Interlibrary Loans and Journal Article Requests

Notice Warning Concerning Copyright Restrictions:

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One specified condition is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be *"used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research."* If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

Upon receipt of this reproduction of the publication you have requested, you understand that the publication may be protected by copyright law. You also understand that you are expected to comply with copyright law and to limit your use to one for private study, scholarship, or research and not to systematically reproduce or in any way make available multiple copies of the publication.

The Stephen B. Thacker CDC Library reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Terms and Conditions for items sent by e-mail:

The contents of the attached document may be protected by copyright law. The CDC copyright policy outlines the responsibilities and guidance related to the reproduction of copyrighted materials at CDC. If the document is protected by copyright law, the following restrictions apply:

- You may print only one paper copy, from which you may not make further copies, except as maybe allowed by law.
- You may not make further electronic copies or convert the file into any other format.
- You may not cut and paste or otherwise alter the text.

SPIM
SOCIETY OF PSYCHOLOGISTS IN MANAGEMENT

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The Psychologist-Manager Journal

1088-7156/18/$12.00

2018, Vol. 21, No. 3, 163–186
http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000074

The Relationships Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior Demands and Extra-Task Behaviors

Jeremy A. Bauer and Natalie A. Wright
Valdosta State University

Kevin Askew
Montclair State University

Paul E. Spector
University of South Florida

The current study investigated the relationship between demands for organizational citizenship behaviors and future displays of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors. Such demands are conceptualized as organizational constraints, coworker failure, and supervisor pressure to commit organizational citizenship behaviors. The design of the current study is prospective with a week time lag between two self-report surveys. Four hundred sixty-four employed U.S. residents were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk service. Of the initial 464 participants, 183 also completed the second survey a week later. The evidence from this study suggests that demands for organizational citizenship behaviors are antecedents to future displays of organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive work behaviors. Similarly, organizational citizenship be-

Jeremy A. Bauer and Natalie A. Wright, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Valdosta State University; Kevin Askew, Department of Psychology, Montclair State University; Paul E. Spector, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida.

This research was supported in part by the Sunshine Education and Research Center and by a training grant (T42-OH008438) from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention/ National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jeremy A. Bauer, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Valdosta State University, 1500 North Patterson Street, Valdosta, GA 31698. E-mail: jabauer@valdosta.edu

haviors preceded all measured demands for organizational citizenship behaviors reported a week later. The results of the current study indicate that managers should be aware that demands for organizational citizenship behaviors may be influencing employee displays of counterproductive work behavior. Moreover, managers should be prepared to intervene if they find evidence of any deleterious effects that may be associated with demands for organizational citizenship behaviors.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior, counterproductive work behavior, workplace demands, workplace stressors, organizational constraints

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB) are two facets of job performance (Sackett, 2002) that can significantly affect the functioning of an organization (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). OCB consists of behaviors assumed to help the organization and its members, whereas CWB consists of behaviors assumed to harm the organization and its members. Although both behaviors have traditionally been conceptualized as extra task and voluntary, they were developed in relatively independent streams of literature. Over the past decade, studies incorporating both types of behavior have become more popular (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Dalal, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2002). Most of these studies, both theoretical and empirical, report a negative association between OCB and CWB (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Lee & Allen, 2002). Across several investigations, OCB and CWB have also been oppositely related to potential antecedents they have in common (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Dalal, 2005). Based on the results from these studies, employees who engage in one form of behavior are not expected to frequently engage in the other.

Although there is evidence to suggest that OCB and CWB are at opposite ends of the same continuum, these results may be partly due to measurement artifacts (Dalal, 2005; Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010). Furthermore, some researchers have discussed the possibility that employees can frequently engage in both OCB and CWB (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002; Reynolds, Shoss, & Jundt, 2015; Spanouli & Hofmans, 2016). Indeed, a large portion of the variance associated with OCB and CWB is within person (Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, & Hulin, 2009; Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006). Additionally, studies have reported a nonsignificant or positive relationship between OCB and CWB while looking within and between participants (Dalal et al., 2009; Spanouli & Hofmans, 2016; Spector et al., 2010; Venkataramani & Dalal, 2007). Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that OCB and CWB are relatively separate and independent constructs and that certain conditions may give rise to both OCB and CWB.

Little attention has been given to circumstances in which both OCB and CWB can co-occur. This may be due to the traditional treatment of OCB and

CWB as opposite forms of behaviors. However, in light of the research discussed previously, it is possible that important information may be revealed by investigating situations that elicit both behaviors. For instance, some researchers have speculated that certain situational antecedents to OCB may also elicit CWB (Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013; Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, & Suazo, 2010; Spector & Fox, 2010a). Thus, a study that focuses exclusively on one type of behavior risks missing any influence that these variables may have on the other extra-task behaviors.

Fortunately, researchers have identified circumstances that may energize employees to engage in both OCB and CWB. More specifically, Spector and Fox (2010b) discussed the role of OCB demands. OCB demands are demands that can pressure an employee to commit OCB. An example OCB demand is the performance failure of a coworker. If tasks are interdependent, employees may feel the need to help coworkers to complete their own tasks. Situations in which employees feel forced to do more work (OCB) may also result in negative outcomes such as negative emotions and CWB (Bolino et al., 2010, 2013; Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2012; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Thus, demands for OCB may motivate employees to engage in OCB as well as CWB.

