UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE INTENTIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

MEGAN R. TURNER
Norman, Oklahoma
2017

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/52916

THE INTENTIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Shane Connelly, Chair

_____
Dr. Michael Mumford

_____
Dr. Lori Snyder

© Copyright by MEGAN R. TURNER 2017
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people that I would like to recognize for their contributions to this thesis. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Shane Connelly. Her guidance throughout this project and others has been invaluable to my growth as a graduate student and as a researcher. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Lori Snyder and Dr. Michael Mumford, for their time and consideration. Their recommendations were always useful in strengthening this research. I also greatly appreciate the time and effort provided by my colleagues, Brett Torrence, Chanda Sanders, and Keith Strasbaugh, in completing the ratings for this project. Additionally, I would like to thank my colleagues Alisha Ness, Brett Torrence, Tristan McIntosh, and Tyler Mulhearn for their wisdom and support throughout this process. Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family for inspiring my curiosity and for always encouraging me to pursue my dreams.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iv
List of Tables vi
List of Figures vii
Abstract viii
Outcomes of OCB 3
OCB Withdrawal and Contextual Influences 6
    Interpersonal Conflict 6
    Organizational Justice 9
    Downsizing: A Threat to Job Security 12
    Contextual Combinations: A Multiplicative Effect 15
OCB Withdrawal and Motivation 16
Method 23
    Sample 23
    Design 23
    Procedures 23
    Manipulations 25
    Outcome Variables. 26
    Covariates 29
Results 31
    OCB Withdrawal 32
    Task Performance 36
    Motivation 37
    Hypothesis Testing 38
Discussion 41
    Limitations 41
    Theoretical and Practical Implications 44
    Suggestions for Future Research 46
    Conclusion 47
References 49
Appendix A: InnoMark Case 58
Appendix B: In-Basket One Tasks 59
Appendix C: In-Basket Two Tasks 61
Appendix D: High Interpersonal Conflict, Low Organizational Justice, and High Downsizing Threat Condition 63
Appendix E: Low Interpersonal Conflict, High Organizational Justice, Low Downsizing Threat Condition 65

List of Tables

Table 1. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Covariates on Anticipated Participation in OCBI and OCBO at Time Two*……..……..67
Table 2. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Significant Covariates on The Number of Items Participants Chose to Complete in In-Basket Two*……. 68
Table 3. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Significant Covariates on The Time Allocated to Items in In-Basket Two*....……..…….…….……..69
Table 4. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Responses to OCBI Items in In-Basket Two* ……..70
Table 5. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Responses to OCBO Items in In-Basket Two* ……..….71
Table 6. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Responses to Job Task Items in In-Basket Two* …….72
Table 7. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Quality and Effort Scores for Each Item Type in In-Basket Two*……73
Table 8. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Qualitative Responses to New Contextual Information*…….74
Table 9. *Intercorrelations Among Significant Dependent and Covariate Variables* …...75
Table 10. *Condition Counts and Descriptive Statistics for Participant's Scores on Significant Dependent Variables.* ……...……... 76

List of Figures

Figure 1. Quality of Performance on Job Task Items Based on Downsizing Threat and Interpersonal Conflict 77

Abstract

Current definitions of withdrawal behavior include actions that fall beneath the umbrella for counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). These acts of withdrawal include behaviors such as lateness, absenteeism and turnover intentions. The present effort investigates the intentional withdrawal of good behavior, specifically organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), as an additional form of withdrawal behavior not previously addressed in the literature. The intentional withdrawal of OCB is likely to comprise a variety of actions including reduced participation in OCB, completing OCBs at a lesser quality or shifting one's motivations for completing OCB. To investigate these withdrawal behaviors, contextual shifts in organizational (downsizing threat and organizational justice) and personal (interpersonal conflict) work elements were examined as factors related to the induction of OCB withdrawal. In addition, the motivations for an individual's continued OCB in the face of negative contextual factors were examined. These motivations included prosocial values, organizational concerns, image enhancement, obligation and functionality. Results provide some preliminary evidence to suggest that individuals withdraw their OCB in contexts of low organizational justice, but increase their participation in OCB when facing downsizing threat. For the examination of motivation, participants' responses to the contexts of high downsizing threat and low organizational justice were significantly influenced by a sense of obligation. Furthermore, participants experiencing high interpersonal conflict expressed less image enhancement motivation.

