

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Managing Interpersonal Conflict at Workplace

Japneet Kaur*

Organizations nowadays require employees who can go beyond the formal requirements of the job role and can act as the 'good soldiers' for them. Literature suggests that the positive work behaviors (Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB)) have a profound impact on the performance of individuals as well as of the organizations. However, very limited research has been carried out to investigate the relationship between negative work behaviors and Interpersonal Conflicts (ICs) arising at workplace. Therefore, this paper has been framed with the purpose of studying the impact of citizenship behaviors on IC at workplace. Empirical research carried out on a sample of 96 employees comprising executives and managers from four major private and public banks. From the results, citizenship behaviors have been found to associate negatively with IC at workplace. Also, extra-role behaviors have been found to predict 60.5% of variance in IC among employees at job places. The high predictive ability of organizational citizenship behaviors for IC illustrates managerial implications to reduce some of the counterproductive work behaviors (like IC). Further, no significant difference exists in the citizenship behavior and conflict levels among employees of private and public banks.

Introduction

With the banking sector entering into a dynamic and erratic business environment, sustaining organization's viability has emerged as a complex and challenging task for the managers (Jordan and Sevastos, 2003; and Ahmed *et al.*, 2012). To enhance organizational performance, firms need more employees who are willing to surpass the formal roles and responsibilities which are often defined by their formal job descriptions (Jordan and Sevastos, 2003; and Peelle III, 2007). These individuals are referred to as the 'good soldiers' (Organ, 1988, p. 160) of an organization distinguished by demonstration of the extra-role behaviors which tend to influence the overall performance of the organization. Such extra-role behaviors have been referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) (Bateman and Organ, 1983). In this era of cutthroat

* Research Scholar, University Business School, Punjab University, Chandigarh-160014, India.
E-mail: japneet15@gmail.com

competition, performance becomes a major criterion for success, defined as the 'actions and behaviors that are under the control of the individual and contribute to the goals of the organization' by Rotundo and Sackett (2002), which also demarcates the top performers from the underachievers (p. 66). As the performance of employees is a result of the behaviors they portray, it becomes imperative to study the underlying behaviors concerning performance. The overall job performance of an employee is a mix of three behaviors, namely, task behavior, citizenship behavior and counterproductive behavior (Colquitt, 2008). Task behavior, also known as In-Role Behavior (IRB), is a behavior that an employee demonstrates while fulfilling the formal duties and requirements of his job. The third category of behaviors move from being 'good soldiers' of organization (Organ, 1988) to being 'bad apples', where the employee behaviors intentionally hinder organizational goal accomplishment and are referred to as Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB), defined as the 'voluntary behavior of organizational members that violates significant organizational norms and, in doing so, threatens the wellbeing of an organization, its members, or both' (Robinson and Bennett, 1995, p. 556). The CWB has been viewed by various authors differently, including organizational aggression (Neuman and Baron, 1998; and Fox and Spector, 1999), antisocial behavior (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997) and workplace deviance (Hollinger, 1986; and Robinson and Bennett, 1995). As today, most of the jobs require at least a minimum amount of interaction with other people (co-workers), such social interactions possibly become a source of satisfaction and personal fulfillment (Riordan and Griffeth, 1995; and Nielsen *et al.*, 2000), but these interactions may result in making work more stressful, if Interpersonal Conflicts (ICs) arise at workplace (Jex and Britt, 2008). CWB includes acts directed at both organizations and people and has been found to be associated highly with IC (Spector and Fox, 2005), and conflict at work has been found to be an important and pervasive workplace stressor (Eatough, 2010). IC at workplace represents the extent to which an employee has negatively charged social interactions with his co-workers (Spector, 1987 as cited in Eatough, 2010). Workplace conflicts have important ties to employee behaviors relevant to organizations (Eatough, 2010). Therefore, analyzing employee behaviors relevant to the organization's wellbeing and also those which work against the organization occupies a vital position in literature and research.

This paper focuses on examining the relationship between extra-role behaviors (OCBs) and ICs arising at workplace among the employees of the public and private sector banks. Additionally, it also aims at analyzing the differences (if any) between public and private sector employees in terms of using these citizenship behaviors.