OCB Demands

OCB was originally defined as extra-role, discretionary behavior that helps other organizational members performs their jobs or that shows support for and conscientiousness toward the organization (Borman & Penner, 2001; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Since then, researchers have suggested that OCB is not always extra-role or discretionary (Organ, 1990). Supervisors often consider OCBs when evaluating employees (Allen & Rush, 1998; Pond, Nacoste, Mohr, & Rodriguez, 1997). Additionally, Werner (2000) discussed how compensation may be a potential avenue for increasing the frequency of OCB. In line with such discussions, researchers have begun to conceptualize citizenship behavior as extra-task but not always extra-role (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). It is important to note that there are differences between behaviors that are considered OCB and those that are classified as task performance. Task-related behaviors tend to vary across jobs and require specific knowledge, skills, and abilities. However, the classifications of OCBs tend to not vary much across jobs, and these behaviors tend to not require specific knowledge or skills. For instance, volunteering or cooperating is likely to be considered OCB at any job, and almost any employee is capable of engaging in such behaviors. Even though OCB is distinct from task performance, it may still be considered a part of an employee's job role. Thus, OCB is expected or is even a requirement in some positions (Hanson & Borman, 2006).

OCB committed out of a perceived obligation is likely to benefit the organization but such pressure may also result in some undesirable behaviors (i.e., CWB; Fox et al., 2012). To understand how this pressure may be positively associated with both OCB and CWB, it is helpful to discuss the stressor–strain perspective (Spector & Fox, 2005). From this perspective, job stressors (i.e., demands) are conditions or situations at work that require an adaptive response on the part of employee (Jex & Beehr, 1991). Having to adapt to such demands in the workplace takes a toll on the employee and may result in strain, which is a negative reaction to a stressor. These reactions can be physical, emotional, cognitive, or behavioral (e.g., CWB). More specifically, OCB that is viewed as mandatory by the employee will increase the amount of work an employee must complete. An increase in workload is associated with negative behavioral reactions (Balducci, Schaufeli, & Fraccaroli, 2011; Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002). Thus, situations that increase demands may energize displays of CWB (e.g., withdrawal behaviors).

OCB demands may also elicit CWB through a host of complex cognitive processes such as justice perceptions. Blau's (1964) social exchange theory can offer some insight into understanding employee behaviors. Social exchange theory is based on the idea that employees develop norms of reciprocity within the organization. Employees are expected to exercise discretion over whether or not to display OCB while monitoring their interactions with the organization and its members (Organ, 1990). For instance, if the organization is treating employees unjustly, the employees may refrain from future displays of OCB. However, employees are expected to perform more, not less, OCB if it is perceived as a requirement. A feasible alternative reaction may be to commit a low-risk CWB to restore balance to the relationship between the employee and the organization. Indeed, poor treatment is often reciprocated with negative attitudes and behaviors (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). Thus, OCB demands are expected to motivate employees to engage in both sets of behaviors under certain conditions.

Spector and Fox (2010b) identified three OCB demands thought to precede extra-task behaviors (i.e., organizational constraints, coworker performance failures, and supervisor demands). Although there are several theories that can aid in developing expectations related to employee reactions to these specific OCB demands, the utility of each likely depends on the specific demand and subsequent behavioral reaction. Furthermore, there are underlying cognitive mechanisms that may influence the magnitude and directions of these relationships. For instance, the presence of instrumental outcomes (e.g., money or promotions) may fundamentally influence employee reactions to OCB demands. Additionally, OCB and CWB can have several antecedents and consequences. Therefore, it would be difficult to use a single overarching framework when generating predictions across the

different types of OCB demands and displays of both OCB and CWB. Instead, expectations can be more accurately created by reviewing theoretical and empirical evidence that is relevant to the individual stream of literature for each specific OCB demand.

Organizational Constraints

Organizational constraints are workplace situations that make it difficult or impossible to perform the necessary job tasks (Peters & O'Connor, 1980). Some examples are poor equipment or insufficient training. To attenuate organizational constraints, employees may engage in OCB to remove obstacles preventing successful task completion (Fox et al., 2012; Spector & Fox, 2010a, 2010b). However, organizational constraints are considered stressors, and there is evidence across several studies that constraints are associated with both negative emotions and CWB (Chen & Spector, 1991; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Penney & Spector, 2005). Additionally, studies have found constraints to be positively associated with both OCB and CWB (Fox et al., 2012; Miles et al., 2002; Spector et al., 2010).

Hypothesis 1: Organizational constraints will be positively associated with OCB.

Hypothesis 2: Organizational constraints will be positively associated with CWB.

Coworker Performance Failure

The failure of coworkers to perform assigned tasks can take many shapes. A coworker can perform tasks incorrectly, complete tasks haphazardly, or fail to initiate tasks at all. These performance failures can increase the workload of other employees. This is particularly true when the coworker is part of a workgroup or has tasks that are interdependent. Employee failure may arise from a lack of ability or a lack of motivation. Regardless of the underlying cause, employees might compensate for performance deficits by doing extra tasks that go beyond their own assignments (Felps, Mitchell, & Byington, 2006; Liden, Wayne, Jaworski, & Bennett, 2004; Zellars & Tepper, 2003). Thus, coworker lack of performance would produce a demand for OCB because employees often require a coworker's task to be complete to successfully complete their own work. Committing such OCB may be perceived as additional work that becomes mandatory. In response to this

perceived stressor, employees may initiate a sense-making process to form attributions about the coworker failure. Attributions toward the coworker are expected to elicit negative emotions (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Taggar & Neubert, 2004, 2008) and CWBs (Hung, Chi, & Lu, 2009), such as ostracizing or excluding the coworker responsible for the failure (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Therefore, coworker failure is another situation in which employees may react with both OCB and CWB.

