

**HOW GOOD EMPLOYEES TURN BAD; EFFECT  
OF FORCED OCB ON INTERPERSONAL  
DEVIANCE OF EMPLOYEES WITH MEDIATING  
ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ENTITLEMENT**

**By**

**Shafi Ullah Khan**



**NATIONALUNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES  
ISLAMABAD**

**May 2020**

**HOW GOOD EMPLOYEES TURN BAD; EFFECT OF FORCED  
OCB ON INTERPERSONAL DEVIANCE OF EMPLOYEES WITH  
MEDIATING ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ENTITLEMENT**

By  
**Shafi Ullah Khan**

MBA, National University of Modern Languages, 2014

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

***MASTER OF SCIENCE***

In **MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

To

FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES  
Human Resource Management



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, ISLAMABAD

May 2020

©Shafi Ullah Khan 2020



## THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defence, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Management Sciences

Thesis Title: HOW GOOD EMPLOYEES TURN BAD; EFFECT OF FORCED OCB ON INTERPERSONAL DEVIANCE OF EMPLOYEES WITH MEDIATING ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ENTITLEMENT

Submitted By: Shafi Ullah Khan Registration #: 247- MSBA/PSC/F 16

Master of Science in Business Administration

Management Sciences

Dr. Amir Ishaque  
Name of Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Supervisor

Prof. Dr Naveed Akhtar  
Name of Dean (MS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Dean (MS)

Brig. Muhammad Ibrahim  
Name of Director General

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Director General

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## CANDIDATE DECLARATION FORM

I Shafi Ullah Khan

Son of Hastam Khan Khalil

Registration No: 247- MSBA/PSC/F 16

Discipline Management Sciences

Candidate of Master of Science in Business Administration at the National University of Modern languages do hereby declare that the thesis How good employees turn bad; Effect of Forced OCB on Interpersonal Deviance of employees with mediating role of Psychological Entitlement submitted by me in partial fulfillment of MS degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2020

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

**SHAFI ULLAH KHAN**

**THESIS SUBMISSION APPROVAL FORM**

**HOW GOOD EMPLOYEES TURN BAD; EFFECT OF FORCED OCB ON  
INTERPERSONAL DEVIANCE OF EMPLOYEES WITH MEDIATING  
ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ENTITLEMENT**

Submitted by: Shafi Ullah Khan

Registration No: 247- MSBA/PSC/F16

Discipline: Management Sciences (Human Resource Management)

Candidate for the degree of: Master of Science in Business Administration

This thesis has been read by me and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and thus fulfils the qualitative requirements of this study. It is ready for submission to the Faculty of Advanced Integrated Studies and Research for internal and external evaluation.

Supervisor: Dr. Amir Ishaque

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Date:

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this research to my parents and specially to my father who is a real source of motivation and inspiration to me , not because he is my father rather because of his conduct , honesty, dedication towards his profession and way of living . No doubt due to special blessing of ALLAH and prayers of my parents today I am able to complete this study.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I am especially thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Amir Ishaque, whose constant support and guidance made this dissertation possible for me. I also acknowledge his soft, approachable attitude which had always been a source of great encouragement for me, especially in my most challenging times during the research. However, this study would not have been possible without the cooperation of few other individuals. Last but not the least special thanks to Sakhawat Amin, Sangeen Khan and Dr. Muhammad Asad Khan for their continuous help and support, in every possible way until the completion of my thesis.

Thank you all very much!

**SHAFI ULLAH KHAN**

## **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this study is to investigate the effect of Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior on Interpersonal Deviance of employees with mediating role of Psychological Entitlement. With this aim, a causal model has been tested that explains the influence of Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior on Interpersonal Deviance of employees through the role of Psychological Entitlement. Causal research design on quantitative collected data provided support for the hypothesis from a sample of 350 employees of banking sector in Peshawar Region KPK, Pakistan. This research gives a lot of knowledge to the existing body of literature. The first purpose of this research is to test and confirm that Psychological Entitlement plays a mediating role between Forced OCB and Interpersonal Deviance. More specifically, this research expands the traditional view of Forced OCB and Interpersonal Deviance impact on employees and suggests that Forced OCB and Interpersonal Deviance do not only effect Psychological Entitlement, but also employee's commitment and motivation.

**Keywords: Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior, Interpersonal Deviance and Psychological Entitlement.**



## Table of Contents

<b>CHAPTER 1</b> .....	<b>xii</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>xiii</b>
1.1 Background .....	xiii
1.2 Problem Definition.....	xviii
1.3 Objectives of the Study .....	xix
1.4 Significance of the Study .....	xix
<b>CHAPTER 2</b> .....	<b>xxi</b>
<b>Literature Review</b> .....	<b>xxi</b>
2.1 Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior .....	xxi
2.2 Psychological Entitlement.....	xxxix
2.3 Interpersonal Deviance.....	xxxix
2.4 Relationship between Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior and Psychological Entitlement .....	l
2.5 Relationship between Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior and Interpersonal Deviance.....	liii
2.6 Relationship between Psychological Entitlement and Interpersonal Deviance.....	lvii
2.7 Mediating role of Psychological Entitlement in the Relationship between Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior and Interpersonal Deviance .....	lviii
<b>CHAPTER 3</b> .....	<b>lxi</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>lxi</b>
3.1 Research Design.....	lxi
3.2 Population.....	lxii
3.3 Sample of the Study .....	lxii
3.4 Data Collection.....	lxii
3.5 Questionnaires .....	lxiii

3.6	Reliability of the Questionnaire .....	lxiii
3.7	Demographics.....	lxiii
3.7.1	Gender.....	lxiv
3.7.2	Age.....	lxiv
3.7.3	Education .....	lxv
3.7.4	Experience.....	lxv
<b>CHAPTER 4.....</b>		<b>lxvi</b>
<b>Data Analysis and Discussion .....</b>		<b>lxvi</b>
4.1	Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis .....	lxvi
4.2	Assumptions of Regression Analysis.....	lxvi
4.3	Regression Analysis .....	lxvii
4.4	Mediation Analysis .....	lxix
4.4.1	Preacher & Hayes Analysis.....	lxx
4.5	Total, Direct and Indirect Effects.....	lxxii
4.6	Discussion of Results .....	lxxiii
<b>CHAPTER 5.....</b>		<b>lxxx</b>
<b>Conclusion and Future Recommendations.....</b>		<b>lxxx</b>
5.1	Conclusion.....	lxxx
5.2	Recommendation for Managers .....	lxxxii
5.3	Practical Implications.....	lxxxiii
5.4	Limitation of the Study .....	lxxxiii
5.5	Future Recommendations.....	lxxxiv
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>		<b>lxxxv</b>



Table 3. 1	Variables with item and reference.....	lxiii
Table 3. 2	Reliability Analysis.....	lxiii
Table 3. 3	Frequency distribution of demographic variables.....	lxiii
Table 4. 1	Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix.....	lxvi
Table 4. 2	Regression Analysis of forced OCB and Interpersonal Deviance.....	lxvii
Table 4. 3	Regression Analysis of forced OCB and Psychological Entitlement.....	lxviii
Table 4. 4	Regression Analysis of Interpersonal Deviance and Psychological Entitlement.....	lxix
Table 4. 5	Model Summary of Psychological Entitlement.....	lxx
Table 4. 6	Model Summary (FOCB and PE).....	lxxi
Table 4. 7	Model Summary of Interpersonal Deviance.....	lxxi
Table 4. 8	Model Summary (FOCB and ID).....	lxxii
Table 4. 9	Total Effect of FOCB on ID.....	lxxii
Table 4. 10	Direct Effect of FOCB on ID.....	lxxii
Table 4. 11	Indirect Effect of FOCB on ID through PE.....	lxxiii

# CHAPTER 1

## Introduction

### *1.1 Background*

Workplace deviance has been demarcated as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational customs and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The knowledge management and continuous improvement becomes the need of every organization. Organizations continuously strive for the work processes efficiency through employee's engagement contributing to organizational citizenship behaviour. The managers of human resource either adopt or adapt strategies for utilizing their capacities for achieving the organizational set standards and outcomes. Further the concept of world market as a global village also brings abrupt changes in organizational work processes. Hence the job needs and demands for producing quality outputs increases. In regards to this the managers of successful organizations start focusing on initiatives and strategies contributing to the nourishment of psychological entitlement of individuals.

Every organization has its own set standards and goals for which jobs are designed to contribute in its achievement through potential human resource selected from available pool in market. They are selected on the basis of their diversified (caroll) and extensive knowledge of job. However it also becomes more challenging for the human resource managers to align their psychological entitlement and avoid the deviance of employees from their roles due to their diversified set of skills and knowledge. It is also notified in numerous studies that organizations having a centralized work system discourage the job involvement of potential employees and stick them towards routine tasks. Therefore it is necessary to focus employee's psychological entitlement to develop and improve organizational citizenship behaviour for the accomplishment of organizational goals. Moreover clear and fare policies for work processes minimize the differences in interests which motivate every individual to work towards a single goal.

The knowledge management and continuous improvement becomes the need of every organization. Organizations continuously strive for the work processes efficiency through employee's engagement contributing to organizational citizenship behaviour. The mangers of human resource either adopt or adapt strategies for utilizing their capacities for achieving the

organizational set standards and outcomes. Further the concept of world market as a global village also brings abrupt changes in organizational work processes. Hence the job needs and demands for producing quality outputs increases. In regards to this the manager's of successful organizations start focusing on initiatives and strategies contributing to the nourishment of psychological entitlement of individuals.

Every organization has its own set standards and goals for which jobs are designed to contribute in its achievement through potential human resource selected from available pool in market. They are selected on the basis of their diversified and extensive knowledge of job. However it also becomes more challenging for the human resource managers to align their psychological entitlement and avoid the deviance of employees from their roles due to their diversified set of skills and knowledge. It is also notified in numerous studies that organizations having a centralized work system discourage the job involvement of potential employees and stick them towards routine tasks. Therefore it is necessary to focus employee's psychological entitlement to develop and improve organizational citizenship behaviour for the accomplishment of organizational goals. Moreover clear and fare policies for work processes minimize the differences in interests which motivate every individual to work towards a single goal.

The mangers of human resource either adopt or adapt strategies for utilizing their capacities for achieving the organizational set standards and outcomes. Further the concept of world market as a global village also brings abrupt changes in organizational work processes. Hence the job needs and demands for producing quality outputs increases. In regards to this the managers of successful organizations start focusing on initiatives and strategies contributing to the nourishment of psychological entitlement of individuals. Every organization has its own set standards and goals for which jobs are designed to contribute in its achievement through potential human resource selected from available pool in market. They are selected on the basis of their diversified (caroll) and extensive knowledge of job. However it also becomes more challenging for the human resource managers to align their psychological entitlement and avoid the deviance of employees from their roles due to their diversified set of skills and knowledge. It is also notified in numerous studies that organizations having a centralized work system discourage the job involvement of potential employees and stick them towards routine tasks. Therefore it is necessary to focus employee's psychological entitlement to develop and improve organizational citizenship behaviour for the accomplishment of organizational goals. Moreover clear and fare policies for work

processes minimize the differences in interests which motivate every individual to work towards a single goal. The knowledge management and continuous improvement becomes the need of every organization. Organizations continuously strive for the work processes efficiency through employee's engagement contributing to organizational citizenship behaviour. The managers of human resource either adopt or adapt strategies for utilizing their capacities for achieving the organizational set standards and outcomes. Further the concept of world market as a global village also brings abrupt changes in organizational work processes. Hence the job needs and demands for producing quality outputs increases. In regards to this the manager's of successful organizations start focusing on initiatives and strategies contributing to the nourishment of psychological entitlement of individuals.

For more than three decades, researchers have generated a great deal of research on the causes, positive and negative effects of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Organ, 1977; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006). Broadly defined, OCB refers to employee behavior that contributes to the effective social and psychological functioning of the organization but is often discretionary and not rewarded relative to in-role job performance (Organ, 1997; Organ et al., 2006). OCB is widely observed as a positive construct (Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003; LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002; Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009), in part because it was originally hypothesized as a purely discretionary behaviour (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Several researchers, however, have noted that employees often involve in OCBs because such behaviors are required as part of their job (Morrison, 1994) or because the behaviors are formally compensated by the organization (MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter, 1991). To resolve the differences between these different types of good deeds at work, Organ transformed the definition of OCBs, suggesting that employee behaviors need not be discretionary or voluntary to be considered acts of citizenship; instead, they must only be contextual, in the sense that they contribute to the "organizational context that supports task performance" (1997; 91).

At the foundation of the employee organization relationship is a psychological contract, comprised of beliefs about reciprocal obligations between the two parties (Rousseau, 1989; Schein, 1965). Nevertheless, employees often perceive that their organization has failed to adequately justify that contract. Robinson and Rousseau (1994) found that 55 percent of their sample of managers perceived that their organizations had failed to fulfil one or more promised obligations in the first two years of the employment relationship. These perceptions, regardless of whether or not they are

accurate, have been found to reduce employees' trust, job satisfaction, intentions to remain with the organization, sense of obligation, and in-role and extra-role performance (Robinson, 1996; Robinson et al., 1994; Robinson and Morrison, 1995). Because of the potential for these negative effects, it is vital to understand the conditions under which perceptions of psychological contract breach arise.

Employees all over the world have been widely recognized and acknowledged as a critical resource in the competitive global marketplace, which in turn creates a growing interest among organizational scholars to understand the motivational implications of person-organization fit (P-O Fit) for employee work attitudes and behaviours (Kim, Aryee, Loi, & Kim, 2013). Furthermore, the heart of P-O Fit was proposed to have congruency between employee values and the organization values (Posner, 2010). As a result, many researchers have shown their interest in exploring P-O Fit, whereby a significant number of studies have been performed to examine the relationship between P-O Fit and organizational outcome and performance (Posner, 2010; Leung & Chaturvedi, 2011; Kim, Aryee, Loi, & Kim, 2013; Chinomona, Dhurup, & Chinomona, 2013; Vveinhardt & Gulbovaitė, 2013; Cha, Chang, & Kim, 2014; Demir, Demir, & Nield, 2015). These studies seem to suggest that P-O Fit is positively related to attitude and behaviour (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Tak, 2011; Jung & Takeuchi, 2013). In relation to this, it has been argued that the growing studies performed on the relationship between P-O Fit and performance only manage to provide limited insight into the direct effects of P-O Fit on the employee outcomes.

P-O Fit is assumed to be able to enhance employee outcomes, which is believed to improve organizational performance. Accordingly, researchers have argued the importance of considering the effects of P-O Fit on employee attitudes and behaviours as a more prominent indicator, which may be regarded as an intermediary outcome in the relationship between P-O Fit and organizational performance (Resick, Baltes, & Shantz, 2007; Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2010; Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonysky, 2010; Kazemi, 2014; Yu, 2014).

Despite the growing acknowledgment that employees often feel compelled by external forces to go the extra mile for their organization, the effect of pressuring employees into performing OCBs is not well understood. A few scholars have theorized that employees will sometimes react negatively when they feel required to engage in acts of citizenship, (Klotz & Bolino, 2013), but to our knowledge no empirical research has provided a causal link between externally driven OCBs and negative organizational consequences to support these claims (Organ et al., 2006). Past studies



conducted by various researchers have shown that the organizational citizenship behaviour plays a vital role in advancement and growth of an organization. The success of an organization needs employees to work more than their usual work and provide better performance that is beyond expectations.

For more than three decades, scholars have generated a great deal of research on the causes and consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Organ, 1977; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006). Broadly defined, OCB refers to employee behavior that contributes to the effective social and psychological functioning of the organization but is often discretionary and not rewarded relative to in-role job performance (Organ, 1997; Organ et al., 2006). OCB is widely regarded as a positive construct (Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003; LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002; Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009), in part because it was originally conceptualized as a purely discretionary behaviour (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Several scholars, however, have noted that employees often engage in OCBs because such behaviors are required as part of their job (Morrison, 1994) or because the behaviors are formally rewarded by the organization (MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter, 1991). To reconcile the differences between these various types of good deeds at work, Organ altered the definition of OCBs, proposing that employee behaviors need not be discretionary or voluntary to be considered acts of citizenship; instead, they must only be contextual, in the sense that they contribute to the “organizational context that supports task performance” (1997; 91).

Consistent with Organ’s (1997) redefined version of OCB, ongoing research has demonstrated that employees often engage in this positive behaviour not out of their own discretion, but because they perceive that they must (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley & Harvey, 2013). For example, Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap and Suazo (2010) found that employees often engage in citizenship behaviors because they feel pressured by their organization to do so. Relatedly, employees may also go above and beyond the call of duty to avoid punishments relative to their peers (Salamon & Deutsch, 2006). Many employees also view OCBs as simply part of their job responsibilities (McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison & Turban, 2007), and in some cases OCBs become expected parts of employees’ jobs over time (Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). In short, research has demonstrated that employees often perform acts of citizenship not because they want to, but because they feel like they have to (Bolino et al., 2013) or ought to (Organ et al., 2006).

In 1963, John Stacey Adams introduced the idea that fairness and equity are key components of a motivated individual. Equity theory is based in the idea that individuals are motivated by fairness, and if they identify inequities in the input or output ratios of themselves and their referent group, they will seek to adjust their input to reach their perceived equity. Adams suggested that the higher an individual's perception of equity, the more motivated they will be and vice versa: if someone perceives an unfair environment, they will be de-motivated.

The easiest way to see the equity theory at work, and probably the most common way it does impact employees, is when colleagues compare the work they do to someone else that gets paid more than them. Equity theory is at play anytime employees say things like, 'John gets paid a lot more than me, but doesn't do nearly as much work,' or 'I get paid a lot less than Jane, but this place couldn't operate without me!' In each of those situations, someone is comparing their own effort-to-compensation ratio to someone else's and is losing motivation in the process.

The main objective of this study is to examine factors that contribute to an employee's perception that the organization has breached his or her psychological contract, or in other words, not adequately fulfilled promised obligations. The study also examines the conditions under which these perceptions will be related to an emotional reaction of anger and betrayal (i.e., feelings of 'violation'). Although there is a growing body of literature on the effects of perceived psychological contract breach (Robinson, 1996; Robinson and Morrison, 1996; Robinson and Rousseau, 1994), this is the first empirical study of factors that affect the development of those perceptions. Our hope is that by better understanding when and why perceptions of psychological contract breach develop, researchers can identify ways to minimize their occurrence and their destructive consequences.