Keywords: Organizational citizenship behavior, OCB withdrawal, motivation, downsizing threat, organizational justice, interpersonal conflict.

The Intentional Withdrawal of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) have become a popular topic for organizational research in the past thirty years. The formal discussion of OCBs as an organizational phenomenon began with Organ's seminal work on OCB as "the good soldier syndrome" (Organ, 1988). Historically, Organ (1997) defines these behaviors 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" (p. 95). Arguably, OCBs have been so popular due to their resoundingly positive implications for enhanced organizational effectiveness (Allen & Rush, 1998; Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Koys, 2001; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). In fact, the literature on OCB has been so resonantly positive that many definitions of the construct include phrases such as, "serve to facilitate organizational functioning" (Lee & Allen, 2002, p.132). Although the supporting evidence for positive OCB outcomes remains undeniable, such one-sided definitions truncate the scope of academic and professional understanding when it comes to these behaviors.

To effectively understand and fully utilize OCBs, it is important to understand the conditions under which these behaviors do and do not produce useful outcomes. For example, recent research suggests that OCBs have positive implications, but only if done in moderation (Grant & Schwartz, 2011; Pierce & Aguinis, 2011) and for the right reasons (MacDougall, 2015; MacDougall, Buckley, Johnson, and Mecca, 2016). In addition to the potential negative implications that stem from over indulgence in OCBs, there is reason to believe that negative outcomes could also result from circumstances in

which individuals choose to withdraw OCBs. In particular, it is known that certain factors, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, positive affective relationships, and justice perceptions may compel individuals to engage in OCB (Dalal, 2005; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Venkataramani & Dalal, 2007). If certain factors drive employees to start completing OCBs, it is reasonable to conclude that shifts in these elements may compel them to stop (i.e., withdrawal OCB), and that this change in helping behavior may have implications beyond those induced by the original decision to complete OCBs.

At the present, withdrawal is defined as a, "set of behaviors dissatisfied individuals enact to avoid the work situation" (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990, p. 63), and it includes such behaviors as turnover, absenteeism, and burnout. When employees pull away or withdraw from their work, organizations may see declines in efficiency, while also losing talent and valuable time to rehiring (Rosse & Noel, 1996). Given these negative associations, acts of withdrawal typically fall beneath the umbrella of counterproductive work behavior (CWB), which is "intentional employee behavior that is harmful to the legitimate interests of an organization" (Dalal, 2005, p. 1241). Similar to literature on OCB, literature on both withdrawal and CWB tends to narrowly focus on harmful work behaviors that result in negative outcomes. In fact, these links are so often made that CWB and OCB are often considered polar-opposites, with CWB being placed at the "bad" end of the behavioral continuum and OCB positioned at the "good" end. This seemingly black and white behavioral classification fails to consider instances where good behavior may be withdrawn. Arguably, the withdrawal of OCB is

inherently different from traditional theories on OCB, CWB, or withdrawal behaviors as they are currently defined.