Hypothesis 3: Coworker failure will be positively associated with OCB.

Hypothesis 4: Coworker failure will be positively associated with CWB.

Supervisor Pressure

There are a number of situations in which a supervisor may require an employee to engage in OCB. For instance, a workgroup supervisor may ask subordinates to work longer hours when the group is faced with urgent deadlines. Similarly, a supervisor may define the job role broadly and assume that OCBs are included in the subordinates' job definition. Regardless of the cause, employees pressured by supervisors to engage in OCB are expected to be motivated to comply with such demands because supervisors are a figure of authority. Pressure to commit OCB has been associated with higher rates of OCB (Bolino et al., 2010). Even though OCB can be beneficial to the organization, Vigoda-Gadot (2007) asserted that pressuring employees to commit behaviors that are, otherwise, considered discretionary can be considered a form of exploitation or abusive supervision. Determining the appropriateness of supervisor pressure is largely dependent on the situation; however, pressure from a supervisor may result in employee strain under certain conditions. For instance, pressure to commit OCB has also been associated with several negative outcomes such as burnout, job stress, and turnover intentions (Bolino et al., 2010; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Thus, supervisor pressure to commit OCB may promote displays of OCB, but it may also be associated with negative employee reactions.

Additionally, employees who perceive pressure to commit OCB may respond with CWB due to a mismatch between employee and supervisor conceptualization regarding job roles (Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999; Morrison, 1994). Lam et al. (1999) speculated that supervisors define job roles more broadly because they are concerned with organizational effectiveness, whereas employees are more concerned with the equity of exchanges and maintaining the status quo. When supervisors require behaviors that employees view as discretionary, employees may perceive the additional demands as unjust and respond with CWB to compensate.

Hypothesis 5: Supervisor pressure for OCB will be positively associated with OCB.

Hypothesis 6: Supervisor pressure for OCB will be positively associated with CWB.

Current Study

The primary goal of the current study was to investigate the direction of the relationships between OCB demands (i.e., organizational constraints, coworker failure, and supervisor pressure) and both OCB and CWB. To this end, a prospective study design was implemented in which two surveys were administered with a 1-week time lag between administrations. Measures of coworker failure and supervisor pressure were developed. Both surveys contained measures of OCB demands and both types of extra-task behaviors (i.e., OCB and CWB).

Method

Participants

Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk (i.e., M-Turk) crowdsourcing tool was used to recruit employed U.S. citizens to complete two online surveys. To participate in the study, participants had to be registered members of the M-Turk labor force and have a success rate of 95% in completing other available assignments. There is some evidence that samples collected from M-Turk are more representative than typical student samples (Barger, Behrend, Sharek, & Evan, 2011). Out of the 641 participants who began the study, 577 completed the first survey (90%) and 274 completed the second survey (43%). Due to missing data or related screening criteria, 113 cases were removed from the data set. Thus, the final number of participants was 464 for the first survey, and 183 participants completed both surveys. Participants received 50 cents for completing the first survey and one dollar for completing the second survey. The mean age of participants sampled was 33.4 years old ($SD = 11.4$). The majority of the sample was female (55.2%) and worked an average of 38.3 hr ($SD = 11.3$) a week. The majority of participants worked in either administrative (24.4%), services (22.2%), or customer service positions (13.3%).

Procedure

The design of the study was prospective with a 1-week time lag between the administrations of two separate surveys. Both surveys were only made available for 3 days each week (Friday through Sunday) to control the time frames in which responses were recorded. A 1-week time lag was chosen because base rates for behaviors and OCB demands were expected to be low with a shorter time frame. Conversely, a longer time frame might have made it difficult to correctly report appraisals of OCB demands and displays of OCB and CWB. To recruit participants, an advertisement was posted on M-Turk that included a description of the study, the requirements, and the compensation for successful completion. To participate, individuals clicked a button that took them directly to the first survey that was hosted by an external service (i.e., surveymonkey.com). They were then e-mailed a link for the second survey the following week, and they were prompted to enter a code they had generated for the first survey. This allowed surveys to be matched by an identifier.

Measures

Demographics. Gender, age, tenure, interaction with supervisors, interaction with coworkers, and average weekly work hours were each assessed with a single item. All demographic items were presented at the beginning of the first survey.

Organizational constraints. The 11-item Organizational Constraints Scale (Spector & Jex, 1998) was used to assess constraints. The instructions and response options were modified to assess constraints over the previous work week. The Likert response scale had five potential responses ranging from *less than once a week* to *7 or more times a week*. The α for the scale was .88 at Time 1 and .87 at Time 2.

Coworker performance failure. Nine items were used to assess coworker failure (see Appendix A). Items five through nine were adapted from George's (1992) Social Loafing Scale. These items were altered to address coworkers instead of group members. These items were also altered to reflect frequency response options. Items that referred to customer service were not included in the current scale. Because coworker failure may not always be perceived as loafing, four additional items were created that focused exclusively on coworker failure. The Likert response scale had five potential responses ranging from *less than once a week* to *7 or more times a week*. The α for this scale was .92 at Time 1 and .92 at Time 2.