Employees often engage in positive behaviour not out of their own discretion, but because they perceive that they must have to (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley & Harvey, 2013).

Research has consistently demonstrated that forced OCB often lead to different types of deviances. (Kai et al. 2017).

Zitek, Jordan, Monin and Leach (2010) demonstrated that individuals can feel psychologically entitled when they feel (or remember) that they have been wronged or treated unfairly.

## ***1.2 Problem Definition***

Despite the growing acknowledgment that employees often feel compelled by external forces to go the extra mile for their organization, the effect of pressuring employees into performing OCBs is

not well understood. A few scholars have theorized that employees will sometimes react negatively when they feel required to engage in acts of citizenship, (Klotz & Bolino, 2013), but to our knowledge no empirical research has provided a causal link between externally driven OCBs and negative organizational consequences to support these claims (Organ et al., 2006). Especially in Pakistan with specific concentration of KPK, there is no study which has been discussed proposed model.

Yam, Klotz, He and Reynolds (2017) found that employees often feel compelled to go the extra mile for their organization later develops higher levels of Psychological Entitlement which may result in deviant behaviour.

Further the effect of pressuring employees into performing OCBs is not well understood in literature.

Due to current job environment, there is a need to check if forced OCB results in Deviance behaviour as per model proposed by (Kai et al., 2017) in Pakistani Context.

### ***1.3 Objectives of the Study***

- ▶ To find the impact of Forced Organizational Citizenship Behavior on the Interpersonal Deviance of the Employees.
- ▶ To check if Psychological entitlement has its role in the relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Interpersonal Deviance of the employees.

### ***1.4 Significance of the Study***

This study will be an addition to the body of literature of organizational behavior with respect to Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Interpersonal Deviance and specifically Psychological Entitlement.

Due to emerging business environment organizations need to consider their employees as an asset and they need not to involve them in Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Despite the growing acknowledgment that employees often feel compelled by external forces to go the extra mile for their organization, the effect of pressuring employees into performing OCBs is not understood. The current study is used to identify the relationship of Forced OCB on Interpersonal Deviance of employees with mediating role of Psychological Entitlement

Organizations are facing employee deviances in their working environment, so conclusion of this study may help to understand and overcome these problems.

This study will help to fill the gap and update the existing literature regarding the relationship of forced OCB, Psychological Entitlement and Interpersonal Deviance.

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

#### 2.1 *Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior*

In organizations, employees are often compelled to engage in OCBs by different number of external forces. OCBs might be referenced in a job description, delicately enforced by the organizational culture, or informally required by a supervisor (Bolino et al., 2010). In any case, OCBs are most commonly secondary to the core job tasks (Organ, 1988), so research has suggested that when employees are compelled to offer OCBs, negative results can develop. For example, Gagne and Deci (2005) proposed that to the extent that organizational climates are controlling in this manner, employees will find OCBs less appealing. More generally, prior research has showed that to the extent that work tasks are performed for autonomous reasons, workers experience higher levels of persistence on those given tasks (Grant, Nurmohamed, Ashford & Dekas, 2011; Turban, Tan, Brown & Sheldon, 2007), but when individuals participate in tasks driven by controlled motives, they experience lower subsequent interest and engagement in that work (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). Similarly, Judge, Bono, Erez and Locke (2005) suggested that employees feel a “quit resistance” to these kinds of external demands placed on them at work (266), and Grant et al. (2011) proposed that employees that employees may begrudge those who pressure them into work tasks. Consistent with this reasoning, we suggest that when obliged to offer OCBs, employees may come to believe that they are providing something above and beyond the needs of the job and have therefore earned something additional to what is being proffered by the organization. Thus, employees who have been externally compelled or pressured to engage in OCBs may feel psychologically entitled to some form of recompense from the organization.

For more than three decades, scholars have generated a great deal of research on the causes and consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Organ, 1977; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006). Broadly defined, OCB refers to employee behavior that contributes to the effective social and psychological functioning of the organization but is often discretionary and not rewarded relative to in-role job performance (Organ, 1997; Organ et al., 2006). OCB is widely regarded as a positive construct (Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003; LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002; Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009), in part because it was

originally conceptualized as a purely discretionary behaviour (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Several scholars, however, have noted that employees often engage in OCBs because such behaviors are required as part of their job (Morrison, 1994) or because the behaviors are formally rewarded by the organization (MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Fetter, 1991). To reconcile the differences between these various types of good deeds at work, Organ altered the definition of OCBs, proposing that employee behaviors need not be discretionary or voluntary to be considered acts of citizenship; instead, they must only be contextual, in the sense that they contribute to the “organizational context that supports task performance” (1997; 91).

Consistent with Organ’s (1997) redefined version of OCB, ongoing research has demonstrated that employees often engage in this positive behaviour not out of their own discretion, but because they perceive that they must (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley & Harvey, 2013). For example, Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap and Suazo (2010) found that employees often engage in citizenship behaviors because they feel pressured by their organization to do so. Relatedly, employees may also go above and beyond the call of duty to avoid punishments relative to their peers (Salamon & Deutsch, 2006). Many employees also view OCBs as simply part of their job responsibilities (McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison & Turban, 2007), and in some cases OCBs become expected parts of employees’ jobs over time (Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). In short, research has demonstrated that employees often perform acts of citizenship not because they want to, but because they feel like they have to (Bolino et al., 2013) or ought to (Organ et al., 2006).

Jacqueline et al, (2004) suggests that, individuals engage in OCB as a form of reciprocity based on organizational treatment. Also the study of Turnipseed & Rassuli (2005) depicted that, the ‘best’ performing workers produced the strongest link between performance and functional participation, which is a helping-type (Altruism) OCB. Also Todd (2003) maintains that, OCB should have a particular impact on the overall effectiveness of organizations by adding to the social framework of the work environment. Lee, (2002) holds that Intellectuals and other potentials that having greater contribution in work processes improvement often demand more attention from management to maintain their motivational level. The author also stated that the higher performers have diversified set of skills and knowledge about their job which enable them to come up with more unique and innovative solutions. Therefore, it is increasingly necessary to engage them in a way which can helps in sustainable development of an organization. Jobs can never be performed in isolations (Oboyle, 2014). The author also stated that employees must interact in a manner that could build

their capacities and enhance their skills to enhance work processes improvement. Jelinek, (2006) also mentioned that efficient interactions of employees can ensure the quality of their produced work which leads to their contribution to organizational outputs and outcomes.

Employee attitudes were found to influence subsequent organizational citizenship. Indeed, as citizenship appears to consist of discretionary behaviours, how the employee perceives the organization (as evidenced by his/her attitude toward it) would likely predispose this employee to either perform or withhold such performance (Dick et al, 2006). Results indicate that perceptions of citizenship performance predict overall performance equally well across all task performance levels (Coole, 2003). As per Jacqueline et al, (2004), it is any behaviour not officially required by the organization; rather its practice depends solely on the consent of employee as a result of the organizational environment. Deckop et al, (1999) argues in his study that, for employees low in value commitment, a pay-for-performance system appears to be a disincentive for engaging in OCB. Niehoff & Yen (2004) asserts that, the belief among theorists is that as more employees engage in OCB, the organization becomes more successful. Such behaviour (i.e. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour) might boost co-workers' or supervisors' productivity, help organize activities, increase the strength of organizational performance, and help the organization attract and retain employees (Borman, 2004). Gautam et al, (2005) maintains that citizenship behaviour within an organization may vary, with change in geographic context i.e. OCB is enacted differently in different cultural contexts – that what it means to be a 'good citizen' may vary. OCB is a function of how employees define in-role and extra-role job behaviour (Morrison, 1994); i.e. which jobs, employees perceive as their duty and what beyond it. As per MacKenzie et al, (1993) findings, assuming that OCB prove to be helpful to the organization; managers must consider what they can do to foster them. After all prior discussed arguments there also exists a view regarding OCB i.e. OCB is an extra-role behaviour that is not formally evaluated (Pond et al, 1997). This view is also shared by Diapola, Tarter & Hoy, (2004) as their study proves that, Organizational Citizenship is discretionary; such behaviour is its own reward; which means that it's up to the employees whether or not they want to indulge themselves in Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Employee performance is increasingly being seen to comprise constructs such as organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Workers, who go above and beyond the minimum requirements of

their employee description, by suggesting improvements, affect performance and result with enhanced workgroup efficiency.

It is commonly accepted in the management literature that organizations need employees who are willing to exceed their formal job requirements (Barnard, 1938; Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Exceeding job requirements, commonly referred to as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), has received a great deal of recent research attention (see Organ [1990] for a review). Despite the growing acceptance of the OCB construct, however, some researchers have raised questions about how OCB is theoretically defined and measured (George & Brief, 1993; Graham, 1988; McAllister, 1991; Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1992). One important issue is whether there is a clear enough conceptual boundary between OCB, or extra-role behavior, and in-role behavior that they can be viewed as distinct constructs. This article presents the argument that this boundary varies across employees. It then identifies factors that explain where this boundary falls for a given employee, assesses how this affects the display of OCB, and addresses some of the implications of this perspective for how OCB is conceptualized and studied. Much of the theoretical and empirical work on OCB creates the impression that the boundary between in-role and extra-role behavior is agreed upon and clearly defined and that OCB is the same for all employees (e.g., Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Organ, 1988; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Yet evidence from several sources challenges this impression. Researchers investigating role making (Graen, 1976), for example, have noted that roles in organizations are rarely fixed and that role perceptions evolve as employees and supervisors negotiate the scope of work activities. Further, Rousseau's (1989) work on psychological contracts indicates that most employees have an understanding of their employment obligation that differs substantially from their employers' understanding. In addition, advocates of social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) have proposed that jobs are cognitive constructions created when employees (and employers) make sense of social and behavioral cues. These streams of research all suggest that the boundary between in-role and extra-role work behavior is ill-defined and subject to multiple interpretations. OCB research has tended to sidestep the potential ambiguity and subjectivity of the OCB construct by adopting a single perspective with respect to the boundary between in-role and extra-role behavior: that of supervisors (e.g., Fahr, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Witt, 1991).



Thus, if supervisors see early attendance as an extra-role behavior, an employee who comes to work earlier than required is defined as engaging in OCB regardless of how the employee sees this behavior. Relying solely on supervisory definitions of extra-role behavior is problematic, however, when research attempts to explain good citizenship by linking it to employee affect and cognition (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Moorman, 1991; Organ, 1990; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Smith et al., 1983; Witt, 1991). In this article, I argue that such an approach requires understanding how employees define their job responsibilities, since an important factor driving employees' behavior is whether they define a given activity as in-role or extra-role. For example, if an employee defines helping co-workers as an in-role behavior, he or she will conceptualize the behavior very differently than an extra-role behavior and will perceive a different set of incentives surrounding the helping behavior. In terms of understanding OCB, therefore, it makes a difference whether an employee helps a co-worker because he or she wishes to engage in extra effort on behalf of the organization, or alternatively, because he or she simply sees the behavior as part of his or her job. OCB impacts workgroup efficiency during times of crisis management. For example, having conscientiousness and helping others result in decreased inter-group conflict and allow managers to focus on more demanding matters (MacKenzie et al., 2009). Having workers highly engaged in OCB may improve managers' efficiency by allowing them to devote a greater amount of time to long-range planning matters. Subsequently, manager's benefit from positive OCB as well as employees (Turnipseed and Rassuli, 2005). OCB is defined by Daniels et al., (2006) as extra behaviour of doing tasks in work place other than routine employee tasks. OCB helps organization to increase its performance in long run as compared to short term. However, Apaydin, (2016) stated that OCB has an impact over both organizational outputs and outcomes. The author also explained that the increased OCB among supervisors and managers help in encouraging and motivating their subordinates to show better performance beyond their targets. Ingrams, (2018) expostulated that the OCB can increase employees work performance when they feel more confident in taking on the spot decisions to maintain product and processes performance. Following strict centralized systems in an organization increases the demotivation of employees due to delay in work process and their productivity (Chawla, 2014). The changing nature of jobs increases need for decentralization ensuring greater contributions from employees through their involvement in a friendly working environment (Shapiro, 2000). Dunlop, (2004) also holds that organizational environment must be dynamic in nature having space for all employees to interact

and enhance their knowledge for maintaining quality of outputs. Moreover, Poncheri (2006) defined OCB as positive behaviour that has constructive effect on organizational development. Both approaches clearly evidence extra role played by the employees in workplace that have positive influence on organizational performance. (Todd, 2003) in his study identified that OCB helps to encourage the employees to apply their maximum knowledge, skill and abilities in workplace. OCB is closely related to organizational motive to attain organizational goals effectively and efficiently (Jiorman et al., 2006). The views of Koys (2001) emphasize OCB as positive impact on profitability of an organization but not on satisfaction of customer. However, Shapiro et al. (2004) defined employee behaviour as based on organizational behaviour, if organization shows positive attitude then employees respond according to that behaviour.

According to Turnip seed and Rassuli (2005), OCB elements which boost performance include: elements which add social capital, helping or altruistic elements, elements resulting with time saving or problem solving, and other elements which provide socio-emotional support by boosting morale or developing a nurturing culture. Researchers all over the world are still fertilizing the area of Organizational Citizenship behaviour which helps organizations to increase their effectiveness. OCB is all about the behaviour of employees so that employees are treated as key players to increase the effectiveness/productivity of an organization. The OCB can best work when an individual employee working in an organization has an inner feeling to go beyond their specified levels of outputs and outcomes (Germeys, 2019). OCB is the self-encouragement of employees to improve their current level of productivity by maintaining and also improving the quality standards (Lee, 2002). The author also vindicated that organizations can only excel and sustain their market position when they have an ability to improve and manage their workforce diversity. Carpenter, (2014) also argued that employees always carries diversified set of skills, expertise and backgrounds which make them unique from every other individual employee. However, Apaydin, (2016) stated that OCB has an impact over both organizational outputs and outcomes. The author also explained that the increased OCB among supervisors and managers help in encouraging and motivating their subordinates to show better performance beyond their targets. Ingrams, (2018) expostulated that the OCB can increase employees work performance when they feel more confident in taking on the spot decisions to maintain product and processes performance. Following strict centralized systems in an organization increases the demotivation of employees due to delay in work process and their productivity (Chawla, 2014). The changing

nature of jobs increases need for decentralization ensuring greater contributions from employees through their involvement in a friendly working environment (Shapiro, 2000). Dunlop, (2004) also holds that organizational environment must be dynamic in nature having space for all employees to interact and enhance their knowledge for maintaining quality of outputs. Judge, (2006) stated that the management of employee's knowledge is crucial to be efficiently utilized for the greater good of an organization. Various processes are directly or indirectly linked in an organization leading to the final outcomes which can be enhanced only when employees are motivated to show better performance (Mulki, 2006). Poncheri, (2006) defined OCB as behaviours that have positive impact on the organizations productivity. Their attitude and behaviour affects the performance of an organization (Koster & Sanders, 2006). The rapid growth in the Banking industry has posed several challenges such as OCBs which is a natural phenomenon that has both negative and positive impacts on employee performance depending on how well it is managed. Empirical evidence of links between OCBs and measures of individual and organizational performance is gathering in the management and marketing literatures (Barksdale and Werner, 2001). Many studies have examined the relationships between personal characteristics and employee attitudes, and employees' citizenship behaviours (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Few comprehensive studies of the possible antecedents of OCBs in marketing and retail contexts are reported in the literature. However, the OCBs and employee performance in banking sector are not well documented and represent a significant gap in the literature.

CWBs are deliberate actions that harm the organization (e.g., theft, sabotage) or its members (e.g., bullying, insulting coworkers; Dalal, 2005). The definition is deliberately broad so as to include a wide range of behaviors that may undermine relationships and performance. First, CWB includes behaviors directed at the organization or directed at members within the organization (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). This distinction mirrors a similar division often recognized in studies of CWB's positive behavior counterpart, organizational citizenship behavior. Second, CWB extends across a spectrum of severity ranging from rather tame indiscretions (e.g., excessive daydreaming) to the extreme (e.g., violence). Third, some researchers examine specific subsets of CWB according to its motivations, including anger (workplace aggression; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), narcissism (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006), or revenge and retribution (organizational retaliatory behavior; Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). Finally, one intriguing subset of CWB is workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), which requires that in addition to intentional harm, the

behavior violates organizational norms. Across all these domains, CWB implies the doing of harm, either due to intentional action or reckless disregard (e.g., arriving to work intoxicated), to the organization or its members (Salgado, 2002). The increased interest in CWB has produced a substantial number of empirical studies testing the relationships between CWB and personality, attitudes, and workplace perceptions. Substantial evidence suggests that several personality constructs relate to CWB. Salgado (2002) and Mount, Ilies, and Johnson (2006) examined the five factor model (FFM) and CWB. They found small to moderate relationships between CWB and all five factors, but the largest negative relationships were with conscientiousness and agreeableness. Berry, Ones, and Sackett (2007) meta-analyzed workplace deviance and found significant population coefficients for several personality variables, including conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability. In addition to traits subsumed under the FFM, several other personality traits also show significant relationships to CWB. Spector and colleagues (Fox & Spector, 1999; Penney & Spector, 2002) found that trait anger was the strongest predictor ( $r = .59$ ) of CWB out of a large number of individual predictors, including all factors of the FFM. In addition, studies of clusters of individual predictors, such as the Dark Triad of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy, have explained significant proportions of variance in CWB (e.g., Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Going beyond personality, researchers have also succeeded in linking CWB to individual differences in attitudes, perceptions, intentions, and values. Dalal (2005), for example, used meta-analysis to identify moderate relationships between CWB and many attitudinal variables, including job satisfaction and organizational commitment. More general attitudinal constructs, such as variations in moral philosophy (Henle, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2005), perceptions of organizational constraints (Fox et al., 2001), justice orientation (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001), turnover intentions (Thomas, Wolper, Scott, & Jones, 2001), and job burnout (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997) each have shown moderate relationships to CWB. Scott and Colquitt (2007) found that tolerance for inequity and preference for equity ratio were predictors of CWB. Specifically, those that sought a higher outcome-to-input ratio than others (Entitleds) and those that sought an exact balance (Sensitives) were more likely to engage in CWB than those accepting a lower outcome-to-input ratio (Benevolents). Furthermore, these attitudinal and perception variables appear to interact with one another and personality variables in the prediction of different forms of CWB. Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004) tested the FFM-moderated relationship between workplace

perceptions and deviance and concluded the relationship between workplace perceptions and CWB was strongest among employees with low conscientiousness, low agreeableness, or high neuroticism. Similarly, other personality traits, such as narcissism, appear to moderate the relationship between perceptions of the workplace (i.e., organizational constraints) and CWB, such that higher levels of narcissism are associated with a stronger link between organizational constraints and CWB (Penney & Spector, 2002). Traditionally, much of the theoretical writing on CWB has been centered on personality, but increasingly, social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) is offered as an explanatory framework for why people engage in CWB. The focus is still on the individual, but instead of stable internal traits, the interest is in their adherence to the norm of reciprocity (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001). Negative reciprocity norms (Gibney, Zagenczyk, & Masters, 2009), in which the individual adopts an “eye for an eye” mentality, psychologically sanction CWB as a means of revenge. A person or group adopting this norm is especially dangerous as the natural tendency is an escalation in counterretaliations (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Positive reciprocity, too, can lead to such CWBs as cronyism and distributive injustice. Positive exchanges can escalate to the point that individuals engage in CWB not as an attack on an enemy but as a favor to a friend (Zagenczyk, Gibney, Murrell, & Boss, 2008). Martinko, Gundlach, and Douglas’s (2002) integrative “dues paying” theory and Spector and Fox’s (2002) emotion-centered model also offer compelling analyses of the complex and interrelated impact of individual affective, cognitive, and motivational processes on counterproductive actions in the workplace.

