contribute to organizational effectiveness” (George & Brief, 1992). The authors construed the construct based on the ‘spontaneous behaviors’, one of the three behavioral patterns asserted by Katz (1964) for the
effective functioning of the organization. Katz (1964) notion of spontaneous behavior is not prescribed under formal role prescriptions; however contribute to organizational goals accomplishment.

**Contextual Performance (CP):** Borman and Motowidlo (1997) explained CP as important activities which “include volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job and helping and cooperating with others in the organization to get tasks accomplished” (p. 100). Thus, these performances contribute to organizational efficacy by supporting collective and psychological context of the organization in which core technical task performance is embedded. A comparative analysis of the constructs analogous to OCB has been done (shown in Table 1.1) based on their conceptual definitions.

**Table 1.1: Comparison between OCB and Analogous constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>ERB</th>
<th>PSOB</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actor’s Intent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived Outcome</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent (+/-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizationally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional/Dysfunctional</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Can be both</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-role</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor Status</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor Motivation</td>
<td>Promotive</td>
<td>Promotive</td>
<td>Promotive</td>
<td>Promotive</td>
<td>Promotive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of the behavior:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Beneficiary</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Reward</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Can be</td>
<td>Can be</td>
<td>Can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active/Passive Behaviors</td>
<td>Includes both</td>
<td>Includes both</td>
<td>Includes both</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Includes both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: OCB-Organizational Citizenship Behavior, ERB-Extra-role Behaviors, PSOB- Prosocial Organizational Behavior, OS- Organizational Spontaneity, CP-Contextual Performance*

The analysis exemplifies the key differences and similarities among the constructs based on some important characteristics. The first one is *Focus* of particular construct; whether the focus is on actor’s intent that will enact such behaviors or it is on perceived outcome of the
behavior or both. The definitional focus of all constructs is on actor’s intent but only Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Contextual Performance, Organizational Spontaneity and Extra-Role Behavior give attention towards the outcome of behavior which is generally to enhance the organizational effectiveness. Next is Intent of an employee to behave in a manner which is beyond the predefined contractually. It can be construed from the definitions of all behaviors that the actor performs them with the positive intent and not intends destructive. Third is to label the behaviors either functional or dysfunctional. This bifurcation is concordance to the perceived outcome of the behavior which is focused in OCB, ERB, OS and CP but not in PSOB. The behaviors focus on perceived outcome directed to benefit the organization and for the same they have labeled as functional behavior but PSOB can be dysfunctional also.

The Fourth and fifth characteristics comprise the nature of role behavior (whether extra-role or in-role respectively) encompasses by the constructs. The theorists limit the definitions of OCB, ERB, OS and CP, which are performed across the boundaries of prescribed or contractual roles. In contrast, formal definitions of ProSocial Organizational Behavior has not cleared the boundaries thus they can be performed within the boundary of prescribed roles or beyond it, referred as extra-roles. Sixth basis of comparison addresses the issue that the behavior should be exhibited by current member of the organization. Seventh basis compare the motive to perform such behaviors. The behaviors are promotive behaviors which accompany helping, supporting, and cooperating actions. Eighth is to compare whether such behaviors targeted to an individual, a group or the organization and the all compared behaviors can be targeted to each of the above category. But the ninth base that addresses the issue of primary beneficiary can vary for each construct. OCB, ERB, OS and CP are primarily directed towards benefiting the organization while ProSocial Organizational Behavior intended to benefit target for example helping a co-worker could shift his focus from his own critical duties and responsibilities that may suffer organization’s efficiency. Tenth characteristic makes comparison based on whether such behavior rewarded formally or not. Citizenship Behavior and extra-role behavior are strictly defines as not formally rewarded but others can be rewarded formally.
The above comparison is evidenced by the definitions of the five constructs. But the empirical investigations found in conventional wisdom are not bound to the use of formal definitions of the term. This has questioned the validity of definitional comparison and therefore makes the difference between the construct unclear. For example, Organ (1988) who initially defined OCB did not address the individual’s intent but emphasized perceived outcome of such behaviors. Soon after, Organ (1990) defined it again and focused on both intent of the actor and perceived outcome of behavior. Alongwith the prior elements he mentioned that “OCB consists of informal contributions that participants can choose to proffer or withhold without regard to considerations of sanction or formal incentives” (p. 46). Construct overlapping has also been seen in the literature for example, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) and Puffer (1987) studied the Prosocial Organizational Behavior but the items they have used to measure it are parallel to those used in the study of Smith, Organ & Near (1983) to measure Organizational Citizenship Behavior. However, PSOB is a wide-ranging construct than OCB (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Furthermore, some of the dimensions of OCB such as Conscientiousness, Courtesy and Civic Virtue have been operationalized as in-role behaviors. Nevertheless, the behavior has been contended as extra-role behavior by many researchers (Organ, 1988; Williams & Anderson, 1991; Graham, 1991; Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch, 1994).