Supervisor pressure for OCB. Ten items were used to assess supervisor pressure for OCB (see Appendix B). Items six through 10 were adapted from

Vigoda-Gadot's (2007) Compulsory Citizenship Measure. These items were tailored to address only pressure from the supervisor. These items were also altered to reflect a frequency response format. Items one through five were adapted from the short version of the OCB Checklist (OCB-C; Fox et al., 2012). Although these items originally assess self-report behavioral frequency, we altered them to assess the frequency with which supervisors pressured the subordinate to commit that particular behavior. The items request that the participant reports the frequency of times the supervisor expected such behaviors over the previous work week. The scale has a 5-point Likert response format ranging from *none* to *7 or more times*. The α for this scale was .88 at Time 1 and .80 at Time 2.

OCB and CWB. Similar to Spector et al. (2010), short 10-item versions of the OCB-C (Fox et al., 2012) and the CWB Checklist (Spector et al., 2006) were adapted for the current study to assess OCB and CWB. For the 10-item CWB measure, the same scale was used as the scale in Spector et al. (2010) but one item was substituted to cover a greater area of the content domain. More specifically, the item "How often have you insulted someone about their job performance" was replaced with "How often have you started or continued a harmful rumor" because another item in the scale already contained some measure of verbal insult (i.e., how often have you insulted or made fun of someone at work). To determine which 10 items to include for the OCB scale, a panel of subject matter experts composed of three industrial organizational psychology doctoral students rated each of the 45 items from the OCB-C on how likely they thought it would be for employees to be pressured to commit each behavior within an organizational setting. From the highest rated items, 10 items were then selected that were believed to be relevant to the greatest number of occupations. For instance, items that referred to behaviors toward customers were avoided because not all jobs require customer interaction. Instructions and response options were tailored to assess behaviors over the previous work week. The items were also tailored to have an ambiguous target. Both scales have a 5-point Likert response format ranging from *none* to *7 or more times*. The α for the CWB scale was .78 at Time 1 and .76 at Time 2. The α for the OCB scale was .79 at Time 1 and .81 at Time 2.

Results

Data Preparation and Cleaning

One issue that researchers must be particularly careful with when conducting research on M-Turk is determining the quality of the data. Because

participants are being paid to participate in the study, some participants might be motivated to adopt strategies that maximize their monetary yield. It is possible that such a motivation can lead to multiple submissions from the same participant and frequent response sets such as careless responding.

Several measures were taken in the current study to prevent such issues from affecting the integrity of the data. First, each worker had a unique worker ID that we could use to eliminate redundant entries. Second, we followed the advice given by Mason and Suri's (2012) guide to collecting data on M-Turk. To investigate careful responding, we included some items that made sure that respondents were reading the question. For instance, the item "Please select the letter B out of the responses below" was included toward the end of the survey. Similarly, we screened participants based on their response times. More specifically, if the participant took less than 7 min to complete Survey 1, they were excluded from the data set. The minimum time limit was determined by the estimated completion time from subject matter experts (i.e., ~20 min) while taking into account that M-Turk participants tend to be more experienced and quicker than the general population due to their high frequency of participation in other surveys. Finally, participant's responses were excluded if they failed to complete more than 90% or more of each survey. In total, 113 cases were excluded, and the final sample consisted of 464 cases for the first survey and 183 cases for the second survey.

Hypothesis Testing

Means, standard deviations, and αs for all measures are reported in Table 1. OCB and CWB were expected to be positively associated with all three demands for OCB. All six hypotheses were fully supported. OCB and CWB at both time points and across both time points were positively associated with all OCB demands (i.e., organizational constraints, coworker failure, and supervisor pressure). See Table 2 for correlations among OCB demands and both OCB and CWB. Although OCB and CWB were positively associated with all three demands of OCB, the demands for OCB were also all highly interrelated within and across time points (see Table 2).

A series of regressions were conducted to explore the direction of the relationships between OCB demands and both types of workplace behaviors. Each measure of Time 2 OCB and CWB was regressed onto each OCB demand separately. These regressions controlled for organizational tenure and the corresponding Time 1 measurement of behavior. Organizational constraints and coworker failures predicted Time 2 reports of OCB and CWB (Tables 3 and 4). Supervisor pressure predicted Time 2 reports of OCB but

Table 1
Measurement Information

Variables	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Items	Scale type	α
Tenure	461	4.94	5.78	1	—	—
Age	464	33.36	11.44	1	—	—
Hours worked per week	463	38.28	11.27	1	—	—
Time 1 variables						
CWB	464	1.33	0.42	10	Established	.78
OCB	464	2.31	0.64	10	Established	.79
Organizational constraints	464	1.51	0.57	11	Established	.88
Coworker failure	464	1.89	0.79	9	New	.92
Supervisor pressure	464	1.44	0.55	10	New	.88
Time 2 variables						
CWB	183	1.25	0.33	10	Established	.76
OCB	183	2.12	0.62	10	Established	.81
Organizational constraints	183	1.44	0.51	11	Established	.87
Coworker failure	183	1.72	0.72	9	New	.92
Supervisor pressure	183	1.32	0.42	10	New	.80

Note. CWB = counterproductive work behavior; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior.

not CWB (see Table 5). Based on these regression analyses, there is some evidence to suggest that OCB demands can predict future display of OCB and CWB.