Given the lack of research in this area, it remains unclear under what circumstances OCBs may be withdrawn and what consequences may result from this behavior. The purpose of the present research is to investigate the intentional withdrawal of OCB as an additional form of withdrawal behavior. The present study also works to examine the contexts under which OCB withdrawal will occur. Specifically, this effort will focus on contextual changes at the individual (interpersonal conflict) and organizational (organizational injustice and downsizing threat) levels. Given the ties these situational factors have to the presence of OCB (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015; Lam, Liang, Ashford, & Lee, 2015), it is thought that the addition of negative shifts to any one of these contextual factors may lead employees to withdraw their OCB. Further, employee's motivation for completing OCB has been shown to alter the nature of OCB outcomes (MacDougall, 2015; MacDougall et al., 2016; Takeuchi, Bolino, & Lin, 2015). Given this association, this effort also seeks to investigate the motivations people have for choosing how to manage their completion of OCB given negative changes in their work context.

Outcomes of OCB

Undoubtedly, there is a large body of empirical literature that supports the association of OCB with positive outcomes. For example, OCBs have been tied to enhancements in productivity and efficiency, and improvements in customer satisfaction (Podsakoff, et al., 2009). Additionally, OCBs are credited with improving

organizational performance through the development of social capital and by reducing costs due to turnover and absenteeism (Bolino et al., 2002; Koys, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Along with positive organizational level outcomes, OCBs are also praised for their individual level effects. In particular, OCBs tend to increase manager liking, positive evaluations, and reward decisions (Allen & Rush, 1998; Bolino, Varela, Bande, & Turnley, 2006; Kiker & Motowildo, 1999). Such findings provide a reasonable foundation from which past theories have concluded that OCBs are generally good and should be encouraged.

Although the positive effects of OCB should not be ignored, recent shifts in the literature have begun to examine the potential for negative OCB outcomes. Much of this research has specifically examined the contexts in which participation in OCB may not yield traditionally positive outcomes. For example, research on OCB and the too-much-of-a-good-thing (TMGT) effect suggests that OCBs do yield positive outcomes, but only if done in moderation (Grant & Schwartz, 2011; Pierce & Aguinis, 2011). OCBs can be productive as long as employees are not pressured to complete them in excess. When there is too much pressure to engage in citizenship behavior, OCBs may lead to work-family conflict, work-leisure conflict, job stress, and increased turnover intentions (Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, & Suazo, 2010). Similarly, time spent on OCB may negatively impact career outcomes if it takes too much time away from task performance (Bergeron, 2007). These negative outcomes may include smaller salary increases and slower advancement in comparison to those who do not complete OCBs (Bergeron, Ship, Rosen, & Furst, 2013). Overall, the tradeoff between task performance and OCB appears to follow the law of diminishing returns. The more OCBs completed

at the expense of task performance, the lower the utility of each additional OCB in producing beneficial outcomes. However, it should be noted that the speed of the decline in returns for OCB may be mitigated by contexts of high interdependence or social density (Ellington, Diedorff, & Rubin, 2014). Outside of simply completing too much OCB, there are also circumstances in which OCBs may even occur alongside CWBs. For example, employees may participate in both OCB and CWB 1) when they are understimulated at work, 2) when their coworkers are not performing as needed, 3) when work conditions interfere with work tasks, 4) when there is a lack of expected rewards for OCB, or 5) when they perform unjustified CWB and then use OCB to restore feelings of justice (Spector & Fox, 2010, p. 21).

Broadly, the idea that OCBs only lead to positive results under the right circumstances is cause for apprehension. Many situational and personal elements lead employees to participate in OCBs. Yet, it remains unclear which of these factors link to positive or negative outcomes. Generally, enacting helping behaviors makes employee feel positive (Chancellor, 2013), thus, it is unlikely that they would terminate OCB without cause. However, if certain factors drive employees to start completing OCBs, it is reasonable to conclude that shifts in these elements may compel them to stop completing OCBs or to shift the manner in which OCBs are completed. Previous research suggests that traditional withdrawal behavior stems from dissatisfaction (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990) and it is possible that intentional OCB withdrawal does as well. However, the specific contexts that facilitate this withdrawal behavior and the consequences that result from the withdrawal of OCB remain unknown.