In order to understand the concept of CWB, the comparative statement of Dalal (2005), on CWB against OCB could be taken into account i.e. OCB and CWB could be considered opposites in the sense that the former benefits the organization, whereas the latter harms it. The findings of Baker (2005) yield a supporting platform for the prior argument i.e. OCB and CWB (Counterproductive Work Behavior) were significantly negatively correlated; which means that a person high on OCB scale will not demonstrate any such behavior posing an adverse consequence to production and will perform for the promotion of the organization. The study of Sackett et al, (2006) yield that, Although aggregate OCB was predicted by Agreeableness, Openness, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness, aggregate CWB had modest and negative relationships with Openness and Extraversion, and was strongly negatively predicted by Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Agreeableness. As per Miles et al, (2002) Negative perceptions of work environment relate to

negative emotions, which are positively correlated with the occurrence of CWB. Spector & Fox (2002) also seconds the prior discussed view i.e. Negative emotions are associated with CWB, whereas positive emotions are associated with OCB. Situations seen by people as unfair are stressors that may lead to negative emotions and presumably to subsequent strains beyond CWB (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). Also, the findings suggest, for instance, that the successful elimination of high-CWB employees during the applicant screening process may not, in and of itself, simultaneously achieve the successful selection of high-OCB employees (Dalal, 2005). Throwing together production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal may give the false impression that all four forms of CWB relate to the same stressors and strains (Spector et al, 2006); which means that different stressors yield different counterproductive work behaviors. Also CWB is typically hidden and is committed by individuals at their own discretion (Spector & Fox, 2002). In general, organizational stressors (such as constraints and injustice) were more closely associated with organizational than personal types of CWB, and interpersonal conflict was more closely associated with personal than organizational CWB (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). The research by Posthuma et al, (2005) yields that, marginal temps (i.e. Temporary Workers) had lower job performance, and exhibited more counterproductive behaviors. The study of Flaherty & Moss, (2007) asserts organizational justice to be a mediator of CWB, as it suggests that individuals who perceived their own workgroup to receive more justice than other units engaged in less counterproductive work behavior. Also, Mount et al, (2006) found that, personality influences job satisfaction, which in turn, has an effect on CPBs (Counter Productive Behaviors). Also the study of Deshpande et al, (2005) found that, respondents with high EI (i.e. Emotional Intelligence) perceived counter productive behaviors to be more unethical than those with low EI. This suggests that people with high EI tend to be better corporate citizens and that better ethical attitudes towards their firm and work. In a nutshell, Kelloway et al, (2002) suggests CPBs (Counter Productive Behaviors) and OCBs (Organizational Citizenship Behaviors) are negatively correlated.

Negative workplace behavior has been referred to as antisocial behavior (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998), organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1966), non-compliant behavior (Puffer, 1987), workplace deviance (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998) and dysfunctional workplace behavior (Griffin et al., 1998), to name a few. This paper focuses on the construct of deviant workplace behavior as defined by Robinson and Bennett (1995). Deviant workplace behavior has been the topic of several investigations and this concept may arguably be considered the most fully

developed (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). That is, researchers have empirically developed a comprehensive typology of deviant workplace behaviors and validated potential methods for measuring workplace deviance. Workplace deviance has been defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). An empirically derived typology of workplace deviance has been developed with the aid of a multidimensional scaling procedure. The results produced a two dimensional configuration of deviant workplace behaviors. One axis of the perceptual map was labeled the organizational/interpersonal dimension. This dimension represented the target of the deviant behavior. The dimension ranged from deviant behavior aimed at the organization (e.g., sabotaging equipment) to deviant behavior primarily directed at a member of the organization (e.g., sexual harassment). The second dimension represented the severity of the deviant behavior. Deviant behavior on this dimension varied on a continuum from minor forms of deviance (e.g., gossiping about fellow employees) to serious forms of deviant behavior (e.g., physical abuse). The perceptual configuration based on the two dimensions resulted in four quadrants, or four classifications of deviant behavior. Robinson and Bennett (1995) referred to the four classes of deviant behavior as (1) Production Deviance, (2) Political Deviance, (3) Property Deviance, and (4) Personal Aggression.

## ***2.2 Psychological Entitlement***

An entitlement is a [provision](#) made in accordance with a [legal framework](#) of a society. Typically, entitlements are based on concepts of [principle](#) ("[rights](#)") which are themselves based in concepts of [social equality](#). In recent decades the meaning of the word has been extended to comprise informal expectations of social relationships, social agreements and [social norms](#) which are considered unreasonable or unduly prescriptive upon others.

Psychological entitlement refers to a general belief that one deserves more or is entitled to more than others are. Psychological entitlement is defined as a general belief because it is consistent over time and across different situations. The concepts of entitlement and deservingness play an important role in much of social life. They both reflect the commonly held idea that when individuals contribute to a situation, they should get something back in return. When individuals do not get what they feel they are entitled to or deserve, they consider the situation unjust or unfair, and may get upset or angry and seek redress. Psychological entitlement has a wide range of

important and often negative consequences for human thoughts, feelings, and behaviour. In the workplace, for example, individuals who have high levels of psychological entitlement often believe that they should be paid more than are others in similar positions. This can potentially lead to conflict or divisiveness at work and leave the psychologically entitled person constantly dissatisfied. In romantic relationships, psychological entitlement is also related to many negative consequences. Individuals who have high levels of psychological entitlement report responding more negatively to conflict in the relationships, being less empathic, less respectful, and less willing to take their partners' perspective. They also report being more selfish and more game-playing. Finally, individuals who have high levels of psychological entitlement are more prone to aggression. These individuals believe that they deserve special treatment, so they are particularly likely to be aggressive toward those who criticize them. In short, individuals who have high levels of psychological entitlement often feel shortchanged by others. This is linked to feelings of resentment or anger, selfish and self-centered behaviors, and even hostility and aggression.

Former research on entitlement often links it to narcissism. Despite differences between psychological entitlement, defined by Campbell et al. (2004) as a pervasive sense that the individual deserves more and he/she is entitled to more than others, and narcissistic entitlement, defined as unjustified expectation for special treatment (Raskin & Terry, 1988), these differences are not essential (see Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). Specifically, psychological entitlement is related to higher self-esteem and grandiose narcissism, whereas narcissistic entitlement is related to lower self-esteem and vulnerable narcissism (Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). There are also some differences in personal correlates of both phenomena (Pryor, Miller, & Gaughan, 2008). In recent research, types of entitlement were distinguished as incorporating adaptive and healthy attitudes, resembling assertiveness, and excessive entitlement, which is problematic and dysfunctional (Fisk, 2010). Tomlinson (2013) further points to the distinction between entitlement as a personal trait versus a set of beliefs, which are related to formulating demands and based on personality. Generally, in the work context, entitlement is regarded both as the expectation of reward in exchange for one's effort (Feather, 2003; Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Major, McFarlin, & Gagnon, 1984; Pelham & Hetts, 2001), which is the most typical conceptualization in social psychology, and as an excessive demand toward one's employer which is not based on actual effort (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Tomlinson, 2013 for review), which is the most typical conceptualization in personality psychology. Harvey and Martinko (2009) analyzed



how psychological entitlement is related to lower satisfaction with work and higher levels of conflict with supervisors. They argued that the negative impact of psychological entitlement is conditioned by dysfunctional attribution processes. That is, employees with high levels of entitlement tend to formulate demands on the basis of being a member of a team, not on actual effort (see also Naumann, Minsky, & Sturmman, 2002). Excessive entitlement and narcissism are linked to counterproductive organizational behaviors (Penney & Spector, 2002). In particular, they are both blamed for unrealistic financial expectations and unrelated to actual effort or input (Fisk, 2010; Tomlinson, 2013). Entitlement influences dissatisfaction with work via the perception of injustice in the organization (Byrne, Miller, & Pits, 2010), and it could increase the number of counterproductive behaviors. Narcissism in the work context is typically conceptualized as overt or grandiose narcissism based on inflated self-esteem (see Miller & Campbell, 2008). In general, recent research tends to assume that entitlement has a negative impact on functioning in the work context. In a non-work context, psychological entitlement is typically regarded as a negative or problematic personal trait due to its association with narcissism, as well (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Campbell et al., 2004). This negative conceptualization of entitlement can lead to oversimplification of explanations of its relationship with organizational behaviors. For instance, according to entitlement concepts put forth by Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) in their refinement of Adams (1963) equity theory (see also Blakely et al., 2005), people prefer reward allocations based on equity rules. Individuals who are oversensitive to underpayment inequity are labelled as entitled. These entitled individuals believe that they are deprived and receive less than they should receive. This belief leads to lower satisfaction with work, which in turn could decrease levels of positive organizational behaviors while increasing negative ones (Byrne et al., 2010; Huseman et al., 1987).

Psychological entitlement is defined as “the compensation expected as a result of an individual participating in an employment relationship” (Naumann, Minsky, &Sturman, 2002:150). Rooted in economics, the term entitlement refers to a good or service due to a party, but psychological entitlement is not necessarily based on an objectively equitable exchange. Naumann et al. (2002) argued that entitlement perceptions are based on perceptions of reciprocity. Thus, individuals with strong entitlement perceptions expect organizational rewards and compensation without having necessarily earned them. In this light, Snow, Kern, and Curlette (2001) described psychologically entitled workers as those perceive that they deserve “special or unique treatment” relative to their

peers (104). The psychological entitlement varies as it reflect the perspective of an individual employee towards themselves and their work (Spector, 2010). High performer employees have also more expectations from their management to keep their morale high for the better employees and organizational performance (Lanaj, 2016). The author also described that the organizational policies, procedures and standards of operating procedures must be competent enough to keep employees motivated towards their jobs. Davila, (2013) highlighted that psychological entitlement is the augmented sense of employees though which they gave greater importance to themselves and their pretentiousness. Perceptions of employees defining their self-worth that breed their inflated expectations in regards to organizational rewards without considering their efforts and contributions (Haq, 2011). The failure of fulfilling employee's expectations that are cantered to self-proclaimed leads to different retaliatory negative effects and outcomes including conflicts, political behaviour, bullying, co-workers abuse etc (Zagenczyk, 2014). The entitled individuals blame the negative happenings over others (Fiksenbaum, 2015). Further, employees with higher psychological entitlement have idealistic expectations from their supervisors for rewards and compensation if which didn't met efficiently leads to their perception of being mistreated.

Employees are always supposed to be indulged in exchange process of their knowledge (Liu, 2017). Specific treatment from various organizational actors with an employee depends on their behaviour that he or she altered during interaction (Geldhof, 2013). The favourable workplace of an organization have a pleasant effects on employees behaviour to interact in a manner that could enhance their productivity (Bolino, 2016). While the unfavourable treatment at workplace gets to the undesirable treatments. Authors and researchers during their studies highlighted a greater role of cognitive factors for improving or discouraging social relationships exchange. The social cognitive exchange preserve emotions that are adopted or altered for mechanisms that contributes to social exchange (Weinstein, 2010). Germeys, (2019) stated that among various strategies for cognitive emotional regulations, the strategy of rumination that stresses on perceptions and thoughts that are linked to negative happenings or event can be significantly linked to its tendency over employees. The higher tendency of rumination strengthens the negative feelings of employees for their supervisors and also for an organization (Yam, 2017). The feelings of an employees of being treated unfairly or injustice at workplace also distort the social exchange process during workplace (Spanouli, 2016). As Judge, (2006) also stressed that the negative perceptions of employees often based on their self-evaluations made on the treatment they received from

organizational actors. The imbalance in employees perceptions for rewards distribution often trigger interpersonal relations with other co-workers and also with an organization (Spector, 2010). Yam, (2017) strongly condemn uncivility that is characterised by displaying rude behaviour at workplace. Zagenczyk, (2014) also envisaged that the significance of uncivil behaviour of employees can never be ignored as it is the main driving force for more intense counterproductive behaviour at work. Psychologically entitled employees usually have a tendency to blame other employees for all negative occurrences and events. Moreover, such employees also have high perceptions about self worth thus, firming the belief that all positive and productive events are due to their efforts (Lang, 1985). This self serving attribution bias (Campbell et al., 2004) stimulates negative thoughts about others thus provoking entitled individuals to engage in negative behaviors towards coworkers. These undesirable behaviors can be in the form of incivility towards coworkers.

Empirical evidence suggests that psychological entitlement exists not only as a trait (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004; Snow et al.,2001) but also as a state. For instance, Zitek, Jordan, Monin and Leach (2010) demonstrated that individuals can feel psychologically entitled when they feel (or remember) that they have been wronged or treated unfairly. More generally, state psychological entitlement emerges when individuals feel that their efforts are worth more than what has been offered to them in return. Thus, we argue that because employees often engage in OCBs not because they want to, but because they are riven by external motives to do so, they are more likely to perceive their OCBs as under rewarded. Therefore, we argue that employees who engage in OCBs in response to external demands can experience a sense of psychological entitlement.

The psychological entitlement varies as it reflect the perspective of an individual employee towards themselves and their work (Spector, 2010). High performer employees have also more expectations from their management to keep their morale high for the better employees and organizational performance (Lanaj, 2016). The author also described that the organizational policies, procedures and standards of operating procedures must be competent enough to keep employees motivated towards their jobs. Davila, (2013) highlighted that psychological entitlement is the augmented sense of employees though which they gave greater importance to themselves and their pretentiousness. Perceptions of employees defining their self-worth that breed their inflated expectations in regards to organizational rewards without considering their efforts and

contributions (Haq, 2011). The failure of fulfilling employee's expectations that are centered on self-proclaimed leads to different retaliatory negative effects and outcomes including conflicts, political behaviour, bullying, co-workers abuse etc (Zagenczyk, 2014). The entitled individuals blame the negative happenings over others (Fiksenbaum, 2015). Further, employees with higher psychological entitlement have idealistic expectations from their supervisors for rewards and compensation if which didn't met efficiently leads to their perception of being mistreated. Employees are always supposed to be indulged in exchange process of their knowledge (Liu, 2017). Specific treatment from various organizational actors with an employee depends on their behaviour that he or she altered during interaction (Geldhof, 2013). The favourable workplace of an organization have a pleasant effects on employees behaviour to interact in a manner that could enhance their productivity (Bolino, 2016). While the unfavourable treatment at workplace gets to the undesirable treatments. Authors and researchers during their studies highlighted a greater role of cognitive factors for improving or discouraging social relationships exchange. The social cognitive exchange preserve emotions that are adopted or altered for mechanisms that contributes to social exchange (Weinstein, 2010). Germeys, (2019) stated that among various strategies for cognitive emotional regulations, the strategy of rumination that stresses on perceptions and thoughts that are linked to negative happenings or event can be significantly linked to its tendency over employees. The higher tendency of rumination strengthens the negative feelings of employees for their supervisors and also for an organization (Yam, 2017).