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The concept of OCB came into limelight when Bateman and Organ (1983) coined the term OCB in 1983 (as cited in Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000, p. 513). The concept was drawn

from Chester Barnard's "willingness to cooperate" (Barnard, 1938 as cited in Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000, p. 513) and Daniel Katz's distinction between dependable role performance and "innovative and spontaneous behaviors" (Katz, 1964). OCB term is synonymous with the "extra-role behavior" coined by Katz (1964). Dennis Organ defined organizational citizenship behavior as 'individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable' (Organ, 1988, p. 4).

Empirical research has focused on four major categories of antecedents: individual (or employee) characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and leadership behaviors (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). Organ (1988) argued that OCB should be determined more by personality/dispositional factors than by ability and motivational factors. Early researchers focused on two major sets of employee characteristics as predictors of OCB: one of them was the general affective "morale" factor, which included the employee's satisfaction with the job, organizational commitment, perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1991; and Jahangir *et al.*, 2004) and perceptions of leader supportiveness (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000); and the second set comprised dispositional factors related to personality (Organ, 1990, 1994; Organ and Lingl, 1995; Penner *et al.*, 1997; and Jahangir *et al.* 2004) and positive and negative affectivity (Organ and Ryan, 1995; and Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). Job satisfaction is the leading predictor of OCB (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith *et al.*, 1983; Williams and Anderson, 1991; and Jahangir *et al.*, 2004). Job satisfaction has been found to have a positive impact on job performance and OCB (Davis, 1992; Brown, 1993; Sager, 1994; and Jahangir *et al.*, 2004). Organizational commitment has also been seen to influence OCB positively (Williams and Anderson, 1991; and Van Dyne *et al.*, 1995), and affective commitment is the strongest antecedent of OCB as it maintains the behavioral direction when there is little expectation of formal rewards (Allen and Meyer, 1996; and Jahangir *et al.*, 2004). The job attitudes, task variables, and various types of leader behaviors appear to be more strongly related to OCBs than other antecedents (Bateman and Organ, 1983; and Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000). It can be seen from the previous studies that OCB impacts the performance of the individual as well as of the organization, hence it is important to determine the level of OCB and also to compare the same among the employees of public and private sector banks. To accomplish this objective, the following hypothesis (H_1) has been framed:

Hypothesis 1: There exists a significant difference in the levels of perceived OCB among employees of select public and private sector banks.

Interpersonal Conflict (IC) at Workplace

Moore (1986) defined conflict as 'struggle between two or more people over values, or competition for status, power and scarce resources' (p. 64). Workplace conflict occurs when an employee perceives that his interests are being obstructed or negatively affected by another party (Aquino, 2000). IC has been defined as the negatively charged interactions with others at workplace (Keenan and Newton, 1985; and Spector, 1987). These interactions may vary from something very momentary to extreme levels like physical violence (O'Leary-Kelly *et al.*, 1996; and Jex and Britt, 2008). Barki and Hartwick (2004) define IC as 'a dynamic process that occurs between interdependent parties as they experience negative emotional reactions to perceived disagreements and interference with the attainment of their goals' (p. 1). IC at work is behavior involving people imposing their will on others and victimizing them through extraordinary behaviors (Tepper, 2000; and Boody, 2013). Conflict at work consists of covert behaviors that are indirect and less identifiable, or overt behaviors with very direct and obvious intentions (Spector and Jex, 1998).

IC at work is a prevalent occupational stressor and has important relationships to a variety of organizational and employee outcomes (Eatough, 2010). IC at work has been related to various behavioral, psychological, attitudinal, and physical health outcomes (Eatough, 2010). Considering the behavioral aspect, IC at workplace is associated with increase in counterproductive work behavior (Penney and Spector, 2005; Bayram *et al.*, 2009; and Eatough, 2010), absenteeism (Giebels and Janssen, 2005; and Eatough, 2010), and reduced job performance (Aquino and Bommer, 2003). IC has been found to be negatively associated with job satisfaction (Penney and Spector, 2005), organizational commitment and turnover intentions (Spector and Jex, 1998; Frone, 2000; Giebels and Janssen, 2005; Liu *et al.*, 2007; and Eatough, 2010).

Hypothesis 2: Significant difference exists in the levels of IC at workplace among employees of select public and private sector banks.