Companies are complex entities with many fluctuating parts that will change over time. Indisputably, organizational changes and social changes are disruptive and carry with them discomfort for some employees. If changes in the organization or changes to an employee's social landscape lead employees to feel dissatisfied and to withdraw their OCB, it is possible that these organizations are experiencing negative outcomes of organizational fluctuations that have been previously unconsidered.

OCB Withdrawal and Contextual Influences

Interpersonal Conflict

One contextual variable that is thought to influence OCB withdrawal is interpersonal conflict. Humans are social creatures, and as such, violations to our interpersonal structures and social communication bring a certain degree of discomfort. In general, interpersonal conflict between individuals or groups is thought to cause conflict stress, emotional exhaustion and other withdrawal behaviors (Giebels & Janssen, 2004). Employees who experience fatigue due to conflict stress have fewer resources to devote to extra role behaviors such as OCBs (Bolino, Harvey, Lepine, & Hsiung, 2015). Furthermore, having to emotionally deal with interpersonal conflict may lead to emotional exhaustion, a construct that is associated with job performance, OCB, and turnover intentions (Chiu & Tsai, 2006; Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003). Generally, the more time and energy that is dedicated to interpersonal group problems, the less there is available for OCBs.

For interpersonal conflict within a group, research suggests that there are a number of factors, such as perceived organizational support, quality of team-member exchange (TMX), and pressure to engage in OCB, that mediate the relationship between

citizenship fatigue and OCB (Bolino et al., 2015). Citizenship fatigue is defined as "a state in which feeling worn out, tired or on edge is attributed to engaging in OCB" (Bolino et al, 2015, p. 57). As it relates to TMX, when a work group is in conflict, building a positive TMX is likely to be difficult, which may result in fewer OCBs. Low levels of TMX have also been tied to decreased group identification, which reduces OCB completion (Farmer, Dyne, & Van, 2014). Identification with the work group has been found to be a strong motivator to help others (Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006). The less one identifies with a particular group, the less willing they are to devote resources to that group. In addition to group identification, high interpersonal conflict may impact both one's sense of group with cohesion (Tekleab, Quigley, & Tesluk, 2009). Interpersonal conflict simply does not lend itself to the presence of group cohesion. People are not likely to self-identify with a bickering work group and they are also unlikely to willingly provide extraneous resources in the form of OCBs.

There is also something to be said for the "change" to interpersonal relations that interpersonal conflict may induce. In many instances where OCBs exist, group norms have been set in place to maintain them. Korsgaard, Meglino, Lester, and Jeong (2010) specifically show that that reciprocity norms can affect rates of OCB completion. Increased interpersonal conflict may change normal interpersonal functioning of the group, which may cause the norm of reciprocity within that group to deteriorate. According to social exchange theory, exchange of personal time and resources through participation in OCB allows for both "the obligation to reciprocate" and the "expectation of reciprocity" to be generated and maintained. By completing OCBs, employees maintain their social obligations and make it more likely that they

will be the recipient of OCBs in the future (Korsgaard et al., 2010). Increases in interpersonal conflict could come to disrupt exchange norms within the work group. When coworkers are arguing, they are likely less inclined to help one another. In such a situation, it becomes far less clear when or if an employee's OCB will be rewarded. Thus, Hypothesis 1a:

H1a: Increases in interpersonal conflict will increase OCB withdrawal.

Along with a main effect of interpersonal conflict on OCB, interpersonal conflict may have a differential impact on different types of OCBs. Although, there are a few prominent OCB typologies (see McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Organ, 1988), the present effort will focus explicitly on the differentiation between OCBO and OCBI. OCBIs are helping behaviors directed at individuals and may include behaviors such as covering for a sick coworker or sharing personal property. OCBOs are helping behaviors directed at the organization itself and may include actions such as verbally defending the organization or working unpaid overtime. OCBO and OCBI are often regarded as two separate factors with different antecedents, motivations, outcomes and linkages to job satisfaction (Lee & Allen, 2002; McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Rioux & Penner, 2001). For example, Bergeron, Ostroff, Schroeder, and Block (2014) suggest that OCBOs may negatively impact career outcomes and productivity, while professional service OCBs (e.g., working overtime) will have a positive effect. Additionally, research suggests that prosocial values are a stronger motivator for OCBIs, while organizational concern is more strongly motivational for OCBOs (Rioux & Penner, 2001).