Former research on entitlement often links it to narcissism. Despite differences between psychological entitlement, defined by Campbell et al. (2004) as a pervasive sense that the individual deserves more and he/she is entitled to more than others, and narcissistic entitlement, defined as unjustified expectation for special treatment (Raskin & Terry, 1988), these differences are not essential (see Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). Specifically, psychological entitlement is related to higher self-esteem and grandiose narcissism, whereas narcissistic entitlement is related to lower self-esteem and vulnerable narcissism (Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). There are also some differences in personal correlates of both phenomena (Pryor, Miller, & Gaughan, 2008). In recent research, types of entitlement were distinguished as incorporating adaptive and healthy attitudes, resembling assertiveness, and excessive entitlement, which is problematic and dysfunctional (Fisk, 2010). Tomlinson (2013) further points to the distinction between entitlement as a personal trait versus a set of beliefs, which are related to formulating demands and based on

personality. Generally, in the work context, entitlement is regarded both as the expectation of reward in exchange for one's effort (Feather, 2003; Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Major, McFarlin, & Gagnon, 1984; Pelham & Hetts, 2001), which is the most typical conceptualization in social psychology, and as an excessive demand toward one's employer which is not based on actual effort (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Tomlinson, 2013 for review), which is the most typical conceptualization in personality psychology. Harvey and Martinko (2009) analyzed how psychological entitlement is related to lower satisfaction with work and higher levels of conflict with supervisors. They argued that the negative impact of psychological entitlement is conditioned by dysfunctional attribution processes. That is, employees with high levels of entitlement tend to formulate demands on the basis of being a member of a team, not on actual effort (see also Naumann, Minsky, & Sturmman, 2002). Excessive entitlement and narcissism are linked to counterproductive organizational behaviors (Penney & Spector, 2002). In particular, they are both blamed for unrealistic financial expectations and unrelated to actual effort or input (Fisk, 2010; Tomlinson, 2013). Entitlement influences dissatisfaction with work via the perception of injustice in the organization (Byrne, Miller, & Pits, 2010), and it could increase the number of counterproductive behaviors. Narcissism in the work context is typically conceptualized as overt or grandiose narcissism based on inflated self-esteem (see Miller & Campbell, 2008). In general, recent research tends to assume that entitlement has a negative impact on functioning in the work context. In a non-work context, psychological entitlement is typically regarded as a negative or problematic personal trait due to its association with narcissism, as well (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Campbell et al., 2004). This negative conceptualization of entitlement can lead to oversimplification of explanations of its relationship with organizational behaviors. For instance, according to entitlement concepts put forth by Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) in their refinement of Adams (1963) equity theory (see also Blakely et al., 2005), people prefer reward allocations based on equity rules. Individuals who are oversensitive to underpayment inequity are labelled as entitled. These entitled individuals believe that they are deprived and receive less than they should receive. This belief leads to lower satisfaction with work, which in turn could decrease levels of positive organizational behaviors while increasing negative ones (Byrne et al., 2010; Huseman et al., 1987).

Former research on entitlement often links it to narcissism. Despite differences between psychological entitlement, defined by Campbell et al. (2004) as a pervasive sense that the

individual deserves more and he/she is entitled to more than others, and narcissistic entitlement, defined as unjustified expectation for special treatment (Raskin & Terry, 1988), these differences are not essential (see Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). Specifically, psychological entitlement is related to higher self-esteem and grandiose narcissism, whereas narcissistic entitlement is related to lower self-esteem and vulnerable narcissism (Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). There are also some differences in personal correlates of both phenomena (Pryor, Miller, & Gaughan, 2008). In recent research, types of entitlement were distinguished as incorporating adaptive and healthy attitudes, resembling assertiveness, and excessive entitlement, which is problematic and dysfunctional (Fisk, 2010). Tomlinson (2013) further points to the distinction between entitlement as a personal trait versus a set of beliefs, which are related to formulating demands and based on personality. Generally, in the work context, entitlement is regarded both as the expectation of reward in exchange for one's effort (Feather, 2003; Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Major, McFarlin, & Gagnon, 1984; Pelham & Hetts, 2001), which is the most typical conceptualization in social psychology, and as an excessive demand toward one's employer which is not based on actual effort (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Tomlinson, 2013 for review), which is the most typical conceptualization in personality psychology. Harvey and Martinko (2009) analyzed how psychological entitlement is related to lower satisfaction with work and higher levels of conflict with supervisors. They argued that the negative impact of psychological entitlement is conditioned by dysfunctional attribution processes. That is, employees with high levels of entitlement tend to formulate demands on the basis of being a member of a team, not on actual effort (see also Naumann, Minsky, & Sturmman, 2002). Excessive entitlement and narcissism are linked to counterproductive organizational behaviors (Penney & Spector, 2002). In particular, they are both blamed for unrealistic financial expectations and unrelated to actual effort or input (Fisk, 2010; Tomlinson, 2013). Entitlement influences dissatisfaction with work via the perception of injustice in the organization (Byrne, Miller, & Pits, 2010), and it could increase the number of counterproductive behaviors. Narcissism in the work context is typically conceptualized as overt or grandiose narcissism based on inflated self-esteem (see Miller & Campbell, 2008). In general, recent research tends to assume that entitlement has a negative impact on functioning in the work context. In a non-work context, psychological entitlement is typically regarded as a negative or problematic personal trait due to its association with narcissism, as well (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Campbell et al., 2004). This negative conceptualization of entitlement

can lead to oversimplification of explanations of its relationship with organizational behaviors. For instance, according to entitlement concepts put forth by Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) in their refinement of Adams (1963) equity theory (see also Blakely et al., 2005), people prefer reward allocations based on equity rules. Individuals who are oversensitive to underpayment inequity are labeled as entitled. These entitled individuals believe that they are deprived and receive less than they should receive. This belief leads to lower satisfaction with work, which in turn could decrease levels of positive organizational behaviors while increasing negative ones (Byrne et al., 2010; Huseman et al., 1987).

### **2.3 *Interpersonal Deviance***

In recent years, workplace deviance has received a great deal of interest by researchers and managers (Nasurdin et al., 2014). Workplace deviance refers to voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in doing so, threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Examples of workplace deviance include sabotage, withdrawal behavior, theft, abuse of time and resources and accepting kickbacks (Bashir et al., 2012; Nasir & Bashir, 2012; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Robinson and Bennett (1995) have identified two types of workplace deviance namely, interpersonal and organizational deviance. In their typology, they further categorized according to the severity of each behavior. Personal aggression was a major type of interpersonal deviance where it involves physical and verbal actions directed toward other individuals such as harassment and abuse, while political deviance was a minor type of interpersonal deviance where it involves behaviors that intentionally disadvantage other individuals such as gossiping and incivility. The second type of workplace deviance is organizational deviance. Organizational deviance consisted of production deviance (minor behaviors which intentionally reducing organizational efficiency of work output such as wasting resources, aloof and intentionally work slower than usual) and property deviance (major behaviors that harm the organization's assets and possessions such as sabotage and theft).

In the past three decades, researchers and managers have continuously probing the pervasiveness of workplace deviance. Workplace deviances, such as personal aggression, theft and withdrawal behavior are overpriced problems to organizations (Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007). Early work by Harper (1990) showed that 33 to 75 percent of employees in United States have involved in some form of theft, vandalism, disruption, personal aggression and unexcused absenteeism. Recently, Bashir, Nasir, Qayyum and Bashir (2012) found 82 percent of employees in Pakistan

public organizations frequently arrive late to work, 90 percent would have longer lunch breaks and 66 percent would leave office early. Such negative work behaviors are known as workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Murphy (1993) believed that workplace deviance resulted in organizational losses estimated to range from US\$6 to US\$200 billion annually. Moreover, the impact of workplace violence was found to cause adverse effect such as substantial mental disturbance and job stress on their employees which subsequently affecting their work performance (Shamsudin, Subramaniam, & Ibrahim, 2011). The amount of research in workplace deviance has increased substantially over the last decade and the majority of the empirical work was based on western settings (Nasurdin, Ahmad, & Razalli, 2014). Moreover, most studies have eventually been devoted to examine the antecedents of workplace deviance in private and public organizations (Abdul Rahim, Shabudin, & Mohd Nasurdin, 2012; Alias, Rasdi, Ismail, & Samah, 2013; Alias & Rasdi, 2015; Kozako, Safin, & Rahim, 2013; Shamsudin, 2003), while it is rare to investigate the voluntary organization. The incidences of deviant behaviors such as incivility, harassment, drug abuse, impersonation and possession of a false identity have been frequently reported in local media. In addition, local studies pertaining to the degree to which volunteers believe that their organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being will influence them to engage in workplace deviance was scarce. Hence, this study contributes to the literature of work behavior and volunteers of emergency relief service, knowing that the emergency relief service is a highly imperative service to the public. On top of that, volunteer organizations are heavily relying on their volunteers for their daily operation. Therefore, the present study seeks to extend the workplace deviance construct into a voluntary organization using a sample of volunteers of emergency relief services and to examine whether perceived organizational support will have a significant negative relationship with workplace deviance.

It has become popular in the workplace deviance literature to make a distinction between interpersonal deviance (ID), which encompasses deviant behaviors targeted toward individuals (e.g., violence, gossip, theft from coworkers), and organizational deviance (OD), which encompasses deviant behaviors targeted toward the organization (e.g., intentionally working slowly, damaging company property, sharing confidential company information), and to treat these as separate behavioral families. Although this dichotomy originally arose from the multidimensional scaling study by Robinson and Bennett (1995), the case can be made that much of its popularity stems from the development, validation, and publication of a public-domain self-



report measure of workplace deviance that includes ID and OD subscales (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Indeed, the vast majority of research using the ID–OD distinction uses the Bennett and Robinson (2000) self-report measure or some variant of it. Despite the intuitive appeal of the distinction, though, the foundation for it came mostly from employees' perceptions of the similarity of deviant workplace behaviors (e.g., Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Robinson & Bennett, 1995) instead of from the more crucial evidence of actual covariation between deviant workplace behaviors (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2003; Sackett & DeVore, 2002).

Basically, there is positive and negative workplace deviance but the present study focused on negative deviance because of the peculiar challenges in public institutions in Nigeria. Robinson and Bennett (1995) described negative deviant workplace behaviour (DWB) as a voluntary behaviour that breaks organizational norms significantly thereby threatens the well-being of an organization, its workforce or both. Also in the words of Kaplan (1975), it has been described as voluntary behaviours exhibited by employees when they become motivated to violate the expectations placed on them in organizations due to lack of motivation to conform to normative expectations of the social setting they have found themselves. Also, Omar and Sulaiman (2013) described DWB as acts which violate performance standards as set by the organization, thereby resulting in harms to the organization and organizational members.

According to Bennett and Robinson (2000), DWB has two major dimensions namely organizational and interpersonal deviance. In its simplest forms, both forms are judged based on the targeted victims. Those deviant acts whose victims are colleagues and other individuals in the organization are called interpersonal deviance while deviant acts directed at the organization or its properties and production schedules are known as organizational deviance. The focus of the present study is on norm-violating behaviours directed at fellow faculty members, students and other individuals in public HEIs.

In the present study, we conceptualized DWB as any intentional and destructive behaviour exhibited by teaching staff members of HEIs for purpose of personal gains as against morality and which contributes to low standards of education thereby causing harm to the stakeholders.

Interpersonal deviance denotes acts that are injurious to members of an organization, such as humiliating colleagues or students, silent treatment, raising voice at students or colleagues, snide treatment, withholding of official information from colleagues, theft from co-workers, assigning blame to colleagues, sexual harassment, and gossiping about colleagues (Bennett & Robinson,

2000). Although DWB has been conceived as a multidimensional concept, we explicitly emphasized the behaviours targeted at an individual and/or student in HEIs in order to ensure parsimony (Arthur, 2011; Kura, Shamsudin, & Chauhan, 2015). Cases of deviant acts directed at colleagues, and students in HEIs are reported in media on daily basis which signifies that there are more incidences of interpersonal deviance than organizational deviance on campuses. However, in our attempt to focus on interpersonal deviance instead of multifaceted dimensions, we are aware of arguments by Blalock (1979) which postulates that authors cannot attain accuracy, simplicity and generality concurrently. Consequently, our focus is on a specific form of deviance instead of generality.

Workplace deviance is a pervasive and expensive problem for organizations. For example, 75% of employees have reportedly stolen from their employer at least once (McGurn, 1988), and it has been estimated that 33% to 75% of all employees have engaged in behaviors such as theft, fraud, vandalism, sabotage, and voluntary absenteeism (Harper, 1990). In recent studies, almost 25% of an employee sample indicated knowledge of illicit drug use among coworkers during the past year (Lehman, Wolcom, & Simpson, 1990), 42% of a surveyed sample of women reported experiencing sexual harassment at work (Webb, 1991), and 7% of a sample of employees reported being victims of physical threats (Northwestern Life Insurance Company, 1993). It is not surprising that the prevalence of workplace deviance poses a serious economic threat to organizations. The annual costs of workplace deviance have been estimated to be as high as \$4.2 billion for workplace violence alone (Bensimon, 1994), \$40 to \$120 billion for theft (Buss, 1993; Camara & Schneider, 1994), and \$6 to \$200 billion for a wide range of delinquent organizational behavior (Murphy, 1993).

Workplace deviance has been defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Workplace deviance refers to voluntary behavior in that employees either lack motivation to conform to, and/or become motivated to violate, normative expectations of the social context (Kaplan, 1975). Organizational norms consist of basic moral standards as well as other traditional community standards, including those prescribed by formal and informal organizational policies, rules, and procedures (Feldman, 1984). For scales to be valid, it is essential that there be at least a tentative theoretical model to guide scale development (Churchill, 1988; DeVellis, 1991). It is argued here that deviant behaviors fall into clusters or families (Robinson &

Bennett, 1997; Roznowski & Hulin, 1992). Any specific deviant behavior can be placed into one of these behavioral families. We make this assumption because we believe that although there are a myriad of different manifestations of deviant behaviors, research suggests that some of these manifestations are similar in nature to one another, share similar antecedents, and may thus be functional substitutes for one another (i.e., they serve the same goals; Robinson & Bennett, 1997). Research suggests a wide range of reasons why employees engage in deviant behavior (Bennett, 1998a, 1998b; Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999), ranging from reactions to perceived injustice, dissatisfaction, role modeling, and thrill-seeking. Yet, deviant organizational behavior is distinct in that it is usually behavior that is very constrained in the workplace. Employees in a given time period or context are very limited in terms of the type of deviant behavior in which they can engage. Thus, they may be motivated to engage in deviance, but that deviance will take different manifestations depending on the constraints of the situation. We would argue then that an employee may choose from among deviant behaviors within a family that are functionally equivalent, choosing the one that is least constrained, most feasible, or least costly, given the context (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). If an individual engages in one behavior from a family, he or she is more likely to engage in another behavior from that family than to engage in a behavior within another family. We assume employees may engage in behavioral switching within families because the behaviors within each are substitutable and functionally equivalent (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). Employees then may engage in one or several behaviors from a wide set. If we apply the family of behavior metaphor to deviant behaviors, what might those families of deviance look like? Robinson and Bennett (1995, 1997) identified a typology of workplace deviance that may provide insight into this question. They argued that an important distinction between types of deviance was whether the deviance was directed or targeted at either the organization (organizational deviance) or at members of the organization (interpersonal deviance). The target of deviance is an important element of deviance for several reasons. First, it is posited that this dimension of deviance identifies an important qualitative difference between deviant acts; individuals prone toward deviance directed at the organization are likely to be different than those individuals prone toward deviance directed at other individuals. Numerous behavioral constructs, from conflict to dissatisfaction behavior to citizenship behavior, have been classified in terms of their targets (C. D. Fisher & Locke, 1992; Organ, 1988, 1990; Roznowski & Hulin, 1992; Williams & Anderson, 1991). The domain of workplace deviance is no exception. Most conceptual

approaches to workplace deviance have explicitly acknowledged that deviance may be directed at either the organization itself or its members, or both (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Both Green (1997) and Turner and Stephenson (1993) have conceptualized organizational crimes in terms of targets. A similar distinction has been drawn regarding conceptualizations of more specific types of deviant acts as well. For example, Greenberg and Scott (1996) have distinguished between employee theft directed at other employees (e.g., taking money from a coworker's wallet) and that directed at the organization (e.g., taking money from the cash register). Using the above example, it makes sense to avoid referring to both behaviors as forms of theft (e.g., Snyder, Blair, & Arndt, 1990) and attempting to interpret them in a similar fashion. Indeed, despite similarities between them, there is good reason to believe that these two forms of deviance are motivated by different factors (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997; Giacalone, Riordan, & Rosenfeld, 1997).

Victims of interpersonal deviance in the forms of harassment and bullying reported lower levels of organisational commitment, increased absenteeism, lower levels of self-confidence, quitting work or intention to quit and increased on-the-job drug use (Lim & Teo, 2009; Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Taylor, Bedeian, & Kluemper, 2012). The main focus of the present study is to examine the effect of Forced OCB on Interpersonal Deviance of employees with the mediating role of Psychological Entitlement.

Workplace deviance is a pervasive and expensive problem for organizations. For example, 75% of employees have reportedly stolen from their employer at least once (McGurn, 1988), and it has been estimated that 33% to 75% of all employees have engaged in behaviors such as theft, fraud, vandalism, sabotage, and voluntary absenteeism (Harper, 1990). In recent studies, almost 25% of an employee sample indicated knowledge of illicit drug use among coworkers during the past year (Lehman, Wolcom, & Simpson, 1990), 42% of a surveyed sample of women reported experiencing sexual harassment at work (Webb, 1991), and 7% of a sample of employees reported being victims of physical threats (Northwestern Life Insurance Company, 1993). It is not surprising that the prevalence of workplace deviance poses a serious economic threat to organizations. The annual costs of workplace deviance have been estimated to be as high as \$4.2 billion for workplace violence alone (Bensimon, 1994), \$40 to \$120 billion for theft (Buss, 1993; Camara & Schneider,

1994), and \$6 to \$200 billion for a wide range of delinquent organizational behavior (Murphy, 1993).