Extra-Role Behaviors (OCB) and IC at Workplace

Low levels of OCB may contribute to higher levels conflict (Kabanoff, 1991). OCB predicts conflict but in negative direction (Enns and Routondo, 2007). Negative correlations were seen among work-family conflict and OCB (Bragger *et al.*, 2005; and Amstad *et al.*, 2011). OCB predicts the conflict resolution strategies deployed by the individuals. It has been found in earlier researches that forcing and withdrawing strategies negatively predicted OCB (Alper *et al.*, 2000; Alotaibi, 2001; Ogungbamila, 2006; and Salami, 2010). Also, effective conflict management can increase the in-role performance and the extra-role (OCB) performance (De Dreu *et al.*, 2001; and Salami, 2010). The previous research findings indicate negative association between OCB and IC. The research study aims to explore the relationship among the variables in the context of banking industry. Based on the literature, it has been proposed that OCB correlates negatively with IC.

Interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism behaviors are expected to reduce the levels of conflict among the co-workers in the banking sector. These citizenship behaviors should discourage IC among employees. Hence, to validate their relationship, the following hypotheses have been framed:

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry and loyal boosterism behaviors will lead to lower levels of IC among the employees.

Hypothesis 4: OCB has a significant impact on IC among the employees of banking sector.

Methodology

This empirical research has been conducted using the explanatory research design to understand whether there is a negative relationship between citizenship behaviors and IC at workplace, and whether we can predict conflict with pre-defined OCB levels of employees in relation to the banking sector of India. For this research purpose, organizational citizenship behavior has been considered as the independent variable, whereas IC at workplace (IC) has been considered as the dependent variable.

Sample and Procedure

The study was conducted on the employees of select public and private sector banks with the help of multi-stage sampling with first stage of stratification of banks into public and private banks and selection of branches on random basis and further using non-probability measures to select the respondents. Four banks were selected (two from each category—public and private) based on high market capitalization (as of March, 2012) and maximum number of employee criterion as per RBI statistics (FY 2011-12). The branches were selected on random basis using the Chit technique; further the selection employees of in the branches was done using the convenience sampling. In total, 120 questionnaires were administered in the form of survey to the employees of select banks, out of which 96 correct and usable questionnaires fit for data analysis were received (response rate 80%). Table 1 gives a brief overview of the data collected from various banks. The respondents were asked to fill the structured questionnaires, which included items related to the independent and dependent variables as well as demographics such as age, marital status, gender, educational qualification, designation and years of experience.

The demographic statistics of the respondents were as follows: Less than half (44.4%) of respondents belonged to the public sector banks, whereas a little more than half (55.2%) were from the private sector banks. Out of all, 56.2% were males and a majority (83.3%) of respondents were married. Table 2 represents the complete demographic profile of the respondents. Table 3 briefly describes the scale of respondents corresponding to their banks.

Table 1: Number of Respondents from Each Bank and Sector-Wise		
Bank	N	n Sector-Wise
PNB	21	43
SBI	22	
AXIS	34	53
HDFC	19	
(N)	96	96

Note: n = Total number of respondents from each bank and sector; and N = Total number of respondents.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Sample		
Demographics	Frequency	Percentage (% Out of Total N = 96)
Gender		
Male	54	56.2
Female	42	43.8
Marital Status		
Unmarried	16	16.7
Married	80	83.3
Age Group (Years)		
<25	6	6.2
25-34	44	45.8
35-44	12	12.5
>44	34	35.4
Educational Qualification		
Graduate	37	61.5
Postgraduate	59	38.5
Sector		
Public	43	44.8
Private	53	55.2
Designation/Scale		
Executive	33	34.4
JMG°	13	13.5

Table 2 (Cont.)

Demographics	Frequency	Percentage (% Out of Total N = 96)
MMG ^{°°}	30	31.2
SMG ^{°°°}	20	20.8
Experience (Years)		
<5	37	38.5
5-9	16	16.7
10-14	6	6.2
14-19	6	6.2
>19	31	32.3
Note: ° Refers to junior management grade; °° refers to middle management grade; and °°° refers to senior management grade.		

Table 3: Sample Profile Based on Bank*Scale

		Scale				Total
		JMG	MMG	SMG	Executive	
BANK	PNB	1	6	4	9	21
	SBI	1	10	5	5	22
	AXIS	7	6	7	14	34
	HDFC	4	6	4	5	19
	Total	13	30	20	33	96
Note: ° Refers to junior management grade; °° refers to middle management grade; and °°° refers to senior management grade.						