To further explore the directionality of the relationships, another series of regressions were conducted with Time 2 demands for OCB regressed onto Time 1 reports of OCB and CWB. Each Time 1 measure of behavior was entered into the regression separately while controlling for organizational tenure and Time 1 reports of OCB demands (see Table 6). OCB predicted Time 2 reports of organizational constraints, coworker failure, and supervisor pressure. CWB did not predict any Time 2 reports of OCB demands.

Because the OCB demands were positively associated with all measures of OCB and CWB, a series of multiple regressions were conducted to have some comparison between the different types of demands for OCB. Each measure of Time 1 OCB and CWB was regressed onto all three Time 1 measures of OCB demands (see Table 7). These regressions controlled for organizational tenure. Organizational constraints predicted unique variance in measure of CWB but not OCB. Conversely, coworker failure predicted unique variance in OCB but not CWB. Finally, supervisor pressure predicted unique variance in measures of both OCB and CWB. An identical analysis was also conducted on Time 2 measurements (see Table 8). A similar pattern of significance was observed with one notable exception. Supervisor pressure assessed at Time 2 did not predict unique variance in the Time 2 measurement of CWB.

Table 2
Correlations Among Focal Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. OCB	—										
2. CWB	.24**	—									
3. Organizational constraints	.32**	.58**	—								
4. Coworker failure	.46**	.41**	.60**	—							
5. Supervisor pressure	.45**	.54**	.63**	.56**	—						
6. OCB 2	.73**	.25**	.39**	.50**	.48**	—					
7. CWB 2	.15*	.74**	.50**	.43**	.37**	.27**	—				
8. Organizational constraints 2	.42**	.41**	.69**	.56**	.55**	.53**	.51**	—			
9. Coworker failure 2	.49**	.31**	.56**	.76**	.50**	.60**	.42**	.65**	—		
10. Supervisor pressure 2	.37**	.29**	.37**	.47**	.65**	.54**	.32**	.66**	.54**	—	
11. Tenure	−.03	−.04	−.04	−.01	−.04	−.02	0	.01	−.03	−.05	—

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; CWB = counterproductive work behavior. $N = 460$ for Time 1 variables, $N = 183$ for Time 2 variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 3
Time 2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) Regressed Onto Time 1 Organizational Constraints

	OCB 2			CWB 2		
OCB demands	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Tenure	0	.01	.02	0	0	.01
Behavior 1	.66	.05	.65**	.50	.05	.66**
Organizational constraints 1	.23	.07	.19**	.08	.04	.12*
Model *F*		70.44**			73.09**	
Model R^2			.54			.55

Note. $N = 459$ for Time 1 variables, $N = 182$ for Time 2 variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

The goal of the current study was to investigate potential situations that may elicit displays of both OCB and CWB. The results presented here suggest that OCB demands are positively associated with reports of both OCB and CWB reported a week later. Not only is this congruent with previous research that has been focused on the relationship between OCB and CWB (Fox et al., 2012; Reynolds et al., 2015) but it expands upon this research by empirically demonstrating that certain demands for OCB are antecedents to subsequent behaviors in some cases. Additionally, the results from the current study suggest that committing more OCB is associated with reporting more frequent demands for OCB the following week. Thus, the relationship between OCB demands and OCB may not be unidirectional. Alternatively, the relationship between CWB and OCB demands appears to be unidirectional, as CWB did not predict future OCB demands.

Although it was expected that OCB demands would precede OCB and CWB, it was not expected that committing more OCB would precede more frequent reports of OCB demands in the future. The reason for this finding is

Table 4
Time 2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) Regressed Onto Time 1 Coworker Failure

	OCB 2			CWB 2		
OCB demands	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Tenure	.01	.01	.04	0	0	.02
Behavior 1	.51	.04	.67**	.52	.05	.69*
Coworker failure 1	.06	.02	.16**	.08	.03	.19*
Model *F*		75.23**			47.18*	
Model R^2			.60			.57

Note. $N = 459$ for Time 1 variables, $N = 182$ for Time 2 variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 5
Time 2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) Regressed Onto Time 1 Supervisor Pressure

	OCB 2			CWB 2		
OCB demands	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Tenure	0	.01	.03	0	0	.01
Behavior 1	.63	.06	.63**	.57	.05	.75**
Supervisor pressure 1	.26	.07	.22**	−.10	.04	−.02
Model *F*		72.54*			70.27*	
Model R^2			.55			.57

Note. $N = 459$ for Time 1 variables, $N = 182$ for Time 2 variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

unclear, but there are a few potential explanations. First, those who commit OCB may be perceived as generally helpful or, at least, more self-reliant than other coworkers. Such assumptions may lead to greater constraints and demands once supervisors and colleagues realize they can depend on the employee to be helpful. Higher frequencies of OCB and expectations of OCB may be one potential manifestation of job creep (Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004). An alternative explanation is that committing OCB may change an employee's perceptions of the workplace. If employees work hard to go above their perceived job role, they might expect to see a significant change in the workplace. Thus, their expectations for support and organizational functioning may be higher than it would be if they chose not to help the organization. This could alter employees' reporting patterns on the second survey. Finally, it is possible that employee-committed OCB may not actually be that helpful in attenuating the presence of demands for OCB.