1.4 Overlapping Among OCB and its Analogous Constructs

The comparison done between the constructs reflect some similarities among these constructs which entail that constructs overlap each other (see Figure 1.1). Organ (1988) acknowledged that ProSocial Organizational Behavior is more broad and inclusive behavior. For the ProSocial Behavior which is beyond the formally prescribed role (extra-role) and results in productive outcomes (functional) Extra-Role Behavior nomenclature can be used. Thus, all ERBs overlap PSOB construct. Organizational Citizenship Behavior encompasses by Extra-Role Behavior as both have same characteristics but there are other extra-role behavior also which has similar characteristics but still different in some way. Organizational Spontaneity Behavior and Contextual Performance are functional behaviors and contain some of the
dimensions of citizenship behavior (e.g. helping co-workers by Organizational Spontaneity and almost all dimensions conceptualized by Graham (1986a) and Organ (1988) by Contextual Performance) but still different in one characteristic that is the behaviors can be rewarded formally by the organization. Thus those Organizational Spontaneity behavior and Contextual performance which are not rewarded formally would overlap to OCB and ERB constructs. OS and CP overlap each other due to sharing of common dimensions of behavior.

1.5 A Paradigm Shift in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): An Outcome of Emotions

Emotions and emotional processes play very important role for organizational behavior (e.g. Brief & Weiss, 2002). Mandler (1975) defined emotions as functional mechanism which interrupts highly systematized activities, to derive “attention on imperative events that are pertinent to physiological needs or that cause disturbing cognitive associations, such as threats to esteem”. Thus, emotions play vital role to stimulate employees’ physiological needs that provoke action tendencies to exhibit certain behavior.
Figure 1.2: Integration of Spector and Fox’s (2002) & Ilies, Peng, Savani and Dimotakis’s (2013) Model of Voluntary Work Behavior

T1, T2, and T3 represent three subsequent different time periods.
The Figure 1.2 shows the emotional process of voluntary work behaviors at workplace by combining two emotion based models pertaining to it. Figure 1.2(a) represents the “Emotional-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior” conceptualized by Spector and Fox (2002) and Figure 1.2(b) represents Emotion-Based Reparatory Model of Voluntary Work Behavior developed by Ilies, Peng, Savani and Dimotakis (2013) who extended the work of Spector and Fox (2002). The model of Spector and Fox (2002) highlights the role of positive and negative emotions to induce Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) respectively. The second model developed by Ilies et al. (2013) explains how feedback to employees of their counterproductive work behaviors motivates reparatory behavior.

The Voluntary Work Behavior’s Emotional-Centered Model suggests that at first environment and its elements are perceived, appraise and then interpreted by an individual where the appraisal and interpretation get influenced by baseline emotional state of the individual (Anderson, Deuser, & DeNeve, 1995). For example, conflict with a family member, before work will affect reactions to work environment. Two other factors which affect the appraisal of the environment are perceived control over the situation and personality of the individual. Appraisal and Interpretation of environmental elements in turn affect emotional state of the individual. A Combined effect of emotions, control perceptions, and personality can be viewed on behavior and behaviors can also impact emotion and control perceptions. For example, an individual might feel guilt after acting counter productively and that serves as a positive emotion to exhibit reparatory behavior. Finally behavior affects environment which encourage environmental conditions and whole emotional process repeats in it and results in behavior.

Role of emotions is on centre in this emotional process of voluntary work behavior model. As whether the emotion is positive or negative will decide the action tendencies or intention to act. Positive emotions lead to positive voluntary behavior such as OCBs (helping
coworkers, adherence to norms, involvement in organization’s political life; Organ, 1988) and negative emotions will tend to elicit negative voluntary work behaviors such as CWBs which include “avoiding work, doing tasks incorrectly, physical aggression, verbal hostility (insults), sabotage, and theft” (Spector and Fox, 2002). However, personality characteristics are also important for the determination of behavior as emotion only gears the engagement in behavior.

Further, the work has been extended by Ilies et al. (2013), proposed that realization to people that they have violated crucial social norms make them feeling guilt. Thus, this induces reparatory behavior to compensate their undesirable or counterproductive behavior in the given context. The figure 2(b) shows Emotion-Based Reparatory Model. The model explicates that the normative feedback provided to an employee based on its actual level of past CWBs exposes them to feeling of guilt. In order to compensate such disapproved behavior employee induces OCBs intentions and so as to OCBs performance. Ausubel (1955) suggested that guilt not only diminishes negative emotions but also encourages positive behaviors (to compensate by repairing the harm caused by past counterproductive behaviors).

Specifically, it is found that CWBs feedback have substantial impact on OCBs intention and actual behavior for those who scores high in CWBs but insignificant for those who scores low in CWBs. Findings are as per expectations, as normative feedback to employees who exhibit lower than average CWBs would not affect their feeling of guilt and OCBs intentions and behaviors. Furthermore, indirect effect of CWBs feedback on OCBs intentions and behaviors is found, mediated by feeling of guilt. Thus, OCBs intentions and behaviors are induced with the experience of guilt come by feedback of past CWBs level among employees who demonstrate high level CWBs.
1.6 Motive Based View of OCB

Till date, many factors such as attitudinal, dispositional and contextual have been studied as antecedents of OCBs. Much of the research in the respective domain assumes that such discretionary behaviors are reactive in nature and engagement in these behaviors depends on the individual’s perception about his/her job or organization. But Penner, Midili, and Kegelmeyer (1997) argued and defined OCBs as proactive behaviors. People have certain motives and needs and to meet and satisfy them they decide to exhibit OCBs. Thus, it suggests that OCBs are not just performed in response to dispositions or perceptions rather it may be demonstrated to fulfill certain motives also. Rioux and Penner (2001) identified the role of three motives in OCBs. These are prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management.