Measures

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB was measured using citizenship instrument developed by Moorman and Blakely (1995) (see Appendix). This scale consists of 19 items used to describe the four dimensions of citizenship behavior. This scale was used on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The dimensions include Interpersonal Helping (IH)- 5 items, describing altruistic behaviors, such as responding to personal needs of co-workers in dealing with job-related problems; Individual Initiative (II)-4 items which refer to employee efforts to improve individual and team performance, challenge group thinking, and encourage participation; Personal Industry (PI)-4 items, describing adherence to rules and instructions, unusual attention to quality and performance of tasks above and beyond

the call of duty; and last, Loyal Boosterism (LB)-5 items, describing the uncritical faithfulness towards the organization, defense of organizational interests and contribution to the organization's good reputation and general welfare. Reliability of this scale was found to be 0.886.

Interpersonal Conflict at Workplace Scale (ICAWS)

The IC at workplace was measured using the ICAWS developed by Spector and Jex (1998). ICAWS consists of four items which help in assessing how well the respondent gets along with others at work, specifically getting into arguments with others and how often others act nasty to the respondent. This scale was used on a five-point Likert scale, with response choices ranging from "never" to "very often". High scores represent frequent conflicts with others. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.854.

Data Analysis

To test the research hypotheses, different techniques were used. First, the descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were calculated to determine the level of existence of OCB as perceived by the respondents at their jobs. Second, a test for normality of data was done to check whether the data follows the normal distribution or not. Third, Mann-Whitney U test was used to perform a comparative analysis of perceived OCB level among the employees of public and private sector banks.

Fourth, a bi-variate correlation matrix using the Pearson's correlation was created to establish the relationships among the research variables. Finally, simple linear regression analysis was applied to demonstrate the relationship between OCB and the dependent variable, i.e., IC. The analyses were done using SPSS 16 package.

Results and Discussion

Normality Test: The distributional shape of the two variables was examined to determine the extent to which the assumption of normality was met. For this purpose, widely accepted numerical tests, Shapiro-Wilk and the Kolmogrov-Smirnov (Lilliefors significance), were used. Kolmogrov-Smirnov (K-S) test is appropriate where the sample size is extremely large. In case, where the size of sample is greater than seven and less than or equal to 2000, the Shapiro-Wilk test results are considered important (Shapiro and Wilk, 1965, pp. 3-4). In both the tests, a p -value of less than 0.05 indicates that the data follows a non-normal distribution (Lomax, 2007). Both the tests were conducted to check the normality of data and the statistics indicated the violation of assumption for normality for data (S-W = 0.952, $df = 96$, $p = 0.002$), (K-S = 0.171, $df = 96$, $p < 0.001$) for OCB (S-W = 0.917, $df = 96$, $p < 0.001$) (K-S = 0.115, $df = 96$, $p = 0.003$). Hence, it is considered that the data doesnot follow the normal distribution. Considering this, further hypotheses testing has been conducted using an appropriate mix of parametric and non-parametric measures.

Descriptive Statistics

The median scores and standard deviations were calculated for variables considering employees of public and private sector of banks. The median score OCB for employees of public banks was 4.45 (SD = 0.311), and 4.39 (SD = 0.342) for those of private banks; the median in both the sectors is higher than the scale mean of 3.00. Additionally, the median score of IC at workplace among the employees was 1.77 (SD = 0.555) for public sector banks and 1.73 (SD = 0.488) for private sector banks. It has been found that the median OCB of public and private sector banks was above the average median of 3, which reveals that high citizenship behaviors are exhibited by the employees of select public and private sector banks, whereas the conflict among the employees is low.

Hypotheses Testing

A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted at the significance level .05 and the results of the test indicated that there was no significant difference in the perceived levels of OCB among the employees of public (Mdn = 4.47) and private sector banks (Mdn = 4.36), $U = 983.5$, $p = 0.249$. Thus, this suggests that the level of OCB is same among the employees of public and private sector banks, hence we reject the first hypothesis (H_1). Similarly, the difference in the levels of IC was to be evaluated among the different sectors, and the Mann-Whitney U test results suggested that there was no difference in their levels, with median of 2.00 and 2.00 for public sector and private sector banks respectively, $U = 1055$, $z = -0.633$ and $p = 0.527$. The findings of Mann-Whitney U test suggest that there is no difference in the conflict levels among the public and private sector employees. As the results of the test do not support the second hypothesis (H_2), we reject it.