Workplace deviance has been defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Workplace deviance refers to voluntary behavior in that employees either lack motivation to conform to, and/or become motivated to violate, normative expectations of the social context (Kaplan, 1975). Organizational norms consist of basic moral standards as well as other traditional community standards, including those prescribed by formal and informal organizational policies, rules, and procedures (Feldman, 1984). For scales to be valid, it is essential that there be at least a tentative theoretical model to guide scale development (Churchill, 1988; DeVellis, 1991). It is argued here that deviant behaviors fall into clusters or families (Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Roznowski & Hulin, 1992). Any specific deviant behavior can be placed into one of these behavioral families. We make this assumption because we believe that although there are a myriad of different manifestations of deviant behaviors, research suggests that some of these manifestations are similar in nature to one another, share similar antecedents, and may thus be functional substitutes for one another (i.e., they serve the same goals; Robinson & Bennett, 1997). Research suggests a wide range of reasons why employees engage in deviant behavior (Bennett, 1998a, 1998b; Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999), ranging from reactions to perceived injustice, dissatisfaction, role modeling, and thrill-seeking. Yet, deviant organizational behavior is distinct in that it is usually behavior that is very constrained in the workplace. Employees in a given time period or context are very limited in terms of the type of deviant behavior in which they can engage. Thus, they may be motivated to engage in deviance, but that deviance will take different manifestations depending on the constraints of the situation. We would argue then that an employee may choose from among deviant behaviors within a family that are functionally equivalent, choosing the one that is least constrained, most feasible, or least costly, given the context (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). If an individual engages in one behavior from a family, he or she is more likely to engage in another behavior from that family than to engage in a behavior within another family. We assume employees may engage in behavioral switching within families because the behaviors within each are substitutable and functionally equivalent (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). Employees then may engage in one or several behaviors from a wide set. If we apply the family of behavior metaphor to deviant behaviors, what might those families of deviance

look like? Robinson and Bennett (1995, 1997) identified a typology of workplace deviance that may provide insight into this question. They argued that an important distinction between types of deviance was whether the deviance was directed or targeted at either the organization (organizational deviance) or at members of the organization (interpersonal deviance). The target of deviance is an important element of deviance for several reasons. First, it is posited that this dimension of deviance identifies an important qualitative difference between deviant acts; individuals prone toward deviance directed at the organization are likely to be different than those individuals prone toward deviance directed at other individuals. Numerous behavioral constructs, from conflict to dissatisfaction behavior to citizenship behavior, have been classified in terms of their targets (C. D. Fisher & Locke, 1992; Organ, 1988, 1990; Roznowski & Hulin, 1992; Williams & Anderson, 1991). The domain of workplace deviance is no exception. Most conceptual approaches to workplace deviance have explicitly acknowledged that deviance may be directed at either the organization itself or its members, or both (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Both Green (1997) and Turner and Stephenson (1993) have conceptualized organizational crimes in terms of targets. A similar distinction has been drawn regarding conceptualizations of more specific types of deviant acts as well. For example, Greenberg and Scott (1996) have distinguished between employee theft directed at other employees (e.g., taking money from a coworker's wallet) and that directed at the organization (e.g., taking money from the cash register). Using the above example, it makes sense to avoid referring to both behaviors as forms of theft (e.g., Snyder, Blair, & Arndt, 1990) and attempting to interpret them in a similar fashion. Indeed, despite similarities between them, there is good reason to believe that these two forms of deviance are motivated by different factors (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997; Giacalone, Riordan, & Rosenfeld, 1997).

In recent years, workplace deviance has received a great deal of interest by researchers and managers (Nasurdin et al., 2014). Workplace deviance refers to voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in doing so, threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Examples of workplace deviance include sabotage, withdrawal behavior, theft, abuse of time and resources and accepting kickbacks (Bashir et al., 2012; Nasir & Bashir, 2012; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Robinson and Bennett (1995) have identified two types of workplace deviance namely, interpersonal and organizational deviance. In

their typology, they further categorized according to the severity of each behavior. Personal aggression was a major type of interpersonal deviance where it involves physical and verbal actions directed toward other individuals such as harassment and abuse, while political deviance was a minor type of interpersonal deviance where it involves behaviors that intentionally disadvantage other individuals such as gossiping and incivility. The second type of workplace deviance is organizational deviance. Organizational deviance consisted of production deviance (minor behaviors which intentionally reducing organizational efficiency of work output such as wasting resources, aloof and intentionally work slower than usual) and property deviance (major behaviors that harm the organization's assets and possessions such as sabotage and theft).

Basically, there is positive and negative workplace deviance but the present study focused on negative deviance because of the peculiar challenges in public institutions in Nigeria. Robinson and Bennett (1995) described negative deviant workplace behaviour (DWB) as a voluntary behaviour that breaks organizational norms significantly thereby threatens the well-being of an organization, its workforce or both. Also in the words of Kaplan (1975), it has been described as voluntary behaviours exhibited by employees when they become motivated to violate the expectations placed on them in organizations due to lack of motivation to conform to normative expectations of the social setting they have found themselves. Also, Omar and Sulaiman (2013) described DWB as acts which violate performance standards as set by the organization, thereby resulting in harms to the organization and organizational members.

According to Bennett and Robinson (2000), DWB has two major dimensions namely organizational and interpersonal deviance. In its simplest forms, both forms are judged based on the targeted victims. Those deviant acts whose victims are colleagues and other individuals in the organization are called interpersonal deviance while deviant acts directed at the organization or its properties and production schedules are known as organizational deviance. The focus of the present study is on norm-violating behaviours directed at fellow faculty members, students and other individuals in public HEIs.

In the present study, we conceptualized DWB as any intentional and destructive behaviour exhibited by teaching staff members of HEIs for purpose of personal gains as against morality and which contributes to low standards of education thereby causing harm to the stakeholders.

Interpersonal deviance denotes acts that are injurious to members of an organization, such as humiliating colleagues or students, silent treatment, raising voice at students or colleagues, snide

treatment, withholding of official information from colleagues, theft from co-workers, assigning blame to colleagues, sexual harassment, and gossiping about colleagues (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Although DWB has been conceived as a multidimensional concept, we explicitly emphasized the behaviours targeted at an individual and/or student in HEIs in order to ensure parsimony (Arthur, 2011; Kura, Shamsudin, & Chauhan, 2015). Cases of deviant acts directed at colleagues, and students in HEIs are reported in media on daily basis which signifies that there are more incidences of interpersonal deviance than organizational deviance on campuses. However, in our attempt to focus on interpersonal deviance instead of multifaceted dimensions, we are aware of arguments by Blalock (1979) which postulates that authors cannot attain accuracy, simplicity and generality concurrently. Consequently, our focus is on a specific form of deviance instead of generality.

Victims of interpersonal deviance in the forms of harassment and bullying reported lower levels of organisational commitment, increased absenteeism, lower levels of self-confidence, quitting work or intention to quit and increased on-the-job drug use (Lim & Teo, 2009; Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011; Taylor, Bedeian, & Kluemper, 2012). The main focus of the present study is to examine the mediating role of neutralization on the relationship between workload, work pressure and interpersonal deviance among faculty members.

Workplace deviance has been defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Workplace deviance refers to voluntary behavior in that employees either lack motivation to conform to, and/or become motivated to violate, normative expectations of the social context (Kaplan, 1975). Organizational norms consist of basic moral standards as well as other traditional community standards, including those prescribed by formal and informal organizational policies, rules, and procedures (Feldman, 1984). For scales to be valid, it is essential that there be at least a tentative theoretical model to guide scale development (Churchill, 1988; DeVellis, 1991). It is argued here that deviant behaviors fall into clusters or families (Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Roznowski & Hulin, 1992). Any specific deviant behavior can be placed into one of these behavioral families. We make this assumption because we believe that although there are a myriad of different manifestations of deviant behaviors, research suggests that some of these manifestations are similar in nature to one another, share similar antecedents, and may thus be functional substitutes for one another (i.e., they serve the same goals; Robinson & Bennett, 1997).



Research suggests a wide range of reasons why employees engage in deviant behavior (Bennett, 1998a, 1998b; Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999), ranging from reactions to perceived injustice, dissatisfaction, role modeling, and thrill-seeking. Yet, deviant organizational behavior is distinct in that it is usually behavior that is very constrained in the workplace. Employees in a given time period or context are very limited in terms of the type of deviant behavior in which they can engage. Thus, they may be motivated to engage in deviance, but that deviance will take different manifestations depending on the constraints of the situation. We would argue then that an employee may choose from among deviant behaviors within a family that are functionally equivalent, choosing the one that is least constrained, most feasible, or least costly, given the context (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). If an individual engages in one behavior from a family, he or she is more likely to engage in another behavior from that family than to engage in a behavior within another family. We assume employees may engage in behavioral switching within families because the behaviors within each are substitutable and functionally equivalent (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). Employees then may engage in one or several behaviors from a wide set. If we apply the family of behavior metaphor to deviant behaviors, what might those families of deviance look like? Robinson and Bennett (1995, 1997) identified a typology of workplace deviance that may provide insight into this question. They argued that an important distinction between types of deviance was whether the deviance was directed or targeted at either the organization (organizational deviance) or at members of the organization (interpersonal deviance). The target of deviance is an important element of deviance for several reasons. First, it is posited that this dimension of deviance identifies an important qualitative difference between deviant acts; individuals prone toward deviance directed at the organization are likely to be different than those individuals prone toward deviance directed at other individuals. Numerous behavioral constructs, from conflict to dissatisfaction behavior to citizenship behavior, have been classified in terms of their targets (C. D. Fisher & Locke, 1992; Organ, 1988, 1990; Roznowski & Hulin, 1992; Williams & Anderson, 1991). The domain of workplace deviance is no exception. Most conceptual approaches to workplace deviance have explicitly acknowledged that deviance may be directed at either the organization itself or its members, or both (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996; Robinson & Greenberg, 1999; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Both Green (1997) and Turner and Stephenson (1993) have conceptualized organizational crimes in terms of targets. A similar distinction has been drawn regarding

conceptualizations of more specific types of deviant acts as well. For example, Greenberg and Scott (1996) have distinguished between employee theft directed at other employees (e.g., taking money from a coworker's wallet) and that directed at the organization (e.g., taking money from the cash register). Using the above example, it makes sense to avoid referring to both behaviors as forms of theft (e.g., Snyder, Blair, & Arndt, 1990) and attempting to interpret them in a similar fashion. Indeed, despite similarities between them, there is good reason to believe that these two forms of deviance are motivated by different factors (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997; Giacalone, Riordan, & Rosenfeld, 1997). Robinson and Bennett (1997) also noted that deviance may vary along a continuum of severity, from minor forms of deviance to more serious forms. Unlike the interpersonal versus organizational distinction, however, this is more a quantitative distinction rather than a qualitative one. Thus, although one would expect that interpersonal and organizational deviance would fall into distinct clusters or families representing two qualitatively different forms of deviance, both families of deviance contain both serious and minor forms of deviance. Serious and minor deviant behaviors would not, by themselves, reflect two different types of deviance. Thus, for example, both spreading rumors and physical violence would fall into the interpersonal deviance family, just as both sabotaging equipment and littering one's work environment would fall into the organizational deviance family. This distinction is analogous to individual items on an achievement test. Items on the test vary qualitatively in terms of knowledge content area (e.g., spelling vs. math items) and quantitatively in terms of difficulty within each content area, just as the items on our deviance scale vary in terms of the type of deviance represented as well as their seriousness. A summation of items reflecting each type of deviance should indicate the participation levels of each form of deviance, much like summing the numbers of math items versus spelling items would indicate the knowledge level in those different areas.

#### ***2.4 Relationship between Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior and Psychological Entitlement***

Generally, in the work context, entitlement is regarded both as the expectation of reward in exchange for one's effort (Feather, 2003; Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Major, McFarlin, & Gagnon, 1984; Pelham & Hetts, 2001), which is the most typical conceptualization in social psychology, and as an excessive demand toward one's employer which is not based on actual effort (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Tomlinson, 2013 for review), which is the most typical

conceptualization in personality psychology. Harvey and Martinko (2009) analysed how psychological entitlement is related to lower satisfaction with work and higher levels of conflict with supervisors. They argued that the negative impact of psychological entitlement is conditioned by dysfunctional attribution processes. That is, employees with high levels of entitlement tend to formulate demands on the basis of being a member of a team, not on actual effort (see also Naumann, Minsky, & Sturmman, 2002). Excessive entitlement and narcissism are linked to counterproductive organizational behaviors (Penney & Spector, 2002). In particular, they are both blamed for unrealistic financial expectations and unrelated to actual effort or input (Fisk, 2010; Tomlinson, 2013). Entitlement influences dissatisfaction with work via the perception of injustice in the organization (Byrne, Miller, & Pits, 2010), and it could increase the number of counterproductive behaviors. Narcissism in the work context is typically conceptualized as overt or grandiose narcissism based on inflated self-esteem (see Miller & Campbell, 2008). In general, recent research tends to assume that entitlement has a negative impact on functioning in the work context. In a non-work context, psychological entitlement is typically regarded as a negative or problematic personal trait due to its association with narcissism, as well (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009 see also Campbell et al., 2004). This negative conceptualization of entitlement can lead to oversimplification of explanations of its relationship with organizational behaviors. For instance, according to entitlement concepts put forth by Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) in their refinement of Adams (1963) equity theory (see also Blakely et al., 2005), people prefer reward allocations based on equity rules. Individuals who are oversensitive to underpayment inequity are labelled as entitled. These entitled individuals believe that they are deprived and receive less than they should receive. This belief leads to lower satisfaction with work, which in turn could decrease levels of positive organizational behaviors while increasing negative ones (Byrne et al., 2010; Huseman et al., 1987).

Organizational behaviors are defined as individual behaviors within work teams (Cole, 1995). As mentioned above, these include behaviors that are both positive and profitable for an organization, such as organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000), and dysfunctional behaviors, defined as counterproductive organizational or work behaviors (Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2012; Fox et al., 2001). Citizenship behaviors increase work efficacy and are voluntarily undertaken by individuals in the workplace; they increase work efficacy and they are not a result of formal reward systems, nor are they formal duties of

employees (Organ, 1988). According to Podsakoff et al. (2000), if an individual does not engage in negative behaviors, it could be also regarded as a citizenship behavior. For this reason, counterproductive and citizenship behaviors logically contradict each other. Counterproductive behaviors naturally are also not included in the formal duties of workers and they are performed voluntarily (Fox et al., 2012). These behaviors negatively influence work efficacy, as they bring negative outcomes both for the organization itself (e.g. by damaging the company's reputation) and for co-workers (e.g., rumors or conflicts; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Both OCB and CWB are conditioned by emotional reactions and by personality traits (Miles et al., 2002). Organizational citizenship behaviors is a result of positive affectivity, high control, empathy and helpfulness, while CWB is a result of negative affectivity, neuroticism and low control (Spector & Fox, 2002). Spector and Fox (2002) assume that the dispositional factors which influence both locus of control and affectivity are important predictors of CWB and OCB levels (see also Miles et al., 2002). In the current study we argue that one such dispositional factor could be entitlement.

Former research on entitlement often links it to narcissism. Despite differences between psychological entitlement, defined by Campbell et al. (2004) as a pervasive sense that the individual deserves more and he/she is entitled to more than others, and narcissistic entitlement, defined as unjustified expectation for special treatment (Raskin & Terry, 1988), these differences are not essential (see Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). Specifically, psychological entitlement is related to higher self-esteem and grandiose narcissism, whereas narcissistic entitlement is related to lower self-esteem and vulnerable narcissism (Ackerman & Donnellan, 2013). There are also some differences in personal correlates of both phenomena (Pryor, Miller, & Gaughan, 2008).

In recent research, types of entitlement were distinguished as incorporating adaptive and healthy attitudes, resembling assertiveness, and excessive entitlement, which is problematic and dysfunctional (Fisk, 2010). Tomlinson (2013) further points to the distinction between entitlement as a personal trait versus a set of beliefs, which are related to formulating demands and based on personality. Generally, in the work context, entitlement is regarded both as the expectation of reward in exchange for one's effort (Feather, 2003; Desmarais & Curtis, 1997; Major, McFarlin, & Gagnon, 1984; Pelham & Hetts, 2001), which is the most typical conceptualization in social psychology, and as an excessive demand toward one's employer which is not based on actual effort (Fisk, 2010; Harvey & Martinko, 2009, see also Tomlinson, 2013 for review), which is the

most typical conceptualization in personality psychology. Harvey and Martinko (2009) analyzed how psychological entitlement is related to lower satisfaction with work and higher levels of conflict with supervisors. They argued that the negative impact of psychological entitlement is conditioned by dysfunctional attribution processes. That is, employees with high levels of entitlement tend to formulate demands on the basis of being a member of a team, not on actual effort (see also Naumann, Minsky, & Sturmman, 2002).

Excessive entitlement and narcissism are linked to counterproductive organizational behaviors (Penney & Spector, 2002). In particular, they are both blamed for unrealistic financial expectations and unrelated to actual effort or input (Fisk, 2010; Tomlinson, 2013).

Entitlement influences dissatisfaction with work via the perception of injustice in the organization (Byrne, Miller, & Pits, 2010), and it could increase the number of counterproductive behaviors. Narcissism in the work context is typically conceptualized as overt or grandiose narcissism based on inflated self-esteem (see Miller & Campbell, 2008).

*H<sub>1</sub>: Forced organizational citizenship behavior has significant positive impact on employee psychological entitlement*

## ***2.5 Relationship between Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior and Interpersonal Deviance***

In order to understand the concept of Interpersonal deviance, the comparative statement of Dalal (2005), on Interpersonal deviance against ForcedOCB could be taken into account i.e. ForcedOCB and Interpersonal deviance could be considered opposites in the sense that the former benefits the organization, whereas the latter harms it. The findings of Baker (2005) yield a supporting platform for the prior argument i.e. OCB and CWB (Counterproductive Work Behavior) were significantly negatively correlated; which means that a person high on OCB scale will not demonstrate any such behavior posing an adverse consequence to production and will perform for the promotion of the organization. The study of Sackett et al, (2006) yield that, although aggregate OCB was predicted by Agreeableness, Openness, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness, aggregate CWB had modest and negative relationships with Openness and Extraversion, and was strongly negatively predicted by Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Agreeableness. As per Miles et al, (2002) Negative perceptions of work environment relate to negative emotions, which are positively correlated with

the occurrence of CWB. Spector & Fox (2002) also seconds the prior discussed view i.e. Negative emotions are associated with CWB, whereas positive emotions are associated with OCB. Situations seen by people as unfair are stressors that may lead to negative emotions and presumably to subsequent strains beyond CWB (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). Also, the findings suggest, for instance, that the successful elimination of high-CWB employees during the applicant screening process may not, in and of itself, simultaneously achieve the successful selection of high-OCB employees (Dalal, 2005). Throwing together production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal may give the false impression that all four forms of CWB relate to the same stressors and strains (Spector et al, 2006); which means that different stressors yield different counterproductive work behaviors. Also CWB is typically hidden and is committed by individuals at their own discretion (Spector & Fox, 2002). In general, organizational stressors (such as constraints and injustice) were more closely associated with organizational than personal types of CWB, and interpersonal conflict was more closely associated with personal than organizational CWB (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). The research by Posthuma et al, (2005) yields that, marginal temps (i.e. Temporary Workers) had lower job performance, and exhibited more counterproductive behaviors. The study of Flaherty & Moss, (2007) asserts organizational justice to be a mediator of CWB, as it suggests that individuals who perceived their own workgroup to receive more justice than other units engaged in less counterproductive work behavior. Also, Mount et al, (2006) found that, personality influences job satisfaction, which in turn, has an effect on CPBs (Counter Productive Behaviors). Also the study of Deshpande et al, (2005) found that, respondents with high EI (i.e. Emotional Intelligence) perceived counter productive behaviors to be more unethical than those with low EI. This suggests that people with high EI tend to be better corporate citizens and that better ethical attitudes towards their firm and work. In a nutshell, Kelloway et al, (2002) suggests CPBs (Counter Productive Behaviors) and OCBs (Organizational Citizenship Behaviors) are negatively correlated.