Table 6
Time 2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Demands Regressed Onto Time 1 OCB and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

	Org. Const. 2			Cow. Fail. 2			Sup. Press. 2		
OCB and CWB behaviors	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Tenure	0	.01	.01	0	.01	.03	0	0	−.05
Relevant OCB demand 1	.59	.05	.63**	.60	.05	.68**	.45	.05	.60**
OCB 1	.17	.05	.21**	.21	.06	.18**	.08	.04	.12*
Model *F*			67.98**			91.61**			45.04**
Model R^2			.53			.61			.43
Tenure	0	.01	0	0	.01	.03	0	0	−.06
Relevant OCB demand 1	.66	.06	.70**	.67	.05	.77**	.51	.05	.68**
CWB 1	0	.08	0	0	.09	0	−.05	.06	−.06
Model *F*			58.24**			83.47**			43.42**
Model R^2			.50			.59*			.42

Note. $N = 459$ for Time 1 variables, $N = 182$ for Time 2 variables. Org. Const. = organizational constraints; Cow. Fail. = coworker failure; Sup. Press. = supervisor pressure.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7
Time 1 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) Regressed Onto Time 1 Demands of OCB

	OCB 1			CWB 1		
OCB demands	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Tenure	.01	.01	.06	0	0	−.01
Organizational constraints 1	−.09	.07	−.08	.29	.04	.40**
Coworker failure 1	.30	.04	.36**	0	.03	0
Supervisor pressure 1	.34	.06	.28**	.23	.04	.30**
Model *F*		42.15**			73.39**	
Model R^2			.27			.39

Note. $N = 459$ for Time 1 variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

To compare the focal constructs, all three OCB demands were entered into regression analyses. More specifically, four regression analyses were conducted to determine the unique contributions from each demand in explaining variance across both extra-task behaviors and time points. Overall, the results from these analyses revealed that OCB demands predict unique variance in extra-task behaviors. Furthermore, the nature of the relationships varied across OCB demands. Although organizational constraints predicted reports of both Time 2 extra-task behaviors, organizational constraints were only a significant predictor of CWB when compared with the other OCB demands within both time points. Similarly, coworker failures predicted both Time 2 reports of extra-task behaviors but was only a significant predictor of OCB when compared with the other OCB demands within both time points. Thus, all three OCB demands appear to be important in predicting future displays of OCB and CWB, but the relative importance of each OCB demand may depend on the context and the criterion of interest.

Table 8
Time 2 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) Regressed Onto Time 2 Demands of OCB

	OCB 2			CWB 2		
OCB demands	*B*	*SE*	β	*B*	*SE*	β
Tenure	0	.01	.02	0	0	0
Organizational constraints 1	.13	.11	.10	.29	.06	.45**
Coworker failure 1	.41	.07	.44**	.06	.04	.14
Supervisor pressure 1	.35	.12	.22**	−.04	.07	−.05
Model *F*		36.01**			16.02**	
Model R^2			.58			.27

Note. $N = 182$ for Time 2 variables.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Implications for Management

Evidence from the current investigation offers several useful considerations for managers. First, it is important that managers understand the lens through which they observe displays of extra-task behaviors. Employees are often rewarded for displaying and reporting incidents of OCB within the workplace setting. However, employees might also be motivated to commit CWB in a covert fashion to avoid potentially punitive measures (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012). Thus, managers likely have an inaccurate estimate of the frequencies of extra-task behaviors committed by their employees. Furthermore, OCB and CWB are often considered opposite ends of the same continuum but the evidence presented here supports the notion that OCB and CWB are different constructs. These extra-task behaviors can co-occur within the organization and the employee. For instance, the same employee that stays late one night to assist their manager can also spread malicious gossip about their colleagues the next day. Such patterns of behavior are complex and managers are susceptible to the same biases (e.g., halo effect) as anyone engaged in behavioral observations (Belle, Cantarelli, & Belardinelli, 2017). Therefore, managers should be aware of their limited perceptual capacity related to the observation of extra-task behaviors.

When an employee is frequently observed committing OCB, managers may perceive such behavior as a positive indicator of effective organizational functioning. There is evidence that such an assumption may be accurate (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). However, there is also evidence that employees who frequently commit OCB may be reacting to perceived pressure to commit OCB and the additional burden may influence their well-being (Bolino et al., 2010, 2013; Fox et al., 2012; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Because it may be difficult for supervisors to determine antecedents to the displays of OCB based solely on their observations, it is recommended that managers collect additional information when engaging in the performance appraisal process. Although employees who commit high levels of OCB should be rewarded for their efforts, managers may want to inquire about the presence of possible OCB demands. Managers can reference existing documents (e.g., work hour logs, critical incident reports, previous performance appraisal data) or assess perceptions directly by effectively communicating with their subordinates. During the performance appraisal process, supervisors should be vigilant in regard to potential indicators of high levels of organizational constraints, coworker failures, and supervisor pressure for OCB. In the case of supervisor pressure for OCB and coworker failures, employees may not accurately report the presence of such perceptions directly to their supervisor. Information related to these sources of pressure

may be more accurately captured through anonymous surveys administered to employees and any mentors within the organization that they may identify.