**Prosocial values** motives involve desire of the individual to help others and develop positive and harmonious interrelationships. The motive of organizational concern comprises individual’s desire for the Company success and to reflect association with and commitment to the organization. The last motive is impression management refers to individual’s desire to look good in the eye of the supervisors and coworkers to gain rewards and benefits. The results indicate that the prosocial values motive is more strongly correlated to OCB-I and organizational concern is more strongly correlated to OCB-O. Impression management is not found as correlate of any dimension of OCB. Another important finding is that the motives have explained unique significant variance beyond the variance accounted by predictors of OCBs.

McClelland’s theory of motivation suggests that people have three motives behind their actions. These motives are Achievement, Affiliation, and Power. This framework of achievement-affiliation-power motive can also come into the role behind the exhibition of OCB. Niehoff discussed a Motive-Based Model of OCB which presents McClelland’s three suggested motives as motive paradigms of OCB.
1.6.1 Motive Paradigm I: Achievement Motive and OCB

An important characteristic that citizenship behaviors include according to the definition given by Organ (1988) is that the behaviors promote the organization’s effective functioning in aggregate. The organization’s effective functioning lies in the successful accomplishment of mission, objectives, projects and tasks of the organization. Thus, when an employee demonstrate citizenship behaviors such as helping peers, abstaining from complaints, consider the rights of others and actively organize and participate in the meetings and functions of the organization to attains important objectives and tasks belong to the interest of the organization then the behaviors are exhibited with the motive of Achievement. When an achievement oriented citizen perceives that the OCB exhibited by him/her is not contributing to the success and effectiveness of the organization, his motivation to perform such behaviors will drop.

1.6.2 Motive Paradigm II: Affiliation Motive and OCB

The Van Dyne et al. (1955) categorized OCB and ProSocial Organizational behaviors under the head Affiliative Behaviors. They explained that affiliative behaviors are those behaviors exhibited to establish and maintain relationship with the members of the organization through helping, cooperating and sharing. Williams and Anderson (1991) conceptualized two constructs OCB-I stands for organizational citizenship behavior towards individual and OCBO which stands for organizational citizenship behavior towards organization. OCBI comprises two of the dimensions as proposed by Organ (1988) Altruism and Courtesy. Both behaviors are oriented towards coworkers and exhibited with the motive of affiliation through helping, cooperating and considering the effects of own actions on the wellness of others.

1.6.3 Motive Paradigm III: Power Motive and OCB

The citizenship behaviors promote organizational interest on one hand and self-interest on the other. Impression management as one of the motives to exhibit OCB has been recently emerges in the darker side (Riouxs & Penner, 2001). The power-oriented citizen demonstrates
OCB to get recognized as well wisher of the organization who prioritize organization’s interest, by the authorities equipped with power. The power seeker citizen will be motivated to exhibit OCB if it comes into visible arena of the higher authorities as this contains opportunity to impress them and subsequently could result in self serving for them. Thus power oriented citizens acquire power by investment in political capital through the OCB performances.

The paradigms help to understand OCB in its strict observable form. As OCB defined as voluntary effort oriented to enhance organizational effectiveness (Organ, 1988) or create and maintain social psychological settings in which task performances will going to be placed (Organ, 1997) but certain motives of the citizens can be identified as probable reasons why employees might perform citizenship behaviors. The three motives explained by Rioux and Penner (2001) that is prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management akin to the motives discussed in McClelland’s theory, these are affiliation, achievement and power. The congruence indicates the role of three main motives in the performance of OCBs can be referred as positive interrelationships, organizational success and positive identity.

1.7 Theory of Value/Identity Based Motivation (VIM)

The framework suggested that the value/identity based motivation stems from one’s desire to behave according to his value or identity (Shamir, 1991). Values are explicated as beliefs about desirable behaviors cross prescribed boundaries, direct the evaluation and selection of such behaviors and ordered based on relative importance. Values are major component of self identity. Motivation based on value/identity induces behaviors that express values and identity of the individual. Thus, individuals engage in OCB to express and maintain the self-consistency between their internalized values, identity and behavior. Wang, Howell, Hinrichs and Prieto (2010) found coincide between five (universalism, conformity, self-direction, security, and benevolence) out of 10 universal values identified by Schwartz (1992) and five factors of OCB: “altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and courtesy” Organ (1988). Thus, people tend to behave in a manner that reflects their value system.
1.8 Social Exchange Theory (SET)

SET is suggested as the most prominent theoretical paradigm to predicate and understand the employee behavior at workplace (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Homan (1961) explained that an activity or behavior performed by an individual to reciprocate the favor or benefits received from other party establishes social exchange relationship between them. Further, he discussed that the persistency of such exchanges is based on the reinforcement principle. For example, the two parties A and B abided by social exchange relationship when A’s favor to B reinforces B’s behavior to return the favor to A and this may further reinforce A’s behavior towards B.