Consistent with Organ's (1997) redefined version of OCB, on-going research has demonstrated that employees often engage in this positive behaviour not out of their own discretion, but because they perceive that they must (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013). For example, Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, and Suazo (2010) found that employees often engage in citizenship behaviors because they feel pressured by their organization to do so. Relatedly, employees may also go above and beyond the call of duty

to avoid punishments relative to their peers (Salamon & Deutsch, 2006). Many employees also view OCBs as simply part of their job responsibilities (McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison, & Turban, 2007), and in some cases OCBs become expected parts of employees jobs over time (Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). In short, research has demonstrated that employees often perform acts of citizenship not because they want to, but because they feel like they have to (Bolino et al., 2013) or ought to (Organ et al., 2006).

Despite the growing acknowledgment that employees often feel compelled by external forces to go the extra mile for their organization, the effect of pressuring employees into performing OCBs is not well understood. A few scholars have theorized that employees will sometimes react negatively when they feel required to engage in acts of citizenship, perhaps by engaging in subsequent deviant behavior (Klotz & Bolino, 2013; Spector & Fox, 2010a, 2010b), but to our knowledge no empirical research has provided a causal link between externally driven OCBs and negative organizational consequences to support these claims (Organ et al., 2006). Accordingly, we draw from self-determination theory (SDT) (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and moral licensing theory (Miller & Effron, 2010; Monin & Miller, 2001) to consider how and when OCBs may lead employees to subsequently engage in deviance at work or out-side of the workplace.

In organizations, employees are often compelled to engage in OCBs by any number of external forces. OCBs might be referenced in a job description, subtly enforced by the organizational culture, or informally required by a supervisor (Bolino et al., 2010). In any case, OCBs are most commonly secondary to the core job tasks (Organ, 1988), so research has suggested that when employees are compelled to offer OCBs, negative results can emerge. For example, Gagne and Deci (2005) proposed that to the extent that organizational climates are controlling in this manner, employees will find OCBs less appealing. More generally, prior research has indicated that to the extent that work tasks are performed for autonomous reasons, workers experience higher levels of persistence on those given tasks (Grant, Nurmohamed, Ashford, & Dekas, 2011; Turban, Tan, Brown, & Sheldon, 2007), but when individuals engage in tasks driven by controlled motives, they experience lower subsequent interest and

engagement in that work (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999). Similarly, Judge, Bono, Erez, and Locke (2005) suggested that employees may feel a “quiet resistance” to these kinds of external demands placed on them at work and Grant et al. (2011) proposed that employees may begrudge those who pressure them into work tasks. Consistent with this reasoning, we suggest that when compelled to offer OCBs, employees may come to believe that they are providing something above and beyond the needs of the job and have therefore earned something additional to what is being proffered by the organization. Thus, employees who have been externally compelled or pressured to engage in OCBs may feel psychologically entitled to some form of recompense from the organization.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be defined as individuals’ voluntary behaviors that cannot be described directly or indirectly by the structural award system of the organization and that help the organization perform its functions effectively as a whole (Organ, 1997). Lievens and Anseel (2004) define OCB as voluntary behaviors of individuals that help achieve organizational aims by contributing to the social and psychological functioning of the organization. Goodman and Svyantek (1999) state that an individual’s wishes, voluntary effort and sincere behaviors are fundamental in OCB. Negative workplace behavior has many social and economic costs for the organization and the individuals. For instance, it is estimated that in the US, theft, which is one of the workplace deviance behaviors, costs approximately 10 to 40 billion dollars for the organizations (Bourque, 1994). In addition to the losses that WDB causes such as theft or equipment damage, maintenance and low efficiency (Dunlop & Lee, 2004), WDB also has costs worth billions of dollars (Holtz & Harold, 2013) such as poor reputation of the organization, increased expenditure on public relations, continuous customer loss, compensations paid to the aggrieved customers and intense business turnover (Applebaum et al., 2005). According to Bennett and Robinson (2000), WDB is both common and costly for organizations. It is defined as being in conflict with the norms by taking a negative attitude toward the meaningful organizational norms or toward the officially and unofficially defined organizational policies, rules and procedures. In a way, WDB threatens “the good situation” that the organization, members of the organization or both are in (Robinson & Bennett 1995). It affects organizations and individuals adversely (Dunlop & Lee, 2004). In the UK, surfing on the internet, which is a type of WDB, costs 600 million dollars to the organizations (Ferris et al., 2009). As a result, it can be concluded that WDB includes



tendencies to intentionally harm organizations, members of the organizations or both. Studies on the hidden behaviors of workers are very few (Vardi & Wiener, 1992). Robinson and Bennett (1995) argue that studies generally do not focus on the true nature of deviant behavior, and that WDB needs to be studied as an organizational phenomenon. WDB has been associated with concepts focusing on psychological consequences such as personality (Giacalone & Knouse, 1990), perceived justice (Aquino et al., 1999; Fox et al., 2001), inequality (Ambrose et al., 2002; Greenberg, 1990), harassment (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996), sexual harassment (Gutek & Koss, 2002), and the use of illegal drugs (Lehman & Simpson, 1992). Studies show that in the organizations where WDB is low, organizational commitment (Liao et al., 2004; Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2006), organizational citizenship (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Bukhari & Ali, 2009) and job satisfaction (Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2006) are promoted. Dalal (2005) found a medium negative relationship between OCB and WDB, while Borman et al. (2001) revealed a higher negative relationship. Based on the literature review, it can be stated that there is a negative relationship between OCB and WDB.

*H<sub>2</sub>: Forced organizational citizenship behavior has significant positive impact on employee interpersonal deviance*

## **2.6 Relationship between Psychological Entitlement and Interpersonal Deviance**

As a distinct employee trait which is gaining considerable research attention within management and organizational literature ([Priesemuth and Taylor, 2016](#)), psychological entitlement refers to “stable and persistent sense that one deserves more and is entitled more than others” ([Campbell et al., 2004](#), p. 31). Heightened entitlement perception among employees would result in difficulties for both employees and their organizations ([Harvey and Harris, 2010](#)). Particularly, psychologically entitled employees are prone to engage in unethical and negative behavior, low level of job satisfaction and high level of turnover intention ([Harvey and Martinko, 2009](#); [Harvey et al., 2014a, 2014b](#)). Despite the rising concern for this phenomenon among researchers and practitioners, little is known about the specific effects of psychological entitlement ([Harvey and Dasborough, 2015](#); [Priesemuth and Taylor, 2016](#), [Harvey and Martinko, 2009](#), [Harvey and Harris, 2010](#)) and the emotional mechanism which investigates the cognitive aspect of entitlement ([Harvey and Martinko, 2009](#), [Harvey and Harris, 2010](#)) in the workplace.

It is assumed that employees are vital to the consistent delivery of brand promise ([Erkmen and Hancer, 2015](#)). However, it has been argued that this occupation confronts with difficulties such as jetlag, work-family conflict, burnout, emotional exhaustion, health issues and physical and mental stress ([Fu, 2013](#); [Karatepe and Vatankhah, 2014](#); [Lee et al., 2015](#)). Particularly, [Fu \(2013\)](#) asserted that aforementioned experiences foster employee's mental pressure which consequently leads to emotional reaction. As employees are the key assets for an organization, organizations should devote a great deal of recognition to the emotional sentiment of their employees to mitigate the possible negative outcomes associated with dysfunctional emotional state.

*H<sub>3</sub>: Employee psychological entitlement has significant positive impact on employee interpersonal deviance*

## ***2.7 Mediating role of Psychological Entitlement in the Relationship between Forced Organization Citizenship Behavior and Interpersonal Deviance***

The mediating role of employees psychological entitlement is the main focal area of this study between forced organizational citizenship and interpersonal deviance behaviour. The behavior of managers and supervisors to keep employees motivated can bring significant improvement in organizational outcomes and its efficiency. However, its negligence may also results to different issues that can be also cost organizational failure. Weinstein, (2010) stated that the harsh and strict behaviour of supervisory role in an organization further enhance the negative psychological entitlements of employees that increases their focus towards their personal needs. The collective work approach in organizations badly effected from employee's perception that they are nor treated fare and rewarded for extra efforts ([Spanouli, 2016](#)). The author also explained employers always have a greater expectation from their employees to improve the wellbeing of an organization. However, while ignoring an individual employee's need can also give ways to serious issues like theft, hate speeches against organization, backbiting etc which badly effecting

overall organizational image and poor work performance (Yam, 2017). As Judge, (2006) enumerated that employees are more comfortable in working environment that encourage them to efficiently interact with other staff members in order to improve the efficiency of an organization for a greater good of an organization. The author also suggested that organizations must focus on an increased level of interactions among employees instead of forcing them as it interns increases the chances of different organizational losses both in terms of financial and non-financial.

The greater need of employees efficiency and innovative work process decreases the number of organizational employees hence only those employees having greater potential to improve their performance would be able to survive in a longer run. Further, Lanaj, (2016) also holds that the downsizing in an organization also increases the interpersonal deviance among employees as they are expected to go beyond their targets with unfair treatments during reward and other appreciations. Judge, (2006) also stated that lack of fairness in performance appraisal of employees can leads to negative word of mouth among employees which may decreases the motivation level of employees towards organizational goals. Higher un employment due to economic instabilities and market saturation in developing have increased demand for employees with greater variety of skills, knowledge and expertise to uplift organizational performance (Spitzmuller, 2013). Therefore, organizations who want to excel must keep the morale of employees higher to willingly step ahead for organizational goals and success. As O'Boyle, (2011) confirmed that goal alignment between employers and employees can have greater effects on personal aggressions and interpersonal deviance. Spector, (2010) also posit that organizations force their employees for greater work outputs must take care of their employees to avoid unpleasant situation at workplace by keeping their motivation level higher. The interpersonal deviance often arises from psychological entitlements that are increased due to the higher employees productivity and no

appreciation from employers (Halbesleben, 2010). Mulki, (2006) also maintained that increase in work load increases the intentions of employees towards their interpersonal deviance including abusive language with co-workers and supervisors, harassment, theft, misuse or use of organizational resources for personal use etc.

*H4: Employee psychological entitlement mediates the relationship between forced organizational citizenship behavior and employee interpersonal deviance.*

## CHAPTER 3

### Methodology

#### 3.1 *Research Design*

Research design is a plan identifying the procedures & methods for collection & analysing the required data and information (William Zikmund, 2013). The research design involves strategy that a researcher chooses to logically integrate various parts of the study in a coordinated manner, to make sure that the research problems are addressed effectively; it constitutes the blueprint for collection of data, measurement of the information, and analysis of data using research tools.

A research design must be efficient, flexible, economical, appropriate and so on. A research design carefully crafted with less experimental error can be one of the best research designs. It must be relevant to the objectives of the research and nature of the problems being addressed. A single research design is not a full answer for all types of studies, but design varies according to research problems. A research design must focus on the ways of gathering information, the availability of staff, researcher skills and the problem nature, study of problem and finally the time and money.

Research design can be of many types for example, descriptive, correlational, explanatory and so on. Keeping in view the aim of the study and nature of problem the researcher has to define the methodology, techniques for data collection and strategy of statistical data analysis. Whether it is explanatory or confirmatory, the researcher in his study must describe initially at the start of the study. There are many types of research designs for example surveys, observations, descriptive which include case study, correlational study includes case control study and observational study, is related to different studies or various topics. Field experiment and quasi-experiments are other types of research. Reviews include literature review and systematic reviews. Some studies may include grouping and comparisons which are known as Cross-sectional study, Cohort study and longitudinal study. The current study is a causal study.

### ***3.2 Population***

According to Sakaran, (2000) a population comprise of the whole cluster of people the researcher intends to study. Population for the study will be the employees working in middle level management of different banks of Peshawar District, Khyber Pakhtun Khwa. Population for this study will be all operational and middle level managers of banking sector in Peshawar district, Khyber Pakhtun Khwa.

### ***3.3 Sample of the Study***

Since the banks did not gave detail of number of employees working in selected region, so I will select 350 operational and middle level managers working in different banks of Peshawar district, Khyber Pakhtun Khwa as 350 sample size is enough for a population of 20,000 as calculated by sample size calculator developed by Raosoft.

### ***3.4 Data Collection***

The study was quantitative in nature. All the variables are measured through structured questionnaire for the collection of primary data. For all variables instruments and constructs have been adapted from previously validated by other researchers. Instrument was adapted from highly qualified researcher's research work i.e Forced Organizational Citizenship Behavior was adapted by Lee & Allen, (2002), Psychological Entitlement was adapted by Campbell et al., (2010) and Interpersonal Deviance scale was adapted from Bennett and Robinson (2002), but to ensure further its content and face validity it was discussed with senior expert researchers (PhD faculty members). For ensuring that its content is valid thorough discussions were held on each item.

Questionnaire of this study consist of two portions. The first portion is used for studying the demographic information and details of respondents, while the next portion contained questionnaire instruments which measured these variables. 350 questionnaires were distributed in private and public banks customers in Peshawar region at different time intervals.

### 3.5 Questionnaires

Data was collected with the help of questionnaires adopted from previous literature.

**Table 3.1 Variables with item and reference**

Sr #	Variable	Author	No. of Items
1	<b>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</b>	<b>Lee &amp; Allen, 2002</b>	<b>16</b>
2	<b>Psychological Entitlement</b>	<b>Campbell et al, 2010</b>	<b>9</b>
3	<b>Interpersonal Deviance</b>	<b>Bennett and Robinson 2002</b>	<b>7</b>

### 3.6 Reliability of the Questionnaire

The study of internal consistency of data Cronbach’s Alpha (1955) technique and method is usually adopted. According to the researcher who uses this method says that the data will be reliable if the value of the Cronbach’s Alpha lies between 0.70 and 0.90. Although the following table shows that the values of all “ $\alpha$ ” are in the range between 0.70 and 0.90. Therefore the following collected data is reliable for further research or statistical analysis such as Preacher and Hayes regression analysis (2016).

**Table 3.2 Reliability Analysis**

Description	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
Forced organizational citizenship behaviour (FOCB)	0.864	14
Pshychological entitlement (PE)	0.763	8
Interpersonal deviance (ID)	0.813	7

### 3.7 Demographics

**Table 3.3 Frequency distribution of demographic variables**

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Gender</b>	Male	280	80	80
	Female	70	20	100
<b>Age</b>	Upto 25	112	32	32
	26 to 35	222	63.4	95.4
	36 to 45	11	3.1	98.6
	46 and Above	5	1.4	100
<b>Education</b>	14 years	40	11.4	11.4
	16 years	281	80.3	91.7
	18 years	21	6	97.7
	18 and Above	8	2.3	100
<b>Experience</b>	Below 2 years	90	25.7	25.7
	2 to 5	191	54.6	80.3
	5 to 10	49	14	94.3
	10 and Above	20	5.7	100

### 3.7.1 Gender

This table shows the gender of employees working in different public and private banks (respondents). A total of 280 out of 350 respondents were male, thus accumulating a percentage of 80. Similarly, 70 out of 350 were female respondents making a percentage of 20. Therefore, the above table indicates that the majority of respondents were male depicting the fact that a significantly large number of the employees working in both public and private sector banking are male. As there are lesser number of female staff in banking sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa therefore, researcher has tried to take responses from all available female staff to ensure the quality of data.

### 3.7.2 Age



This table displays the age of respondents. The employees lie up to 25 years is 112 in number out of 350 having percentage of 32. 222 respondents lie between interval of 26-35 having a percentage of 63.4. The age of 35-45 interval contains 11 respondents having a percentage of 3.1. The respondents above 45 years are 5 out of 350 having a percentage of 1.4.

### **3.7.3 Education**

This table shows the education level of employees working in different public and private banks of Peshawar, KPK. The employees having bachelor degree is 40 in number having a percentage of 11.4 out of 350 respondents. The masters qualified are 281 having a percentage of 80.3 out of 350 respondents. The employees having 18 years of education are 21 out of 350 respondents having a percentage of 6. Those employees having 18 and above education are 8 out of 350 respondents having a percentage of 8.

### **3.7.4 Experience**

This table shows the experience level of employees working in different public and private banks of Peshawar, KPK. The employees having below 2 years are 90 out of 350 having a percentage of 25.7. Those employees having 2 to 5 years' experience are 191 out of 350 having a percentage of 54.6. The employees having 5 to 10 years' experience are 49 out of 350 having a percentage of 14. Those employees having 10 and above years' experience are 20 out of 350 having a percentage of 5.7.

## CHAPTER 4

### Data Analysis and Discussion

#### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Table 4. 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D	FOCB	PE	ID
<b>FOCB</b>	1	3	2.12	0.619	1		
<b>PE</b>	1	3	2.20	0.587	.705**	1	
<b>ID</b>	1	4	2.01	0.733	.275**	.467**	1

The correlation matrix indicates the association among the dependent variable and the independent variable and tells us the strong point of the association among dependent and independent variables. The following can be found in table for the variables means, standard deviations and inter-correlations. The table shows the linear association among the independent variables that is forced organizational citizenship behavior and psychological entitlement and interpersonal deviance. Researcher of this study inspected from the following table that there is high positive correlation between forced organizational citizenship behavior and psychological entitlement. However, there is significantly weak positive correlation arises between forced organizational citizenship behaviour and interpersonal deviance. Weak positive correlation occurs between psychological entitlement and interpersonal deviance.