By definition, it seems logical that OCBIs rather than OCBOs would be withdrawn in a situation of interpersonal conflict. From the perspective of the employee, the problem will appear to lie with individual workers; therefore, extra-role helping behaviors directed at individuals may be reduced or removed. Also, social network ties are related to the performance and receipt of interpersonal citizenship behaviors (Bowler & Brass, 2006). If the social network of a group is disrupted due to interpersonal conflict, completion of OCBIs could decrease. Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015) specifically found that a spiral of reciprocal resource gain can develop between coworkers, which pushes them to invest personal resources in each other in the form of OCBIs. They argue that, under the conservation of resources theory, OCBs are resource investment behaviors. Shifting interpersonal relations that result from conflict may lead to shifts in the utilization of personal resources (i.e., OCBs). A conflict ridden, non-cooperative work group may not appear as a good investment. Additionally, if changes to interpersonal relations affect norms of reciprocity within the work group, it seems apparent that OCBI more so than OCBO, would be the specific type of OCB affected. In an instance of interpersonal conflict, OCBIs would be more directly related to the social norms and motivations being violated. This leads to Hypothesis 1b:

H1b: Increases in interpersonal conflict will lead to larger increases in the withdrawal of OCBIs compared to OCBOs.

Organizational Justice

Contextual changes related to organizational justice are also likely to influence intentional OCB withdrawal. Generally, justice can be broken down into three different categories distributive, procedural, and interpersonal justice (Cropanzano, Fortin, &

Kirk, 2015). Distributive justice deals with whether or not rewards, assignments, and punishments within an organization are actually given out in a fair manner (Cropanzano et al., 2015). Fair distribution may mean that rewards get divided up equally, based on merit or need (Adams, 1963; Lerner, Miller, & Holmes, 1976; Leventhal, 1976). The second element of justice is procedural justice, which deals with whether or not the procedures an organization carries out are fair and just (Cropanzano et al., 2015; Leventhal & Karuza, 1980). Procedural injustice applies to situations where organizational rules may be biased, inconsistent, or simply unethical. The third justice type is interactional justice. This type of justice is often broken down to include elements of interpersonal treatment and the communication of information (Greenburg, 1993a). Each of these justice types have a differing impact on employee perceptions of justice and employee behavior. For the purposes of this research we will be focusing on the distributive and procedural elements of justice. Both procedural and distributive justice are related to the presence of OCB in organizations (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Lambert & Hogan, 2013).

There is a relatively consistent positive link between high organizational justice and the presence of OCBs (Ball, Treviño, & Sims, 1994; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, 2001; Lambert & Hogan, 2013). Justice in organizations and an employee's perceptions of justice shift over time. While this research has only tested for the presence of OCB, and not necessarily OCB withdrawal, it is reasonable to conclude negative changes to procedural and distributive justice will impact employee perceptions of the organization, and potentially result in a reduction of OCB. Generally, people are motivated to believe that they live in a just world and are part of just

organizations (Cropanzano et al., 2015; Lerner, 1980). Unjust organizational behaviors may violate this belief, and can prompt an employee to pull away from the organization.

Similarly, procedural and distributive justice have a positive relationship to an employee's identification with an organization (Olkkonen & Lipponen, 2006). If a once just organization starts to be perceived as unjust, an employee may begin to feel unsupported (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Noruzy, Shatery, Rezazadeh, & Hatami-shirkouhi, 2011) and mistrustful of organization. These feelings may decrease organizational identification, which likely leads to employee withdrawal from workplace activities such as OCBs.