Another approach asserted by Blau (1964) to define social exchange is economic and utilitarian in nature. Blau (1964, p: 91) posited that “Social exchange refers to voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others.” Blau’s Utilitarian approach to social exchange looks forward while Homans (1961) reinforcement approach looks backward. Thus both approaches have shown an important rule of social exchange that is norm of reciprocity. The norm of reciprocity implies that perceived fair treatment by an individual make him obligatory to reciprocate the benefit he/she received from. Based on this notion Konovsky and Pugh (1994) propounded that employees reciprocate the supervisor’s fair treatment and one of the way for employee reciprocation is likely to be organizational citizenship behavior.

The suspected linkage between perceived fairness and OCB seems to be paradoxical to the conceptualization of OCB explicated by Organ (1988). The salient characteristics drawn from the definition of OCB are discretionary, not formally recognized and an impetus to the organizational effectiveness. More specifically, nonrecognition of OCB in pay, status or supervisory supportiveness (although seems unfair but) would not cause reduced or absence of OCB. Thus, the definition presented a view which contradicts to Konovsky and Pugh (1994) expected positive relationship between perceived fairness and OCB. Organ (1990) asserted that
distinguishing employee-employer relationship based on *social* and *economic exchange* as described by Blau (1964) makes the apparent contradiction less vexing.

Economic exchange is contractual in nature as it inherent a specific quid for a particular quo, a precise time, and do not based on trust. On the other hand social exchange entails expectation of unspecified obligations to return favors. However, the nature, value, and timing of obligation discharge are ill-defined or unspecified. Social exchange is based on trust which one party has on another party of the exchange that obligation will be discharged fairly in the long-run. Thus fairness in economic exchange refers to the compliance to the term of contract or exchange but fairness in social exchange is different. An exchange, in which relationship between parties is based on *good faith* that the each other’s contribution will be recognized, referred as a fair social exchange. Employees are abided in the social exchange relationship when they trust their employer. An important base to build trust in the relationship of employee and employer is procedural justice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Thus, the application of fair practices by an employer reflects that the rights and self-esteem of the employees are considered.
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respectful by the employer. The consideration develops their trust on the fairness that it will sustain even in long-run in the relationship. Trust on fairness makes employees obligatory to return the benefits or contributions received from their employer in the form of fair treatment and encourages them to put extra effort from those mandated by their employers (Rousseau & Parks, 1993) may be in the form of OCB with the belief that their contributions will be recognized.

Organ (1990) suggested a model that shows dispositional tendency as the predominant predictors of OCB and the relationship is moderated by perceived fairness in the social exchange relationship (see Figure 1.3). The perception of fairness in social exchange is predicated by threshold of sensitivity. The threshold would vary among individual but one situational influence should also come into consideration. High degree of intrinsic involvement and preoccupation with task or other related matters would divert the individual from cogitation on the fairness of individual outcomes, atleast until the proof of unfairness is overpowering. Thus, once the threshold for perceived unfairness is infringed, the social exchange relationship is transformed into economic exchange relationship and OCB gestures those have generally seen in “automatic and unconstrained fashions are become controlled or withheld”. In general, the model has presented the role of fair social exchange relationships in explaining and predicting OCBs is as moderator of the simple relationship with individual dispositions. However, all robust predictors would have good fit to the model at the place of disposition.

1.9 Consequences of OCB

Knowing and understanding the consequences of OCBs and relationship between both is important due to the role of consequences of OCBs for the organization’s success highlighted by the Organ’s (1988, 1997) original definition. The conventional wisdom has empirically studied the outcomes of OCB at two levels: Individual Level (Allen & Rush, 1998; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Werner, 1994) and Organizational Level (Dunlop & Lee, 2004;
At individual level the examination of literature noticed three critical outcomes of OCB: managerial evaluations, managerial decisions concern to formal or informal reward allocation, promotion, training, and withdrawal-related activities of employee such as turnover intentions, actual turnover, and absenteeism. Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Hui (1993) have discussed the several conscious and unconscious potential reasons behind the positive association between OCB and employee’s performance evaluation and managerial decision with respect to them (see Figure 1.4). For Example, managers believe that such behaviors enhance the organizational functioning (Organ, 1988) may encourage them to acknowledge such contributions in performance appraisal to promote citizenship behaviors. In addition, OCBs are extra-role behaviors or volitional, engagement in such behavior indicates employee’s commitment to the organizational interest rather to his self. To appreciate their motivation and commitment to such performances are also incorporated in performance assessment. Next can be managers’ tendency to establish social exchange (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960) to keep cycle move on. Managers reciprocate the favor what employee did by exhibiting citizenship behaviors; give them higher ratings in performance evaluation. Another reason can be that OCB are distinctive forms of behaviors therefore managers search such distinctive information and remember when they are asked to evaluate someone’s performance (DeNisi, Cafferty, & Meglino, 1984). Finally, Lefkowitz (2000) suggested that employees who exhibit OCB are liked by the managers and subsequently get higher rating for their performance. In aggregate, the above arguments construed that the engagement of employees in the citizenship behaviors influence their overall performance evaluation.
Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) reviewed the empirical studies those have reported the effect of OCB (extra-role behavior) and task performance (formally prescribed in-role behavior) on overall performance evaluation and managerial decision. Taken together, the results of such empirical researches (Avila, Fern, & Mann, 1988; Lowery & Krilowicz, 1994; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994) report that the task performance uniquely explained 9.5% variance in employees’ performance evaluation and on the other hand unique variance explained by OCB is 42.9%, on average. This implies that the OCB influences managerial evaluations more substantially than task performances. Moreover, through the examination of few more studies (Allen & Rush, 1998; Johnson, Erez, Kiker, & Motowidlo, 2002; Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999; Park & Sims, 1989; Shore, barksdale, & Shore, 1995; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000) determined the substantiality of the role of OCB/contextual performance and task performance as a predictor of managerial decisions with respect to employee’s reward allocation, promotability, and training. Findings are consistent with the above discussed results for managerial evaluations. Moreover, the other outcomes of OCBs
studied by X.-P. Chen (2005) and X.-P. Chen, Hui, and Sego (1998) are the lower intention to turnover and actual turnover.