Correlations

The basic statistics like median, standard deviations, internal reliabilities and inter-correlations among the variables are presented in Table 4. All measures were found to be reliable with the coefficient alphas ranging from 0.646 to 0.886. Degree of correlation among the variables has been ascertained using the Pearson's correlation coefficient, as the data has been measured using interval scale (variables are measured using Likert scale). Also, the Pearson's test of correlation has been found to be robust enough to withstand the violations of normality assumption, thus facilitating its application (Field, 2000, p. 86; Runyon *et al.*, 1996; and Bishara and Hittner, 2012, p. 5). The Pearson's correlation coefficients among the variables were statistically significant and support the hypothesized relationships, i.e., OCB was found to have a statistically significant negative relationship with IC at workplace $\{r(96) = -0.802, p < 0.001\}$.

OCB, Its Dimensions and Its Relationship with IC

Highly significant negative relationship was obtained between OCB and IC at workplace, $\{r(96) = -0.802, p < 0.001\}$. The dimensions of OCB also demonstrated significant negative

	Median	SD	1	3	4	5	6	7
1. Organizational Citizenship Behavior	4.42	0.328	(0.886)					
2. Interpersonal Conflict at Workplace	1.75	0.517	-0.802*	(0.854)				
3. Interpersonal Helping	4.43	0.325	0.826*	-0.648*	(0.671)			
4. Individual Initiative	4.40	0.384	0.856*	-0.716*	0.628*	(0.785)		
5. Personal Industry	4.30	0.440	0.891*	-0.776*	0.726*	0.755*	(0.646)	
6. Loyal Boosterism	4.52	0.395	0.764*	-0.551*	0.564*	0.454*	0.561*	(0.858)

Note: N = 96; SD = standard deviation; Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) of each scale have been mentioned on the diagonal (in parentheses); * $p < 0.001$; and $\alpha = 0.05$.

correlation; interpersonal helping $\{r(96) = -0.648, p < 0.001\}$, individual initiative $\{r(96) = -0.716, p < 0.001\}$, personal industry $\{r(96) = -0.776, p < 0.001\}$ and lastly, loyal boosterism $\{r(96) = -0.551, p < 0.001\}$ had a moderate correlation with IC at workplace. Taking into account the Pearson's correlation results, the proposed third hypothesis has been accepted, which suggests a strong negative correlation between the two variables.

Regression Analysis

The assumptions of linear regression suggest normality of standardized residuals (y and x) and linear relationship between them (Seltman, 2013). The variables OCB and IC were measured using interval scale and to apply regression analysis, the distributions of standardized residuals (error term) for both the variables were analyzed. The error terms were found to follow normal distribution. The normal shape of the residual terms fulfilled the assumptions of regression, hence facilitating the application of linear regression on the data used for possible analyses of OCB's impact on IC. Table 5 represents the results of simple linear regression conducted to predict the impact of independent variable (OCB) on the dependent variables, IC at workplace. OCB accounted for 60.5% ($R^2 = 0.605$) of

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Remarks
	B	Standard Error	B	
OCB→Interpersonal Conflict at Workplace	-1.224	0.102	-0.778	H_4 accepted

Note: N = 96; OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior; B = unstandardized regression coefficients; and significance at $p < 0.001$ level.

variance in IC at workplace, and was found highly significant, $\{F(1,94) = 143.6, p < 0.001\}$. As, these regression results are consistent with our hypothesized impacts of OCB on IC, we accept the fourth hypothesis framed in this context.

Conclusion

This research focused on understanding the relationship of OCB and IC at workplace in the context of banking industry. OCB, being the extra-role behavior, has been considered as a separate construct than the in-role behavior linked to in-role performance. The results suggest that OCB is strongly associated with conflict and has the ability to predict IC among the employees of banking sectors.

The first hypothesis of the study stands rejected, as the results of Mann-Whitney U test were not found significant, suggesting that there is no significant difference in the citizenship levels among the employees of public and private sector banks. This finding reflects the exposure of public and private sector banks to different cultures' and practices though they operate in a similar dynamic environment, but still the level of OCB has been found similar irrespective of the sector.