If there is evidence that employees feel a high degree of pressure to commit OCB, there are a variety of interventions available to managers that range from complex adjustments to organizational policies to simpler adjustments of employee perceptions. A manager can advocate for changes in policy and procedures to remove organizational constraints from the workplace (e.g., reducing interruptions or malfunctioning equipment). Additionally, a high-level coworker failure could be addressed by retraining the target employee, altering workgroup assignments and processes to maintain a balance of responsibilities, and altering expectations of successful employees when they are engaging in interdependent tasks to better account for coworker failures. In regard to supervisor pressure for OCB, managers could decrease perceived pressure by clarifying job role boundaries during the performance appraisal processes. Moreover, managers may want to adapt their leadership style to be more congruent with a servant leadership style (Choudhary, Akhtar, & Zaheer, 2013). The interventions mentioned here are in reference to the three OCB demands that were assessed in the current study. If other demands of OCB are identified, they may require a different approach. Conducting a needs analysis may help to identify interventions that may be successful.

Finally, managers should be aware that determining the success of an intervention may be difficult. When pressure to commit OCB is high, relieving this pressure will likely remove stressors or the perceptions of stressors. Thus, lower levels of employee strain should be observable. However, managers will also likely observe lower levels of OCB. Managers should be careful in determining when to intervene to remove pressure to commit OCB. Low levels of pressure to commit OCB may not be perceived as too stressful by employees but it likely depends on a host of contextual variables. Thus, managers should tailor the complexity of their investigation and the aggressiveness of their intervention to their particular organizational landscape.

Limitations and Future Directions

There were several limitations to the current study. First, the OCB demands included were workplace constructs that had been identified by researchers. However, future research should investigate which organizational factors employees' rate as causing the most amount of pressure to commit OCB. There may be some OCB demands that are more influential on employee behavior than the demands included in the current study. Addi-

tionally, the levels of perceived pressure from OCB demands may vary across employees, and future research should consider personality and motivational variables that moderate the OCB demand–extra-role behavior relationship. For instance, negative affectivity (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) and hostile attribution bias (Williams, Lochman, Phillips, & Barry, 2003) are likely to influence how an employee perceives demands from the organization.

Another limitation of the current study is that it is self-report. The results of this study would be more conclusive if similar results were observed among supervisor or coworker reports of employee OCB demands and displays of OCB. Considering the design of the current study, it is possible that common method bias may have had some influence on the magnitude of the zero-order correlations. However, method variance is unlikely to affect results of multiple regression analyses with multiple predictors (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010). Future research can control common method bias among the measures by collecting data from other sources (Podsakoff et al., 1997). Admittedly, this may prove difficult as the visibility of OCB and CWB within the organizational setting can be controlled, to some extent, by the employee. Future research should determine if the same pattern of associations is observed across reports from different organizational members.

Future research should also investigate other potential timeframes over which these focal variables are assessed. The current study adopted a 1-week time lag. However, it would be interesting to determine the nature of the relationships across several time-points over the span of a year or more. Although there is some indirect evidence reported here that OCB may yield future demands for OCB, it would be useful to further investigate the potential bidirectional nature of the relationship over a greater span of time. Measuring perceived growth in responsibilities across this timeframe may also yield contributions to the literature.

Conclusion

The current study was the first to investigate how OCB demands were associated with future displays of OCB and CWB. The study was unique in that it adopted a prospective design. OCB demands were found to predict future displays of OCB and CWB. Conversely, committing OCB was associated with future reports of OCB demands. Thus, the relationships between demands for OCB and OCB is likely not unidirectional. Overall, the findings of this study indicate that OCB demands are an important precursor and a potential outcome of OCB and CWB. Although additional research should be conducted, these results suggests that managers should engage in a concerted

effort to investigate the underlying mechanism related to incidents of extra-task behaviors. Although incidents of OCB are beneficial for the organization, they may also be an indicator that employees are being exposed to workplace stressors. Managerial intervention may be necessary to enhance employee well-being.

References

Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 247–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.247

Balducci, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Fraccaroli, F. (2011). The job demands–resources model and counterproductive work behaviour: The role of job-related affect. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20,* 467–496. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594321003669061

Barger, P., Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., & Evan, F. S. (2011). IO and the crowd: Frequently asked questions about using mechanical turk for research. *TIP, 49,* 11–18.

Belle, N., Cantarelli, P., & Belardinelli, P. (2017). Cognitive biases in performance appraisal: Experimental evidence on anchoring and halo effects with public sector managers and employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 37,* 275–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0734371X17704891

Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97,* 613–636. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026739

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 410–424. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.

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,* 542–559. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1847

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,* 835–855. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.635

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, and Associates. (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San-Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. C., & Penner, L. A. (2001). Citizenship performance: Its nature, antecedents, and motives. In B. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace* (pp. 45–61). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10434-002

Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1991). Negative affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 398–407. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.398

Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116,* 433–440. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1470-8

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86,* 278–321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 425–445. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1241–1255. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241

Dalal, R., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 52,* 1051–1066. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.44636148

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining and social support in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45,* 331–351.

Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., & Byington, E. (2006). How, when, and why bad apples spoil the barrel: Negative group members and dysfunctional groups. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 27,* 175–222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(06)27005-9

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85,* 199–220. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x

George, J. M. (1992). Extrinsic and intrinsic origins of perceived social loafing in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 191–202.