As one of the key tenets of OCB construct defined by Organ (1988) is that, in aggregate such behaviors contribute to organizational effectiveness. Thus, one of the important consequences that OCBs have at organizational level is increased unit and/or organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2000) including enhanced productivity, profitability, efficiency, and reduced costs. OCBs contribute to overall performance of the unit/organization (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Some of the forms of OCBs have substantial impact on quality and quantity of work group performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1996). Operating efficiency and customer satisfaction are the organizational factors that found positive linkage with OCB (Walz & Niehoff, 2000). Podsakoff et al. (2009) have done a meta-analysis includes 206 study sample to examine the consequences of OCB at individual and organizational level. The causality between OCB and unit level effective performance is evident by this research. Karambayya (1990) argued that work units those perform high, reported high level of OCB than low performing work units. However, this strong relationship between OCB and organizational effectiveness has some exceptions. Dunlop and Lee (2004) confounded that the workplace deviant behaviors negatively associated with business unit performance and presence of deviant employees in the organization impede effect of OCB on the performance. The results embodied to the notion that “the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel”.

Researchers (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) posited that OCB improves functioning and effectiveness of the organization as it “lubricate the social machinery” of the work group through maintaining cooperative and supportive ambience among organizational members. Recently, many scholars have identified specific theoretical mechanism (Refer Figure 1.5) serves as potential reasons for the fact that OCBs influence unit/organizational effectiveness (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Borman & Motowidlo,
1993; Kambayya, 1990; Kyos, 2001; MacKenzie et al. 1991, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2009; Smith et al., 1983). For example, the experienced and skilled employee engagement in OCBs motivates him to train and teach best practices at work to less experienced or unskilled employee. Spread of such best practices through helping behavior bring enhanced productivity. Similarly employees who engage in different forms of citizenship behaviors such as civic virtue and sportsmanship may help their managers to enhance managerial productivity by giving innovative suggestions for improving organizational performance and allow manager to centre their focus on critical tasks. In addition, OCBs aid coordination among team members and work groups through active participation and attendance in organizational unit’s meetings that lead to more effectiveness. Next, OCBs might free up managers from the core maintenance functions and also reduce the need for other scarce resources as it induces team spirit and cohesiveness and readiness to cope with less than ideal circumstances. Finally, OCBs create social capital in the organization through developing and maintaining social psychological environment which includes strong network ties, effective distribution of information, and organizational learning. Several researches (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Koys, 2001; MacKenzie et al., 1996; Podsakoff et al., 2009; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994, 1997; Walz & Niehoff, 2000) are important evidences for this reasoning. The studies have shown positive association between OCBs and organizational effectiveness including its different measure such as profitability, productivity, customer satisfaction, operating efficiency, reduced cost and unit level turnover.
Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) derived average results based on four studies who have used same scale to measure OCBs, for the relationship of OCB to organizational effectiveness. The average variance accounted by OCBs in the quantity, a measure of performance is 20%, in quality is more than 19%, in financial efficiency indicator is 25%, and in customer service indicators is about 38%. Thus, the Organ’s (1988) notion that OCBs influence performance is strongly evident by empirical researches.

1.10 Antecedents of OCB

The antecedents selected for the present study are organizational commitment, occupational role stress and job satisfaction have been undertaken in detail to understand their relationship with OCB.

1.10.1 Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Moday, Porter, and Steers (1982) claimed that there are many instances when organization requires its members to perform beyond their formal roles as such performance will benefit the organization in the extended way. The behaviors beyond the prescribed role
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require more than a sincere compliance to the norms and rules stipulated by the organization. O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) posited that the motivational base for the organizational members to exhibit such spontaneous gestures those are not included in their assigned jobs is their psychological attachment to the organization. They conceived OC as psychological attachment towards the organization, felt by the organization’s members. The attachment provokes the sharing of organizational goals and values by its members and feel internalized to the organization thus they perform inherently to benefit the organization.

Indirect linkage between organizational commitment and OCBs was depicted by the Scholl’s (1981) and Wiener’s (1982) models of organizational commitment. The model proposed by Scholl has defined organizational commitment “a stabilizing force that acts to maintain behavioral direction when expectancy/equity conditions are not met and do not function” (p. 593). William and Anderson (1991) pointed out OCBs as behaviors that take place with no or very small expectation of getting recognized formally by the organization. Thus, organizational commitment is an appropriate determinant of OCBs. Weiner (1982) defined organizational commitment as internalized normative beliefs, persist behaviors (i) indicate personal sacrifices which have been done for the organization’s benefits, (ii) volitional in nature, independent from rewards or punishments, and (iii) reflect a personal concern with the organization. In general, OCBs are also described by the similar characteristics. The view provides additional support to the notion that organizational commitment is a robust predictor of OCBs.