The relationship of OCB and IC at workplace also got a significant negative result, $r(96) = -0.802, p < 0.001$, complementing the hypothesis. The OCB dimensions share a significant negative association with IC resulting in acceptance of third hypothesis. Results supported fourth hypothesis, signifying the ability of OCB to predict IC at workplace ($R^2 = 0.605$). These findings are similar to those of Salami (2010), which signify that the management of conflict can be done by appropriate citizenship behaviors. Also, according to Salami (2010), forcing and withdrawing strategies negatively predicted OCB, signifying an inverse and negative impact of OCBs on conflict management styles.

The present research findings have both theoretical and practical implications. The current study highlights the need for enhancing positive work behaviors among employees, which will aid in increasing the performance of employees, thus inculcating the spirit of growth and healthy competition. The other important finding, which has a major implication when it comes to interactions of employees, adding to tension at job place, is the demonstration of strong negative impact of OCB on IC. The managers/supervisors should focus on increasing extra-role behaviors amongst employees which will lead to reduction in conflicts and make workplace more stress-free, where individuals can enjoy their work as well as show good behaviors by supporting and helping others in their work as well as building a powerful image of their organization. The citizenship behaviors can be used as a means of reducing the counterproductive behaviors such as aggression and IC (Fox *et al.*, 2001) at workplace among employees.

Limitations and Future Scope: Firstly, the self-report measures used in the study for data collection can add on to bias. Secondly, the size of the sample has been restricted due to time constraints, and lastly, the sample chosen for study is based on non-random sampling, which cannot be considered representative of the population. To remove these

shortcomings, it is suggested to use a mix of self-report measures along with supervisor reporting, which may be complemented with the qualitative data collection methods like focus groups and in-depth interviews. A longitudinal study can also be planned considering similar variables with a large sample size. A similar study can be conducted across the industries to facilitate the generalization of inferences. □

References

1. Ahmed N, Rasheed A and Jehanzeb K (2012), "An Exploration of Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Significant Link to Employee Engagement", *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 99-106.
2. Allen J and Meyer N (1996), "Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity", *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 49, pp. 252-276.
3. Alotaibi A G (2001), "Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Study of Public Personnel in Kuwait", *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 363-376.
4. Alper S, Law K S and Tjosvold D (2000), "Conflict Management, Efficacy, and Performance on Organizational Teams", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 625-642.
5. Amstad F T, Meier L L, Fasel U *et al.* (2011), "A Meta-Analysis of Work-Family Conflict and Various Outcomes with a Special Emphasis on Cross-Domain Versus Matching-Domain Relations", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 151-169.
6. Aquino K (2000), "Structural and Individual Determinants of Workplace Victimization: The Effects of Hierarchical Status and Conflict Management Style", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 171-193.
7. Aquino K and Bommer W (2003), "Preferential Mistreatment: How Victim Status Moderates the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Victimization", *Organization Science*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 374-385.
8. Barki H and Hartwick J (2004), "Conceptualizing the Construct of Interpersonal Conflict", *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 216-244.
9. Barnard C I (1938), *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
10. Bateman T S and Organ D W (1983), "Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee 'Citizenship'", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 587-595.

11. Bayram N, Gursakal N and Bilgel N (2009), "Counter Productive Work Behavior Among White-Collar Employees: A Study from Turkey", *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 180-188.
12. Bishara A J and Hittner J B (2012), "Testing the Significance of a Correlation with Non-normal Data: Comparison of Pearson, Spearman, Transformation, and Resampling Approaches", *Psychological Methods*, Vol. 17, pp. 399-417.
13. Boody C R (2013), "Corporate Psychopaths, Conflict, Employee Affective Well-Being and Counterproductive Work Behavior", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 102, pp. 255-259.
14. Bragger J D, Srednicki O R, Kutcher E J, Indovino L and Rosner E (2005), "Work-Family Conflict, Work-family Culture, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Among Teachers", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 303-324.
15. Brown R (1993), "Antecedents and Consequences of Salesperson Job Satisfaction: Meta Analysis and Assessment of Causal Effects", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 30, pp. 63-77.
16. Colquitt J A (2008), "Job Performance", *Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*, 1st Edition, pp. 34-63, Tata McGraw Hill.
17. Davis R V (1992), "Person-Environment Fit and Job Satisfaction", in C J Cranny and P C Smith and E F Stone (Eds.), *Job Satisfaction*, pp. 69-73, Lexington Books, NY.
18. De Dreu C K W, Evers A, Beersma B *et al.* (2001), "A Theory Based Measure of Conflict Management Strategies in the Workplace", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 22, pp. 645-668.
19. Eatough E M (2010), *Understanding the Relationships Between Interpersonal Conflict at Work, Perceived Control, Coping, and Employee Well-Being*, Graduate School Theses and Dissertations, Scholar Commons, University of South Florida.
20. Enns J R and Rotundo M (2007), *Relative Group Status and Its Effect on Intergroup Counterproductive Work Behaviour During Conflict*, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association for Conflict Management, Budapest, Hungary.
21. Field A (2000), *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS for Windows*, Sage Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks, CA.
22. Fox S and Spector P E (1999), "A Model of Work Frustration-Aggression", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 20, pp. 915-931.
23. Fox S, Spector P E and Miles D (2001), "Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp. 291-309.