Hanson, M. A., & Borman, W. C. (2006). Citizenship performance: An integrative review and motivational analysis. In W. Bennett, C. E. Lance, & D. J. Woehr (Eds.), *Performance measurement: Current perspectives and future challenges* (pp. 141–173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., . . . Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 228–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.228

Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: DC Heath & Co. Lexington Books.

Hung, T. K., Chi, N. W., & Lu, W. L. (2009). Exploring the relationships between perceived coworker loafing and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of a revenge motive. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24,* 257–270. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9104-6

Jex, S. M., & Beehr, T. A. (1991). Emerging theoretical and methodological issues in the study of work-related stress. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 9,* 311–365.

Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 126–138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.126

Lam, S. S. K., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 594–601. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.594

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 131–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131

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,* 52–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.52

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 326–336. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.2.326

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A., & Bennett, N. (2004). Social loafing: A field investigation. *Journal of Management, 30,* 285–304. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2003.02.002

Mason, W., & Suri, S. (2012). Conducting behavioral research on Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods, 44,* 1–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0124-6

Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10,* 51–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00193

Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1159–1168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159

Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 1543–1567.

Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43–72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 777–796. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.336

Peters, L. H., & O'Connor, E. J. (1980). Situational constraints and work outcomes: Influences of a frequently overlooked construct. *Academy of Management Review, 5,* 391–397. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.1980.4288856

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,* 262–270. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262

Pond, S. B., Nacoste, R. W., Mohr, M. F., & Rodriguez, C. M. (1997). The measurement of organizational citizenship behavior: Are we assuming too much? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27,* 1527–1544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb01611.x

Reynolds, A., Shoss, M., & Jundt, D. (2015). In the eye of the beholder: A multi-stakeholder perspective of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors. *Human Resource Management Review, 25,* 80–93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2014.06.002

Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10,* 5–11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00189

Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2010). Common method bias in regression models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods, 13,* 456–476. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428109351241

Smith, C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 653–663. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653

Spanouli, A., & Hofmans, J. (2016). Walking the tightrope: Counterproductive work behavior as compensation for citizenship demands. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7,* 1530. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01530

Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 781–790. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019477

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 269–292. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). A model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151–174). Washington, DC: APA. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10893-007

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2010a). Counterproductive work behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour: Are they opposite forms of active behaviour? *Applied Psychology, 59,* 21–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00414.x

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2010b). Theorizing about the deviant citizen: An attributional explanation of the interplay of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work

behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 20,* 132–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.06.002

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68,* 446–460. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005

Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3,* 356–367. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.3.4.356

Taggar, S., & Neubert, M. (2004). The impact of poor performers on team outcomes: An empirical examination of attribution theory. *Personnel Psychology, 57,* 935–968. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00011.x

Taggar, S., & Neubert, M. J. (2008). A cognitive (attributions)-emotion model of observer reactions to free-riding poor performers. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 22,* 167–177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9058-0

Van Dyne, L., & Ellis, J. B. (2004). Job creep: A reactance theory perspective on organizational citizenship behavior as over-fulfillment of obligations. In J. A. M. Coyle-Shapiro, L. M. Shore, M. S. Taylor, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 181–205). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R. S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 952–966. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.952

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Redrawing the boundaries of OCB? An empirical examination of compulsory extra-role behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 21,* 377–405. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-006-9034-5

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 1063–1070. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063

Werner, J. M. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 10,* 3–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00036-4

Williams, S. C., Lochman, J. E., Phillips, N. C., & Barry, T. D. (2003). Aggressive and nonaggressive boys' physiological and cognitive processes in response to peer provocations. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 32,* 568–576. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15374424JCCP3204_9

Zellars, K. L., & Tepper, B. J. (2003). Beyond social exchange: New directions for organizational citizenship behavior theory and research. In J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 22, pp. 395–424). Greenwich, CT: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301(03)22009-0

Appendix A

Coworker Performance Failure

Please indicate how many times the following events occurred over the previous work week . . .?	Less than once	1–2 times	3–4 times	5–6 times	7 or more times
1. A coworker who was unable to perform his/her job.					
2. A coworker did not complete his/her tasks on time.					
3. A coworker asked you to help him/her complete their task.					
4. A coworker did his/her tasks incorrectly.					
5. A coworker deferred his/her responsibilities to someone else.					
6. A coworker did not do his/her share of the work.					
7. A coworker put forth less effort than other coworkers.					
8. A coworker avoided performing housekeeping tasks.					
9. A coworker left his/her work for the following shift to complete.					

(*Appendices continue*)

Appendix B

Supervisor Pressure for Organizational Citizenship Behavior

How many times over the previous week do you experience the following situations?	Less than once	1–2 times	3–4 times	5–6 times	7 or more times
1. My supervisor asked me to give advice to coworkers about their job.					
2. My supervisor asked me to assist coworkers with the completion of their responsibilities.					
3. My supervisor asked me to complete work tasks that are not part of my job.					
4. My supervisor asked me to work during non-work hours.					
5. My supervisor asked me to provide emotional support for coworkers.					
6. My supervisor put pressure on employees to engage in extra-role work activities beyond their formal job tasks.					
7. My supervisor pressured me to work extra hours, beyond the formal workload and without any formal rewards.					
8. My supervisor pressured me to invest more effort in this job than I want to and beyond my formal job requirements.					
9. My supervisor forced me to help coworkers beyond my formal obligations.					
10. My supervisor made me assist him/her beyond my formal job obligations and against my will.					