Shore, Barksdale, and Shore (1995) asserted that managers view employee engagement in OCBs as valuable sign of his/her commitment towards the organization. As OCBs are the constructive and cooperative gestures and performed by the employee by his/her own choice without any contractual recognition and directed to benefit the organization. Thus, the demonstration of such behaviors shows the high level of internalization or attachment to the organization.
One more issue that must be addressed is that when employee feel emotionally attached towards the organization they develop attitude of commitment. The rationale for this can be drawn from the social exchange theory. The theory suggests that when employee perceives fair social and economic exchange they tend to increase their attachment. Moreover, to establish fair social exchange employees are prone to exchange their commitment for leader’s or organizational support (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). The employees reflect their commitment by engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors. The organizational commitment and OCB positive relationship is evident by many scholars (Bragger, Rodriguez-srednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, & Rosner, 2005; Cohen, 2007; Cohen & Keren, 2008; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Golparvar & Javadian, 2012; Kwantes, 2003; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2008; Lavelle et al., 2009; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1998; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Shore & Wayne, 1993).

1.10.2 Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The notion that “high subordinate morale leads to high work performance” is a firm belief hold by many organizational professionals and leaders (Gannon & Noon, 1971; Katzell & Yankelovich, 1975; Kossen, 1996). More specifically, satisfaction from the rewards contingent to performance have strong linkage to job performance, the view has been endorsed by organizational psychologists (Lawler & Porter, 1967). However, organizational researchers have found less empirical evidence for the job satisfaction - job performance relationship thus viewed as naive folk wisdom. The study examined the link between JS and productivity was carried out by Kornhauser and Sharp (1932; cf. Organ et al., 2006) found weak evidence of such relationship. Brayfield and Crockett (1955) after review of several studies had drawn a conclusion that the linkage of JS and individual productivity is not appreciable. Vroom (1964) reviewed the related studies of Post-1955 to update Brayfield and Crockett review and observed median correlation of 0.14 among JS and work output. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky’s (1985) meta-analysis also noted low positive correlation of 0.17 for satisfaction-performance hypothesis. Just after a year, Podsakoff and Williams (1986) reviewed and compared findings of
several research studied individual satisfaction-work performance relationship. The review suggested insignificant correlation between both constructs.

The rationale behind the discrepancy between organizational professionals’ belief and scholars’ actual findings propounded by Organ (1988) is the difference in focus of managers and researchers on the type of performance. Organ has explained that managers think that satisfied employees are willingly put extra efforts either voluntarily or when requested in their work performance to strive excellence for the organization on the other hand researchers examine the relationship by using traditional units of performance such as quality, quantity, profitability, and reduction in cost. Thus, the linkage of satisfaction with performance is found unsupported by the literature because of the wrong operationalization of the measured performance (Organ, 1977). The traditional performance depends on one’s abilities and skills and it is not necessary that a satisfied employee may have this but he/she may have willingness to exert efforts that are voluntary and positive also for the organization benefits and not restricted by any particular skill and ability. The behavior expected by organizational practitioners from a satisfied employee is to put extra efforts those are beyond their contractual job and constructive in nature, comprised of organizational citizenship behaviors.

According to Barnard (1939) one’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction felt at workplace articulates the willingness to cooperate. The notion had postulated a testable proposition that JS is a determinant of OCBs. The proposition has been tested by many researchers. Several studies (Bateman & Organ 1983; Kyos, 2001; Puffer, 1987; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Motowidlo, 1984; Murphy, Athanasou, & King 2002; Organ & Lingl 1995; Schnake, Cochran & Dumler, 1995; Williams & Anderson; 1991) have evident the empirical linkage between OCB and job satisfaction.

The main premises of this relationship are social exchange theory (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), and psychological
contract theory (Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Social exchange theory predicts that employee tend to reciprocate the favor by organization officials if the benefits provided by them result in satisfaction at job. The reciprocation may not comprise increased quantity or improved quality of output as it is a matter of employee’s abilities, skills and opportunity provided. Citizenship behaviors are not constrained by abilities and skills thus such behaviors are more likely to be an appropriate mode of reciprocation. Psychological contract theory suggested that employees’ perception that their organization will always fulfill its obligation to them and this stems feeling of satisfaction on job which motivates citizenship behaviors.