24. Frone M (2000), "Interpersonal Conflict at Work and Psychological Outcomes: Testing a Model Among Young Workers", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 246-255.
25. Giebels E and Janssen O (2005), "Conflict Stress and Reduced Well-Being at Work: The Buffering Effect of Third-Party Help", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 137-155.
26. Giacalone R A and Greenberg J (1997), *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*, SAGE Publications.
27. Hollinger R C (1986), "Acts Against the Workplace: Social Bonding and Employee Deviance", *Deviant Behavior*, Vol. 7, pp. 53-75.
28. Jahangir N, Akbar M M and Haq M (2004), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents", *BRAC University Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 75-85.
29. Jex S M and Britt T W (2008), *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*, John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey.
30. Jordan C and Sevatos P (2003), "Improved Understanding of Job Performance: Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviours from Perceived Organizational Support and Fairness", *Australian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 55, pp. 131-132.
31. Kabanoff B (1991), "Equity, Equality, Power and Conflict", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 415-441.
32. Katz D (1964), "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior", *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 9, pp. 131-133.
33. Keenan A and Newton T J (1985), "Stressful Events, Stressors, and Psychological Strains in Young Professional Engineers", *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, Vol. 6, pp. 151-156.
34. Liu C, Spector P E and Shi L (2007), "Cross-National Job Stress: A Quantitative and Qualitative Study", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 209-239.
35. Lomax R G (2007), "Introduction to Hypothesis Testing: Inferences About a Single Mean", *An Introduction to Statistical Concepts*, 2nd Edition, Routledge.
36. Moore C (1986), *The Meditation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflicts*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
37. Moorman R H (1991), "The Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 845-855.
38. Moorman R H and Blakely G L (1995), "Individualism - Collectivism as an Individual Difference: Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, pp. 127-142.
39. Neuman J H and Baron R A (1998), "Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes, and Preferred Targets", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 24, pp. 391-419.

40. Nielsen I K, Jex S M and Adams G A (2000), "Development and Validation of Scores on a Two-Dimensional Workplace Friendship Scale", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 60, pp. 628-43.
41. O'Leary-Kelly A M, Griffin R W and Glew D J (1996), "Organization-Motivated Aggression: A Research Framework", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 225-253.
42. Ogungbamila B (2006), "Relational Conflict Resolution Strategies (RCRS) and Workplace Frustration", *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 59-64.
43. Organ D W (1990), "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", in B M Staw and L L Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 12, pp. 43-72, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
44. Organ D W (1994), "Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 465-478.
45. Organ D W (1988), *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
46. Organ D W and Lingl A (1995), "Personality, Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 135, No. 3, pp. 339-350.
47. Organ D W and Ryan K (1995), "A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, pp. 775-800.
48. Peelle III H (2007), "Reciprocating Perceived Organizational Support Through Citizenship Behaviors", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 554-575.
49. Penner LA, Midili A R and Kegelmeyer J (1997), "Beyond Job Attitudes: A Personality and Social Psychology Perspective on the Causes of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Human Performance*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 111-131.
50. Penney L and Spector P E (2005), "Job Stress, Incivility, and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB): The Moderating Role of Negative Affectivity", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26, No. 7, pp. 777-796.
51. Podsakoff P, MacKenzie S, Paine B and Bachrach D (2000), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 513-563.
52. Riordan C M and Griffeth R W (1995), "The Opportunity for Friendship in the Workplace: An Underexplored Construct", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 10, pp. 141-154.
53. Robinson S L and Bennett R J (1995), "A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 555-572.