#### 4.2 Assumptions of Regression Analysis

Linear regression is an analysis that assesses whether one or more predictor variables explain the dependent (criterion) variable. The regression has five key assumptions:

- Linear relationship
- Multivariate normality

- No or little multicollinearity
- No auto-correlation
- Homoscedasticity

### 4.3 Regression Analysis

The regression analysis is used for the statistical process which measures the relationship among the variables. According to the researcher regression analysis show model fitness and value of R square which estimates the descriptive supremacy of model which is required Sekaran (2003). Secondly Regression analysis is also used for finding change occurs in dependent variable due to change occur in independent variable, also when independent variable is different and other independent variables in the study are set aside as constant. Thirdly regression analysis shows that how much variable are significance in model to process for further analysis of different moderation and mediation analysis. Researcher of this study used multi regression technique for the sack of data analyzing as required in model and investigation. In this research Preacher and Hayes analysis is used for regression analysis.

Table 4. 2 Regression Analysis of forced OCB and Interpersonal Deviance

Variables	Unstandardized $\beta$	Standardized $\beta$	t	Sig	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	Sig
Constant	1.317		9.71	0.000	0.076	0.073	28.22	0.000
FOCB	0.327	0.275	5.31	0.000				

Dependent Variable: ID, Predictor variable: FOCB

Above table indicates the regression analysis and represents the dependence relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. The table shows t-statistics, F-value along with  $\beta$  coefficients, to examine the change in outcome variable (Interpersonal deviance) caused by predictor variable (Forced organization citizenship behaviour). The table shows that the value of unstandardized beta coefficient of independent variable (FOCB) to be 1.317, which means 1.317

units changed in dependent variable (Interpersonal deviance) is caused by the independent variable (FOCB). The value of standardized beta coefficient is 0.275, which indicates 0.275 units change in outcome variable caused by the predictor variable. Furthermore, the value of t-statistics is 5.31 for independent variable, which is significant at  $p = 0.000$ . The value of coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is 0.076, which means 7.6 % Percent change in dependent variable is explained by independent variable. Adjusted  $R^2$  for this relationship is 0.073, which means 7.3 % change in dependent variable is caused by independent variable. The F-value represents overall goodness of fit of the model being used for the study, its value is 28.22, which is significant at  $p = 0.000$ .

Table 4. 3 Regression Analysis of forced OCB and Psychological Entitlement

Variables	Unstandardized $\beta$	Standardized $\beta$	t	Sig	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	F	Sig
Constant	0.784		9.82	0.000	0.497	0.495	343.29	0.000
FOCB	0.669	0.705	18.5	0.000				

Dependent Variable: PE, Predictor variable: FOCB

Above table indicates the regression analysis and represents the dependence relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. The table shows t-statistics, F-value along with  $\beta$  coefficients, to examine the change in outcome variable (Psychological Entitlement) caused by predictor variable (Forced organization citizenship behaviour). The table shows that the value of unstandardized beta coefficient of independent variable (FOCB) to be 0.784, which means 0.784 units changed in dependent variable (Psychological Entitlement) is caused by the independent variable (FOCB). The value of standardized beta coefficient is 0.705, which indicates 0.705 units change in outcome variable caused by the predictor variable. Furthermore, the value of t-statistics is 18.5 for independent variable, which is significant at  $p = 0.000$ . The value of coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is 0.497, which means 49.7 % Percent change in dependent variable is explained by independent variable. Adjusted  $R^2$  for this relationship is 0.495, which means 49.7 % change in dependent variable is caused by independent variable. The F-value represents overall

goodness of fit of the model being used for the study, its value is 343.29, which is significant at  $p = 0.000$ .

Table 4. 4 Regression Analysis of Psychological Entitlement and Interpersonal Deviance

Variables	Unstandardized $\beta$	Standardized $\beta$	t	Sig	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	F	Sig
Constant	0.724		5.339	0.000	0.219	0.216	96.199	0.000
PE	0.582	0.467	9.808	0.000				

Dependent Variable: ID, Predictor variable: PE

Above table indicates the regression analysis and represents the dependence relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. The table shows t-statistics, F-value along with  $\beta$  coefficients, to examine the change in outcome variable (Interpersonal deviance) caused by predictor variable (Psychological Entitlement). The table shows that the value of unstandardized beta coefficient of independent variable (FOCB) to be 0.724, which means 0.724 units changed in dependent variable (Interpersonal deviance) is caused by the independent variable (PE). The value of standardized beta coefficient is 0.467, which indicates 0.467 units change in outcome variable caused by the predictor variable. Furthermore, the value of t-statistics is 9.808 for independent variable, which is significant at  $p = 0.000$ . The value of coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is 0.219, which means 21.9 % Percent change in dependent variable is explained by independent variable. Adjusted  $R^2$  for this relationship is 0.216, which means 21.6 % change in dependent variable is caused by independent variable. The F-value represents overall goodness of fit of the model being used for the study, its value is 96.199, which is significant at  $p = 0.000$ .

#### 4.4 Mediation Analysis

A mediator is the variable which causes mediation between dependent variable and independent variable. In other words, it explains the link among the dependent variable and the independent variable. Mediation also states that the overall intervention caused by the mediator variable.

Mediation analysis measures the intervention and strength of effect caused by intervention of the mediator variable on dependent and independent variable. Changes in the outcome variable are observed by controlling the intervening variable.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), to conduct a mediation test the three elementary conditions must be contented. Same conditions must be fulfilled for Preacher and Hayes (2016) Process Macros as well. These three conditions are;

- a. There must be a positive and significant relationship between Predictor variable and outcome variable.
- b. Predictor variable must have positive and significant relationship with mediating variable.
- c. There must also be a positive and significant relationship between mediating variable and outcome variable.

#### **4.4.1 Preacher & Hayes Analysis**

To analyze the mediation effect of the third variable i.e. Psychological Entitlement, influencing the relationship between the predictor (Forced Organizational Citizenship Behavior) and the outcome variable (Interpersonal Deviance), the researcher adopted Preacher and Hayes technique for mediation. This procedure involves resampling and bootstrapping, recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2004).

Selection of this technique was because of its superiority and user friendliness, above various other techniques, such as Barron & Kenny (1986) and Sobel test (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Furthermore, the data obtained after conducting this test is very easy to read and handle.

Following this procedure, the researcher used 5000 boot strapped samples along with a biased correctional method at 95 % confidence intervals. A general rule of thumb is that the upper level and lower level of the 95 % confidence intervals should not contain a zero (0) in an indirect effect in order to achieve a mediation effect between two variables (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Results of the analysis carried out using this technique are presented in the following tables along with their interpretations.

Table 4. 5      Model Summary of **Psychological Entitlement**

Outcome Variable: Psychological Entitlement (PE)

R	R-Sq	MSE	F	df1	df2	P
.7260	.5270	.1644	383.3099	1.0000	344.0000	.0000

Based on the results mentioned in the table above, the value of coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is 0.5270, which means 52 % change is caused in Psychological Entitlement (PE), because of change in Forced Organizational Citizenship Behavior (FOCB), which is our predictor variable in this case. Furthermore, the table also show the F-value, which indicates the overall model fit of the model being used. The value of F-Stat is 383.3099, which is significant at P<0.05, indicating that the model overall is significant.

Table 4. 6 Model Summary (FOCB and PE)

	Coeff	SE	T	P	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	.7430	.0780	9.5274	.0000	.5896	.8963
FOCB	.6932	.0354	19.5783	.0000	.6236	.7629

The table above shows that, the 1 unit change in FOCB brings about 0.69 units change in Psychological Entitlement of an employee, the direction of the relationship is positive, i.e. it does not contain a negative value. It means that there is a significant positive relationship between FOCB and PE. Furthermore, the table also shows the values of LLCI and ULCI, both of them are positive and do not include a zero, which means that there is also a mediation effect influencing the direct relationship between these two variables. The magnitude of the relationship of FOCB with PE is also represented by the t-value, which is significant at P<0.05.

Table 4. 7 Model Summary of Interpersonal Deviance

Outcome variable (Interpersonal Deviance) ID

R	R-sq	MSE	F	df1	df2	P
.2753	.0758	.4979	28.2181	1.0000	344.0000	.0000

The table above shows the value of coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>), which is 0.075, which means that 7 % variance is caused in outcome variable (ID) due to change in independent

variable (FOCB). However, the value of R2 is relatively low, which means that the independent variable itself, accounts for a low level of variance in dependent variable i.e. ID, it means that there is another variable playing its role and sharing variance with the dependent variable in the analysis. The F-Stats shows the overall model is highly significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

Table 4. 8 Model Summary (FOCB and ID)

	Coeff	SE	T	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	1.3174	.1357	9.7087	.0000	1.0505	1.5843
FOCB	.3273	.0616	5.3121	.0000	.2061	.4485

The values of coefficients in the above table, represent that a unit change in the predictor variable (FOCB) causes 0.32 units change in the outcome variable (Interpersonal Deviance, ID). The table also, indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between FOCB and ID with t value of 5.31, which is significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

#### 4.5 Total, Direct and Indirect Effects

Table 4. 9 Total Effect of FOCB on ID

Path	Total effect	SE	T	p	LLCI	ULCI
FOCB → PE → ID	0.3273	0.616	5.3121	.0000	.2061	.4485

The table above shows the total effect of FOCB and PE on the outcome variable, i.e. Interpersonal Deviance. The total effect size is 0.3273, with the t value of 5.3121 significant at  $p < 0.05$ , which means that FOCB is related positively to the outcome variable i.e. ID, but the effect size is low regardless of being significant. Therefore, it can be inferred that FOCB has a direct as well as indirect effect on the outcome variable ID, because of the values of LLCI and ULCI, which are both positive and doesn't contain a zero.

Table 4. 10 Direct Effect of FOCB on ID

Effect	Se	T	P	LLCI	ULCI
--------	----	---	---	------	------



0.1609	0.0820	1.9616	.0506	-0.3223	-0.2196
--------	--------	--------	-------	---------	---------

The above table shows the direct relationship between the independent variable i.e. FOCB and dependent variable Interpersonal Deviance (ID). The value of effect is .1609, with a standard error estimate of .0820 along with t value of 1.9616. The results obtained here shows that the direct relationship of predictor variable and outcome variable is insignificant at  $P < 0.05$ , which means that there is definitely an indirect relationship between these two variables with a mediation effect of a third variable, as the LLCI and ULCI values are both negative and doesn't contain a zero.

Table 4. 11 Indirect Effect of FOCB on ID through PE

	Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
PE	.4107	.0540	.3007	.5136

This table shows the indirect relationship of FOCB with ID through the mediation of PE, which is used as a mediator variable in this study. From the table we can see that the value of effect is .4107, with the boot standard error estimate of .0540. Both the values of LLCI and ULCI are greater than zero and positive, which means that Employee's Psychological Entitlement acts as a mediator, influencing the relationship of Forced Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee's Interpersonal Deviance. Thus, the fourth hypothesis of the study is highly supported by the results achieved from the analysis.

#### 4.6 Discussion of Results

The model of current research study was based on concept derived from previous literature executed in different geographic and industrial contexts. The researchers during their previous research studies continuously stressed over the exploration of Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (FOCB) and its linkages with the interpersonal deviance of employees. Further, it is also worth mentioning to identify the mediation effect of employee's psychological entitlements conducted and concluded in different cultural and industrial contexts. As the extensive review of

literature results to the formulation of three hypotheses which were studied in banking sector of District Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The relationships of variable has been tested with the help of collected data through SPSS. As it has been observed after the analysis of the primary data in regards to the proposed model all the three hypotheses are accepted. This study has found a significant link between Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour with Interpersonal Deviance and also the mediating effect of psychological entitlement of employees between independent and dependent variable.

The objective was to identify and highlight relationships between FOCB with Interpersonal deviance and to also identify the mediation effect of psychological entitlement of employees which is clearly revealed the significant values derived through regression analysis. The findings of results in current study strongly supported the hypothesized statements.

The results revealed that organizations following forced organizational citizenship behaviour also open backdoors for all those issues that drive employees towards their interpersonal deviance. Further, it is also identified that the psychological entitlements of employees also boost the interpersonal deviance in organizations following the strategy of forced organizational citizenship behaviour. Means when employees are forced towards exerting their maximum energy of the greater good of an organization must also take care of their potentials to enhance their positive psychological entitlements. As the scarce resources of an organization and for ensuring maximum efficiency across organizational levels it is expected from every employee to be more loyal and committed to organizational goals. However, the harsh and strict behaviour of employers towards their employees activate the negative psychological entitlements which force them towards focusing their personal needs which lasts over their interpersonal deviance. Further, the potential and committed employees also appreciate sufficient empowerment to execute and accomplish their

assigned roles in a more creative and efficient manner. While the incompetent appraisal systems led them towards their demotivation towards focusing on personal goals despite that of organizational. Employees involvement in various organizational decisions and initiatives enabled them to think over many aspects needs special attention and must be addressed on priority in order to overcome the upcoming challenges. Organizations following top to bottom approach must ensure that employees are provided with sufficient resources to ensure the accomplishment of task in an efficient manner (Jelinek, 2006). However, it is also identified that organizations providing sufficient empowerment to their employees increases their psychological entitlement and are willing to exert their maximum energy for organizational success. While in contrast organizations focusing on the forced organizational behaviour have lack of control over the interpersonal deviance of their employees and are more focused on their personal goals instead of organizational.

The objective was to identify and highlight relationships between FOCB with Interpersonal deviance and to also identify the mediation effect of psychological entitlement of employees which is clearly revealed the significant values derived through regression analysis. The findings of results in current study strongly supported the hypothesized statements. The results revealed that organizations following forced organizational citizenship behaviour also open backdoors for all those issues that drive employees towards their interpersonal deviance. Further, it is also identified that the psychological entitlements of employees also boost the interpersonal deviance in organizations following the strategy of forced organizational citizenship behaviour. Means when employees are forced towards exerting their maximum energy of the greater good of an organization must also take care of their potentials to enhance their positive psychological entitlements. As the scarce resources of an organization and for ensuring maximum efficiency

across organizational levels it is expected from every employee to be more loyal and committed to organizational goals. However, the harsh and strict behaviour of employers towards their employees activate the negative psychological entitlements which force them towards focusing their personal needs which lasts over their interpersonal deviance. Further, the potential and committed employees also appreciate sufficient empowerment to execute and accomplish their assigned roles in a more creative and efficient manner. While the incompetent appraisal systems led them towards their demotivation towards focusing on personal goals despite that of organizational. Employees involvement in various organizational decisions and initiatives enabled them to think over many aspects needs special attention and must be addressed on priority in order to overcome the upcoming challenges. Organizations following top to bottom approach must ensure that employees are provided with sufficient resources to ensure the accomplishment of 60 tasks in an efficient manner (Jelinek, 2006). However, it is also identified that organizations providing sufficient empowerment to their employees increases their psychological entitlement and are willing to exert their maximum energy for organizational success. While in contrast organizations focusing on the forced organizational behaviour have lack of control over the interpersonal deviance of their employees and are more focused on their personal goals instead of organizational.

The overall results of this research study in the context of banking sector operating in Peshawar it has been observed that there is a great impact and relationship of Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on the interpersonal deviance of employees which becomes more strengthened due to involvement of interpersonal deviance. The psychological entitlement of productive employees decreases their motivation level towards their assigned roles and responsibilities and hence more focused towards their own needs instead of organizational. As the

interpretations are mainly drawn on the basis of mediation role of psychological entitlement of employees between forced organizational citizenship behaviour and employee's interpersonal deviance hence the analysis of the primary data has been concluded accordingly. The psychological entitlements of employees are developed solely on the basis of untapped loops in organizational policies which badly effect their motivation and work performance.

The overall results clearly revealed that forced organizational citizenship behaviour significantly influence interpersonal deviance with a greater mediation effect of interpersonal deviance. The results also highlighted that the concept of efficiency decreases the number of employees in any organization with a more efficient cost and benefits analysis techniques. The employers are identified to be more focusing towards more centralized structure in an organization forcing employees to meet their targets badly effecting frustration among employees. The employees were also identified to concentrate more on the fulfilment of their own need with greater intentions to find out other opportunities for them to leave. The employees were also found to have a lesser organizational citizenship behaviour due to the strict and rude behaviour of supervisors to focus on their assigned roles only.

As it has been observed after the analysis of the primary data in regards to the proposed model all the three hypotheses are accepted. This study has found a significant link between Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour with Interpersonal Deviance and also the mediating effect of psychological entitlement of employees between independent and dependent variable. The objective was to identify and highlight relationships between FOCB with Interpersonal deviance and to also identify the mediation effect of psychological entitlement of employees which is clearly revealed the significant values derived through regression analysis. The findings of results in current study strongly supported the hypothesized statements. The results revealed that

organizations following forced organizational citizenship behaviour also open backdoors for all those issues that drive employees towards their interpersonal deviance. Further, it is also identified that the psychological entitlements of employees also boost the interpersonal deviance in organizations following the strategy of forced organizational citizenship behaviour. Means when employees are forced towards exerting their maximum energy of the greater good of an organization must also take care of their potentials to enhance their positive psychological entitlements. As the scarce resources of an organization and for ensuring maximum efficiency across organizational levels it is expected from every employee to be more loyal and committed to organizational goals. However, the harsh and strict behaviour of employers towards their employees activate the negative psychological entitlements which force them towards focusing their personal needs which lasts over their interpersonal deviance. Further, the potential and committed employees also appreciate sufficient empowerment to execute and accomplish their assigned roles in a more creative and efficient manner. While the incompetent appraisal systems led them towards their demotivation towards focusing on personal goals despite that of organizational. Employees involvement in various organizational decisions and initiatives enabled them to think over many aspects needs special attention and must be addressed on priority in order to overcome the upcoming challenges. Organizations following top to bottom approach must ensure that employees are provided with sufficient resources to ensure the accomplishment of 60 tasks in an efficient manner (Jelinek, 2006). However, it is also identified that organizations providing sufficient empowerment to their employees increases their psychological entitlement and are willing to exert their maximum energy for organizational success. While in contrast organizations focusing on the forced organizational behaviour have lack of control over the interpersonal deviance of their employees and are more focused on their personal goals instead of

organizational. The overall results of this research study in the context of banking sector operating in Peshawar it has been observed that there is a great impact and relationship of Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on the interpersonal deviance of employees which becomes more strengthened due to involvement of interpersonal deviance. The psychological entitlement of productive employees decreases their motivation level towards their assigned roles and responsibilities and hence more focused towards their own needs instead of organizational. As the interpretations are mainly drawn on the basis of mediation role of psychological entitlement of employees between forced organizational citizenship behaviour and employee's interpersonal deviance hence the analysis of the primary data has been concluded accordingly. The psychological entitlements of employees are developed solely on the basis of untapped loops in organizational policies which badly effect their motivation and work performance. The overall results clearly revealed that forced organizational citizenship behaviour significantly influence interpersonal deviance with a greater mediation effect of interpersonal deviance. The results also highlighted that the concept of efficiency decreases the number of employees in any organization with a more efficient cost and benefits analysis techniques. The employers are identified to be more focusing towards more centralized structure in an organization forcing employees to meet their targets badly effecting frustration among employees. The employees were also identified to concentrate more on the fulfilment of their own need with greater intentions to find out other opportunities for them to leave. The employees were also found to have a lesser organizational citizenship behaviour due to the strict and rude behaviour of supervisors to focus on their assigned roles only.