Moorman (1993) argued that the type of job satisfaction measure effect the job satisfaction-OCB relationship. Job satisfaction measures may differ in the dominance of affective component or cognitive component. Affective satisfaction construed from the good mood or positive feelings evoked by the job. The affective component dominant measures include questions that gauged the feelings (positive or negative) and mood (good or bad). A high job satisfaction level would be indicated by positive feelings and positive mood. The cognitive satisfaction is drawn from the rational appraisal of the job settings. The cognitive component dominant measures include questions to judge whether the nature of working conditions or job satisfy one’s need or not. Thus, the cognitive satisfaction is the positive appraisal of job conditions, opportunities and outcomes rather than positive feelings or emotional judgments. Organ and Near (1985) first asserted that measurement instruments of JS are predominantly cognitive rather than affective. Brief and Roberson (1987) and Williams (1988) argued that the influence of affective component is also present. They found that both components are positively correlated with the overall job satisfaction but when cognitions are statistically controlled then measures of affect lost its linkage with overall job satisfaction. Findings enlighten that the responses for the level of satisfaction rather directly based on the cognitions and evaluations of job conditions than on the modal states.
Some researchers (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Moorman, 1993) have studied the link connecting JS and OCB by taking into consideration the influence of affective and cognitive components. Results indicate that more unique variance to OCB is explained by satisfaction drive from cognitive appraisal of job rather than ephemeral ‘good mood’. Organ (1990) cautioned that if relationship between job satisfaction and OCB found stronger due to positive cognitive appraisal of job condition then OCB will be interpreted as cognitively dominant, controlled process rather than a mere expressions of positive mood state. (See Figure 1.6).
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Figure 1.6: Diagram showing OCB is largely determined by Cognition

However, the causality between the two constructs, whether job satisfaction causes OCB or OCB causes job satisfaction or the relationship is in a reinforcing loop is currently in debate. Yet, many empirical records have been evident for job satisfaction as robust predictor of OCB (Organ & Lingl, 1995; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Schnake, Cochran & Dumler, 1995; Williams & Anderson, 1991).
1.10.3 Occupational Role Stress and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The adverse effect of several role stressors, for example “role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload and work-family conflict” on employee attitude and behaviors is postulated based on Organizational Role Theory (Jain & Cooper, 2012). The theory suggested that employees show reluctance to perform in a way which is not consistent with the role defined. OCB is an extra-role behavior, and engagement in such behavior causes role conflict because they are not the part of formal role defined. Sometimes, exhibition of both in-role and beyond the prescribed role behaviors creates pressure because of the inability to meet demands from multiple roles. OCB is a discretionary behavior; its non exhibition would not cause any punishment. Thus, when employees feel strain due to imbalance between demand and coping ability at workplace they choose to refrain themselves from engaging in extra-role behaviors (OCB) which are not required. They are more likely to concentrate their time and energy on in-role behaviors which are mandatory (Tompson & Werner, 1997). Different job stressors evoke negative emotions and have detrimental impact on the likelihood of the employees to involve in citizenship behaviors.

1.11 Anti-Citizenship Behaviors

Where, the managers made efforts to promote citizenship behavior as these are the positive behaviors contribute to organizational effectiveness they also need to focus on behaviors those hinder organizational effective functioning and lead to negative consequences for organization, its members and society (Gholipour, Saeidinejad, & Zehtabi, 2009). These behaviors are termed as anti-citizenship behaviors or bad behaviors due to its contrary characteristics to citizenship behaviors. Ball, Trevino, and Sims (1994) consider anti-citizenship behaviors as a misconduct that reduces the work performance. The proliferation in related domain of research gives a wide range of negative intended actions that cause damage such as physical violence, theft, sabotage, aggression, bullying, work deviance, antagonism, anti-social behavior, misbehavior, incivility, abuse, work avoidance and dysfunctional behavior. The constructs encompasses somewhat same harm intended actions and also known as Anti-citizenship behaviors are:
- Workplace aggression (Baron & Richardson, 1994)
- Employee deviance behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995)
- Antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997)
- Organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996)
- Antagonistic work behavior (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997)
- Workplace violence (Neuman & Baron, 1998)
- Dysfunctional behavior (Griffin, O’Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998)
- Organizational Bullying Behavior (Salin, 2003)
- Counterproductive work behavior (Spector & Fox, 2002)

These interchangeable concepts are briefly defined below:

**Workplace Aggression (WA):** Aggression at workplace is explicated in a wide range of varied behaviors attempts to harm the other work groups (Baron and Richardson, 1994). They explained aggression at workplace in three stages: (i) non-cooperation, spreading rumors, and verbal hostility; (ii) disagreement or opposition to supervisors, coworkers, clients, hurting emotionally, and threatening; (iii) showing annoyance through fighting, inflaming, using weapons, hurting physically, murder, and rape. Baron and Neuman (1998) introduced five forms of workplace aggression: “covert aggression, overt aggression, verbal aggression, obstructionism, and workplace violence”.

**Employee Deviance Behavior:** Robinson and Bennett (1995) define deviance behavior as an abnormal behavior by employees that violate organizational norms. This is an optional act threatens the interest of the organization, its members or both. They differentiated the abnormal behavior from and unethical behavior. In their opinion, abnormality of behavior refers to violation of important organizational norms, while unethical behavior comprises the violation of laws and traditions of society. Thus, they viewed deviance behavior as bad behavior.
Organizational Misbehavior (OMB): According to Vardi and Wiener (1996) OMB includes action that is intended to break norms established by society and/or organization. They consider intention as an important player in such behavior. Based on intentions three types of OMB have been identified “(i) OMB Type S, intends to promote the self interest, (ii) OMB Type O, intends to promote the organizational interest, and (iii) OMB Type D, and intends to cause damage”.