54. Rotundo M and Sackett P R (2002), "The Relative Importance of Task, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Performance to Global Ratings of Job Performance: A Policy Capturing Approach", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp. 66-80.
55. Runyon R P, Haber A, Pittenger D J and Coleman K A (1996), *Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics*, 8th Edition, Tata McGraw-Hill, New York.
56. Sager J K (1994), "A Structural Model Depicting Salespeople's Job Stress", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 22, pp. 74-84.
57. Salami S O (2010), "Conflict Resolution Strategies and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Moderating Role of Trait Emotional Intelligence", *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 75-86.
58. Seltman H J (2013), *Simple Linear Regression, Experimental Design and Analysis*, pp. 213-240, Carnegie Mellon University. Retrieved from <http://www.stat.cmu.edu/~hseltman/309/Book/Book.pdf>
59. Shapiro S S and Wilk M B (1965), "An Analysis of Variance Test for Normality (Complete Samples)", *Biometrika*, Vol. 52, Nos. 3-4, pp. 591-611.
60. Smith C A, Organ D W and Near J P (1983), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 653-663.
61. Spector P E (1987), "Interactive Effects of Perceived Control and Job Stressors on Affective Reactions and Health Outcomes for Clerical Workers", *Work and Stress*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 155-162.
62. Spector P E and Fox S (2005), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigation of Actors and Targets*, APA Books, Washington, DC.
63. Spector P E and 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*, Vol. 3, pp. 356-367.
64. Tepper B J (2000), "Consequences of Abusive Supervision", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 178-190.
65. Van Dyne L, Cummings L L and Parks J M (1995), "Extra-Role Behaviors: in Pursuit of Construct and Definitional Clarity (A Bridge Over Muddied Waters)", in L L Cummings and B M Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, pp. 215-285, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
66. Williams L J and Anderson S E (1991), "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 601-617.

Appendix

Questionnaire

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Scale – Moorman and Blakely (1995)						
		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1.	I go out of my way to help my co-workers with work-related problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2.	I voluntarily help new employees settle in their jobs.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3.	I frequently adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4.	I go out of my way to make newer employees feel welcomed in the work group.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5.	I show genuine concern and courtesy towards co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situation.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6.	For issues that may have serious consequences, I express my opinions honestly even if others disagree with it.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7.	I often motivate others to express their ideas and opinions.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8.	I encourage others to try new and more effective ways of doing their jobs.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
9.	I encourage hesitant and quiet co-workers to voice their opinions.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
10.	I frequently communicate to co-worker's suggestions on how the group can improve.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
11.	I rarely miss work even when I have a genuine reason to do so.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
12.	I perform my duties with unusually few errors.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Appendix (Cont.)

		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
13.	I perform my job duties with extra-special care.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
14.	I always meet deadlines for completing work.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
15.	I defend my organization when other employees criticize it.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
16.	I encourage my family and friends to use the products and services of my bank (organization).	<input type="checkbox"/>				
17.	I defend my organization when outsiders criticize it.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
18.	I show pride when I represent my organization in public.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
19.	I actively promotes my bank's products and services to the potential customers.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Interpersonal Conflict At Work Scale (ICAWS) – Spector and Jex (1998)						
		1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Quite Often	5 Very Often
1.	How often do you get into arguments with others at work?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
2.	How often do other people yell at you at work?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3.	How often are people rude to you at work?	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4.	How often do other people do nasty things to you at work?	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Appendix (Cont.)

Demographics

Gender: Male Female

Marital Status: Unmarried Married

Age Group: <25 years 25-34 years
 35-44 years >44 years

Educational Qualification: Postgraduate Graduate
 Professional Undergraduate

Others (please specify) _____

Job Role: Managerial Non-Managerial

Designation: _____

Years of Service in the Organization: <5 years 5-9 years
 10-14 years 15-19 years
 >19 years

Bank: _____

Name: _____

Contact Details: E-mail id _____

Mobile (Optional): _____

Reference # 06J-2014-10-02-01

Copyright of IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior is the property of IUP Publications and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.