## CHAPTER 5

### Conclusion and Future Recommendations

#### 5.1 Conclusion

The key goal of this research is to investigate the impact of Forced OCB on Interpersonal Deviance with mediating role played by Psychological Entitlement. With this goal, a causal model has been proposed that explain the impact of Forced OCB on Interpersonal Deviance through the mediating role played by Psychological Entitlement.

This research gives a lot of knowledge to the existing body of literature. The first purpose of this research is to test and confirm that Psychological Entitlement play a middle role between Forced OCB and Interpersonal Deviance. More specifically, this research expands the traditional view of Forced OCB on employees and suggests that Forced OCB do not only affect Interpersonal Deviance but also Psychological Entitlement. This research adds further empirical evidence to the recent observations of the negative influence of Forced OCB on employees performance. Moreover up to my knowledge this research first time test and support that Forced OCB has an influence on Psychological Entitlement in KP Pakistan.

This research study aimed to have an in depth knowledge regarding the interpersonal deviance of employees in the Banking Sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The personal observations of researcher and continuously reported issues in previous study at different organizational and country context highlighted the greater need to dissolve an issue of employees interpersonal deviance due to FOCB with a role of their psychological entitlement. The purpose of conducting this study was purely the identification of significant relation between FOCB and interpersonal deviance with a stronger mediation role of psychological entitlement of employees. This study has a greater contribution in existing literature due to testing the mediation role of psychological entitlement which increases



and may also decrease the interpersonal deviance of an employee especially when an organization adopted a strategy of FOCB. The organizational and professional commitment of employees has also been explored due to the proposed model studied in the banking sector of Peshawar.

It becomes very essential to figure out and focus on the objectives of this study discussed in chapter 1 and are successfully achieved which will be helpful from the perspective of academic and industrial practitioner's. The results clearly mentioned that this model can be considered as a guideline to identify the root causes of interpersonal deviance among employees and their professional commitment in banking sector to retain their motivated employees for a longer period of time. By considering this study the organizations will become able to encourage and motivate their employees to perform their tasks efficiently and contribute more in the achievement of the end goals of an organization.

It has also been found that managers and all those employees who are in the middle level of organizational hierarchy accept and believe that although organizational leaders must have a greater control over the work processes with a stronger supervisory role. While on the other hand top management must also needs to ensure various aspects especially fairness in their policies and work procedures in order to maintain their continuous improvement in work processes for better organizational wellbeing. The forced organizational citizenship behaviour might have positive outputs and outcomes for a greater control over work process in vertical organizational structures but the lack of fairness leads to the psychological entitlement of employees and ultimately impersonal deviance.

## ***5.2 Recommendation for Managers***

As there is a great impact and relationship among forced organizational citizenship behaviour, psychological entitlement of employees and interpersonal deviance therefore this study is very

helpful for the banking sector to efficiently decrease the interpersonal deviance of employees in an organization to achieve their end goals in a most effective manner. This study will allow banks and other financial institutions to better understand the factor of Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, psychological entitlement and interpersonal deviance hence before making any strategy they should keep in mind the implementers of strategy because without their concern it will become a dream of an organization to efficiently implement any strategy. Keeping in view the findings and conclusion of this study there are some of the following recommendations that every manager and executive must keep in mind:

- The managers and executives should keep in mind that for the achievement of the end goals and success they should psychologically empower their employees to contribute more.
- With the help of this study the top management team of an organization will be able to retain their employees for a longer period of time.
- This study advocates managers and executives to consider their employees as their real assets of an organization to efficiently motivate them and increase their organizational commitment. Because the organizations can gain sustainable competitive edge on their competitors only in a situation when their employees are highly motivated and encouraged to perform their duties in an effective manner.
- By implementing this study organizational leaders can make implementable strategies and will be also able to maximize their sales and revenue which is the ultimate goal of every organization.
- The managers and top management team should also pay more attentions to the importance of psychological empowerment of employees to efficiently produce and provide high quality goods and services to their customers.

### *5.3 Practical Implications*

This study has a great contribution to the Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and interpersonal deviance of employees by incorporating the psychological entitlement of employees through the investigation of existing literature and primary data. Furthermore in this study different models and factors that influence the interpersonal deviance. It is the first research study that has been conducted with the most important factors and plays very important role in the organizational and business researches i.e Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour with a mediating role of employee's psychological entitlement. This study will contribute more in the discipline of interpersonal deviance and its alignment with the Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. However in other studies the interpersonal deviance has been studied with only one factor i.e Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

### *5.4 Limitation of the Study*

This study has answered all the research questions that were asked in chapter 1 and all the objectives of this study have also been achieved.

First limitation of this study is its methodology as it was a survey based study which has a shortcoming that it occurs in a point in time such as the impact of the Forced Organizational Citizenship Behaviour may not fully realised until the psychological entitlement of employees has been incorporated to identify the interpersonal deviance of employees in organizations has been fully implemented before conducting a research study to analyse its impact on other organizational outcomes.

Second the main approach for this study was to meet the criteria of selection in the banking sector operating in Peshawar. Therefore a small sample size has been selected for this research study which prohibits use the more powerful statistical tools such as Structural Equation Modelling

Technique and the results was only limited to regression and correlations analysis. One the basis of these limited statistical analyses there may come problems in conclusion.

As in this study the proposed framework has been analysed in the banking sector of Peshawar. Therefore this frame should also consider the other important factors such as technological, cultural and organizational which may differ Pakistan from the other countries.

### ***5.5 Future Recommendations***

This study has also explored various other directions for future for interpersonal deviance in the banking sector of Pakistan such as:

- In future study the relationship and impact of the psychological empowerment should be analysed with the employee's performance and employee's productivity.
- The model may be also analysed with the other important factors such as with strategic planning and strategy implementation, Job crafting, employees proactive personality, knowledge and learning.

The sample size of the study should be also increased to run more powerful statistical tools and conclude the research work in a batter way.

## REFERENCES

- A., Guedes, A. G., Lund, F. E., Subramanian, S., Walseth, T. F., & Kannan, M. S. (2017). CD38 in the pathogenesis of allergic airway disease: Potential therapeutic targets. *Pharmacology & therapeutics*, 172, 116-126.
- Alonso, P., Moscoso, S., & Salgado, J. F. (2017). Structured behavioral interview as a legal guarantee for ensuring equal employment opportunities for women: A meta-analysis. *The European journal of psychology applied to legal context*, 9(1), 15-23.
- Amos, E. A., & Weathington, B. L. (2008). An analysis of the relation between employee—Organization value congruence and employee attitudes. *The journal of psychology*, 142(6), 615-632.
- Apaydin, Ç., & Sirin, H. (2016). The Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Group Cohesiveness and Workplace Deviance Behavior of Turkish Teachers. *International Education Studies*, 9(10), 58-69.
- Barksdale, K., & Werner, J. M. (2001). Managerial ratings of in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors, and overall performance: testing different models of their relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 51(2), 145-155.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship”. *Academy of management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Barnard, C. (1938). 1.(1938). *The functions of the executive*.
- Bauer, J. A., Wright, N. A., Askew, K., & Spector, P. E. (2018). The relationships between organizational citizenship behavior demands and extra-task behaviors. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 21(3), 163.
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4), 542-559.
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4), 542-559.
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., & Podsakoff, N. (2018). The unintended consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors for employees, teams, and organizations. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, 185.

- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B., & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(6), 835-855.
- Bowler, W. M., Paul, J. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2019). LMX and attributions of organizational citizenship behavior motives: When is citizenship perceived as brownnosing?. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *34*(2), 139-152.
- Baker, D. P., Gustafson, S., Beaubien, J. M., Salas, E., & Barach, P. (2017). Medical teamwork and patient safety: the evidence-based relation. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. 2005.
- Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current directions in psychological science*, *13*(6), 238-241.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). An introduction to positive organizational scholarship. *Positive organizational scholarship*, *3*(13).
- Carpenter, N. C., Berry, C. M., & Houston, L. (2014). A meta-analytic comparison of self-reported and other-reported organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(4), 547-574.
- Cashman, J., Dansereau Jr, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1976). Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *15*(2), 278-296.
- Cha, J., Chang, Y. K., & Kim, T. Y. (2014). Person–organization fit on prosocial identity: implications on employee outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *123*(1), 57-69.
- Chawla, V. (2014). The effect of workplace spirituality on salespeople's organisational deviant behaviours: research propositions and practical implications. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *29*(3), 199-208.
- Chinomona, E., Chinomona, R., & Dhurup, M. (2013). Does employee perceptions of fit to job, fit to organisation and fit to community influence job performance? The case of Zimbabwe's manufacturing sector. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *11*(1), 1-10.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., Kessler, I., & Purcell, J. (2004). Exploring organizationally directed citizenship behaviour: reciprocity or 'it's my job'?. *Journal of management studies*, *41*(1), 85-106.
- Coole, D. R. (2003). The effects of citizenship performance, task performance, and rating format on performance judgments.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange relationships: Examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, *90*(4), 774.

- Dalal, R. S., & Carpenter, N. (2018). The Other Side of the Coin?: Similarities and Differences Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior*, 1864.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 125(6), 627.
- Deckop, J. R., Mangel, R., & Cirka, C. C. (1999). Getting more than you pay for: Organizational citizenship behavior and pay-for-performance plans. *Academy of Management journal*, 42(4), 420-428.
- Demir, M., Demir, S. S., & Nield, K. (2015). The relationship between person-organization fit, organizational identification and work outcomes. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 16(2), 369-386.
- Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(1), 67-80.
- Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N., & Davis, A. J. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Nepal. *Asian journal of social psychology*, 8(3), 305-314.
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Graham, J. W. (1995). Leadership, moral development, and citizenship behavior. *Business ethics quarterly*, 43-54.
- Grant, A. M., Nurmohamed, S., Ashford, S. J., & Dekas, K. (2011). The performance implications of ambivalent initiative: The interplay of autonomous and controlled motivations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116(2), 241-251.
- Ingrams, A., Manoharan, A., Schmidhuber, L., & Holzer, M. (2018). Stages and determinants of e-government development: a twelve-year longitudinal study of global cities. *International Public Management Journal*, 1-39.

- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: the role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of applied psychology, 90*(2), 257.
- Ju, D., Xu, M., Qin, X., & Spector, P. (2019). A Multilevel Study of Abusive Supervision, Norms, and Personal Control on Counterproductive Work Behavior: A Theory of Planned Behavior Approach. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 26*(2), 163-178.
- Joireman, J., Kamdar, D., Daniels, D., & Duell, B. (2006). Good citizens to the end? It depends: empathy and concern with future consequences moderate the impact of a short-term time horizon on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(6), 1307.
- Kashy, D. A., Ackerman, R. A., & Donnellan, M. B. (2018). Analyzing cross-sectional and longitudinal data in close relationships.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral science, 9*(2), 131-146.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (Vol. 2, p. 528). New York: Wiley.
- Kim, T. Y., Aryee, S., Loi, R., & Kim, S. P. (2013). Person–organization fit and employee outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(19), 3719-3737.
- Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2013). Citizenship and counterproductive work behavior: A moral licensing view. *Academy of management review, 38*(2), 292-306.
- Koster, F., & Sanders, K. (2006). Organisational citizens or reciprocal relationships? An empirical comparison. *Personnel review, 35*(5), 519-537.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of management, 43*(6), 1854-1884.
- Leung, A., & Chaturvedi, S. (2011). Linking the fits, fitting the links: Connecting different types of PO fit to attitudinal outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(2), 391-402.
- Lennard, A. C., & Van Dyne, L. (2018). Helping that hurts intended beneficiaries: A new perspective on the dark side of helping organizational citizenship behavior. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, 169*.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The



- nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(1), 52.
- Liu, B., Liu, J., & Hu, J. (2010). Person-organization fit, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: An empirical study in the Chinese public sector. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 38(5), 615-625.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(1), 123-150.
- McAllister, D. J., Kamdar, D., Morrison, E. W., & Turban, D. B. (2007). Disentangling role perceptions: How perceived role breadth, discretion, instrumentality, and efficacy relate to helping and taking charge. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1200.
- Meyer, J. P., Hecht, T. D., Gill, H., & Toplonysky, L. (2010). Person–organization (culture) fit and employee commitment under conditions of organizational change: A longitudinal study. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 76(3), 458-473.
- Minei, E. M., Eatough, E. M., & Cohen-Charash, Y. (2018). Managing illegitimate task requests through explanation and acknowledgment: A discursive leadership approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 32(3), 374-397.
- Mulki, J. P., Jaramillo, F., & Locander, W. B. (2006). Emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance: Can the right job and a leader's style make a difference?. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(12), 1222-1230.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Nur, Y. A., & Organ, D. W. (2006). Selected organizational outcome correlates of spirituality in the workplace. *Psychological Reports*, 98(1), 111-120.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(3), 492.
- O'Boyle Jr, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 788-818.

- Organ, D. W. (1977). Intentional vs arousal effects of goal-setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18(2), 378-389.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 74(1), 157.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of management*, 33(5), 774-800.
- Papadopulos, A. S., Igea, J., Smith, T. P., Hutton, I., Baker, W. J., Butlin, R. K., & Savolainen, V. (2019). Ecological speciation in sympatric palms: 4. Demographic analyses support speciation of *Howea* in the face of high gene flow. *Evolution*, 73(9), 1996-2002.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Bommer, W. H., Podsakoff, N. P., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and subordinate attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors: A meta-analytic review of existing and new research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99(2), 113-142.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122.
- Poncheri, R. M. (2006). The impact of work context on the prediction of job performance.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 82(2), 262.
- Posner, B. Z. (2010). Another look at the impact of personal and organizational values congruency. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(4), 535-541.
- Resick, C. J., Baltes, B. B., & Shantz, C. W. (2007). Person-organization fit and work-related attitudes and decisions: Examining interactive effects with job fit and conscientiousness. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(5), 1446.
- Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 15(3), 245-259.
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (1995). Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 16(3), 289-298.

- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative science quarterly*, 41(4).
- Rupp, D. E., Shapiro, D. L., Folger, R., Skarlicki, D. P., & Shao, R. (2017). A critical analysis of the conceptualization and measurement of organizational justice: Is it time for reassessment?. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 919-959.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative science quarterly*, 224-253.
- Salamon, S. D., & Deutsch, Y. (2006). OCB as a handicap: An evolutionary psychological perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 27(2), 185-199.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). *Organizational culture* (Vol. 45, No. 2, p. 109). American Psychological Association.
- Smartt, S., Chen, T. W., Jerkstrand, A., Coughlin, M., Kankare, E., Sim, S. A., ... & Huber, M. E. (2017). A kilonova as the electromagnetic counterpart to a gravitational-wave source. *Nature*, 551(7678), 75.
- Smith, M. B., Hill, A. D., Wallace, J. C., Recendes, T., & Judge, T. A. (2018). Upsides to dark and downsides to bright personality: A multidomain review and future research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 44(1), 191-217.
- Tak, J. (2011). Relationships between various person–environment fit types and employee withdrawal behavior: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 78(2), 315-320.
- Takeuchi, N., & Takeuchi, T. (2013). Committed to the organization or the job? Effects of perceived HRM practices on employees' behavioral outcomes in the Japanese healthcare industry. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(11), 2089-2106.
- Todd, S. Y. (2003). A causal model depicting the influence of selected task and employee variables on organizational citizenship behavior. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University*.
- Turban, D. B., Tan, H. H., Brown, K. G., & Sheldon, K. M. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of perceived locus of causality: An application of self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(10), 2376-2404.

- Turnipseed, D. L., & Rassuli, A. (2005). Performance perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviours at work: A bi-level study among managers and employees. *British Journal of Management*, 16(3), 231-244.
- Van Dyne, L. I. N. N., & Ellis, J. B. (2004). Job creep: A reactance theory perspective on organizational citizenship behavior as over-fulfillment of obligations. *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives*, 181-205.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*, 36(5), 661-683.
- VVEINHARDT, J., & Gulbovaitė, E. (2013). Comparative analysis of the researches on personal and organizational value congruence. *Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai*, 127-142.
- Yam, K. C., Klotz, A. C., He, W., & Reynolds, S. J. (2017). From good soldiers to psychologically entitled: Examining when and why citizenship behavior leads to deviance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 373-396.
- Yen, H. R., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(8), 1617-1637.
- Venus, M., Johnson, R. E., Zhang, S., Wang, X. H., & Lanaj, K. (2018). Seeing the big picture: A within-person examination of leader construal level and vision communication. *Journal of Management*, 0149206318761576.
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of management journal*, 37(6), 1543-1567.
- Zagenczyk, T. J., Purvis, R. L., Cruz, K. S., Thoroughgood, C. N., & Sawyer, K. B. (2020). Context and social exchange: perceived ethical climate strengthens the relationships between perceived organizational support and organizational identification and commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-20.
- Zikmund, W. G., D'Alessandro, S., Winzar, H., Lowe, B., & Babin, B. (2017). *Marketing Research: Asia-Pacific Edition*. Cengage AU.