Anti-social Behavior: It is described as actions that cause destruction to an organization, its members and other parties who have stake in the organization. Thus, this is simply a negative behavior that innate physical, economic, psychological and emotional harm to other employees, organization or both. Some of the examples of such behaviors are: extortion, blackmail, discrimination, kickback, espionage, violations of confidentiality, violence, lying, arson, sabotage, bribery, theft, and fraud.

Antagonistic Work Behavior: The behavior encompasses activities those are opposite to prosocial activities which include arguing with coworkers and gossiping. Such behavior includes acrimonious influence techniques such as threats and abuse. The instances of antagonistic behavior are usually come to seen in political oriented scenario (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997).

Workplace Violence: Neuman and Baron (1998) characterized it as the most extreme form of aggression involves direct physical assault oriented to other employees of the organization. It can also be defined as an act inherent the intention to cause physical hurt or harm to other members of the organization (Greenberg & Barling, 1999).

Dysfunctional Behavior: Scholars identified that these behavior leads to negative consequences for organization and its employees. These behaviors detract from organizational and individual performance. Thus, these are prohibitive behaviors oriented to organization or employees.
**Organizational Bullying Behavior:** Salin defined bullying at workplace as repeated, continuous and negative acts towards one or more individual(s). Thus, bullying is an interpersonal aggression that creates hostile working environment. Bullying behavior encompasses several negative actions such as bringing social isolation, spreading rumors, harming the victim’s private life or attitudes, unnecessary criticism, monitoring of work, withholding information, take away responsibility, and verbal aggression.

**Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB):** As the term suggests the behavior inherent non-productive outcomes at workplace. Authors explained CWB as the behavior aimed to hurt the organization and its employees. This comprises the acts which have potential damage for example: evasion of work, not doing task correctly, physical violence, work disruption, insulting and theft. The acts are oriented to both individuals and organization such as abusing and hostility directed to individual, while improper way of working, avoidance, hindering work directed to organizational non-productive outcomes.

1.12 Need of the Study

The Informational Technology (IT) - Business Process Management (BPM) industry has highest impact among all other sectors on Indian economy. The sector’s contribution to India’s GDP has grown by 8% in the last 10 Years. The revenue generated by Indian IT-BPM sector in aggregate is of USD 118 billion in Financial Year 2014. The sector has grown by 13% in terms of its revenues. During the Financial Year 2013, direct employment created by the sector was three million. The 1.66 lakhs jobs are added in Financial Year 2014. Thus, the IT-BPM sector is persistent in sustaining their image as the largest employer among the other organized private sectors in India. IT-BPM domestic market revenues are expected to grow by 9 to 12% in 2015 and the revenues are expected to touch USD 130 billion. These are the some fact that helps to judge the importance of the IT industry for the Indian economy. (Source: www.nasscom.in)
The Indian IT industry is one of the important pillars for the growth of Indian economy. The important element for the growth of Indian IT industry is “employees because the industry works on the human resources (HR) augmentation mode” (Upadhya & Vasavi, 2006). The Industry’s revenue is the function of the “number of the projects handled and number of employees working on a project” (TSchang, 2001). Hence, the number of IT professionals working in an IT organization is an indicator of the revenue generated by the organization. As it is a knowledge based industry, intellectual capital is like a blood for IT organizations which lends competitive advantage to the organization.

But, the biggest persistent HR challenge facing by the Indian IT industry is to retain and motivate their highly skilled professionals. The attrition rate in the Hi-Tech sector for the year 2013-14 is 14.2% (Source: Compensation Trend Survey 2014-15 by Deloitte). The survey has found Hi-Tech sector as a third highest attrition rate sector among other sectors such as ITes, Media, Pharma, Retail and many others, thus, continues to be a concern. Leaving current company and working with another company is a tendency of IT employees (Korunka, Hoonakker & Carayon, 2008). IT employees easily switch their jobs because of increasing demand from other IT Companies (McKnight, Philips & Hardgrave, 2009). But, the quit of talented IT employees can adversely affect the competitive advantage, profitability and ultimately survival of an organization (LeRouge, Nelson & Blanton, 2006). The profitability affects due to the high cost associated with the IT employees in terms of their recruitment and high training cost, work disruption and demoralization of remaining employees. Moreover, the expertise and unique skills of IT professionals raise the expenses of the employee turnover (McKnight et al., 2009). The replacement of a skilled IT worker, costs double of his annual salary (Young, 2002).

To face the prominent HR challenge in today’s IT industry i.e. reducing employee turnover rate and absenteeism so as to improve organizational performance and effectiveness, there is need to adapt some High Involvement-Innovative Human Resource Practices to keep
employees engaged. There are various factors that affect employees’ intent to quit; one of them is organizational citizenship behavior (Organ et al., 2006; Podsaaoff et al., 2000; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is a prominent element of Strategic Human Resource Management. It has a significant impact on the productivity and efficiency of the organization. Cultivation of OCB among the IT employees may help to survive the downturn and hold the employees, thus, lowering rates of absenteeism and turnover through creating and maintaining a friendly, supportive working environment and a sense of belonging.

This study and its findings will be significant and beneficial to the HR practitioners who look behind the all HR issues in IT industry such as recruitment of world-class workforce and their retention, compensation and career planning, performance appraisal, training and development, employee turnover and absenteeism. This study will reveal the factors or a model that describe the Organizational Citizenship Behavior.