Furthermore, combinations of procedural and distributive injustice may produce particularly strong emotional reactions (Chory, Horan, Carton, & Houser, 2014), especially in contexts where the justice perceiver is personally impacted (Cropanzano et al., 2015). When facing such personal injustice, employees may feel angry with their organization and may withdraw their OCB to restore lost equity, or as a form of retaliation. Conversely, within the context of organizational injustice, OCB withdrawal could also result as a byproduct of citizenship fatigue. Overall, organizational injustice is likely to induce a context where emotional reactions are coupled with decreased organizational support and organizational identification. All of these factors are precursors to citizenship fatigue, which leads to reduced participation in OCB (Bolino et al., 2015; Lepine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Thus, Hypothesis 2a:

H2a: Decreases in organizational justice will increase OCB withdrawal.

There is also reason to believe that decreases in organizational justice will result in differential impacts for OCBOs and OCBIs. Generally, it appears logical that

OCBOs, rather than OCBIs, would be withdrawn in contexts involving organizational injustice. From the employee's perspective, the organization itself is likely at fault. Placing blame with the organization rather than any one individual is likely to result in greater reductions of OCBO. Additionally, perceptions of the justice issues related to reward equity and recognition have been shown to explain significant variance in OCBO (McNeely & Meglino, 1994). If a company is not perceived to be behaving fairly, employees will likely be less motivated to provide personal time and resources in the completion of OCBOs. This leads to Hypothesis 2b:

H2b: Decreases in organizational justice will lead to larger increases in the withdrawal of OCBO compared to OCBI.

Downsizing: A Threat to Job Security

In addition to interpersonal conflict and organizational injustice, organizational changes related to the induction of job insecurity are also likely to have a significant effect on rates of OCB completion. Although many contexts may induce the feeling of job insecurity, this effort will focus on downsizing. Overall, literature on the impact of threats to job security on OCBs remains somewhat mixed, suggesting that there may be individual differences in how employees perceive and respond to job insecurity.

To begin, when a company is downsizing, employees look for ways to maintain their position. In seeking ways to maintain their job during downsizing, employees may become more careful and strategic about where they chose to invest their resources (e.g. time, personal energy). According to the conservation of resources theory, "people must invest resources in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources" (Hobfoll, 2011, p.117). Within this context, one potential resource

investment option is to focus one's energy on increasing performance on job tasks. Both contextual and task performance have been shown to have a positive influence on manager reward decisions (Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999). However, task performance has been shown to be more important to employee's overall careers than contextual performance, like OCBs (Bergeron et al., 2013). In the context of downsizing, employees who see job tasks as more pertinent to the maintenance of their job may choose to demonstrate their worth by investing more effort into completing job tasks. In this scenario, OCB withdrawal may result as a byproduct of having less time and energy available to complete OCBs.

Beyond calculated resource investment, there are other reasons to suggest that employees may withdraw their OCB when presented with downsizing threat. For example, job insecurity may impact an employee's organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989; Feather & Rauter, 2004), which may push them to disassociate themselves from the organization. This decreased commitment and job satisfaction may manifest itself in the form of intentional OCB withdrawal or in more typical withdrawal behaviors, such as turnover intensions or absenteeism (Falkenburg, Schyns, 2007; Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009; Tett & Mayer, 1993). In addition, according to theories on the conservation of resources, "stress is the result of a threat to resources" (Halbesleben, 2006, p.1134). Stressful work environments can lead to fatigue or even burnout, both of which are not conducive to the continued completion of OCB (Bolino et al., 2015; Halbesleben, 2006). If an employee is stressed and concerned that he or she may soon lose monetary or other resources provided by a company, that employee may be less inclined to provide

personal resources in the form of OCBs. Should that employee make the active decision to withdraw OCBs, he or she may be more likely to withdraw OCBOs than OCBIs. As with organizational justice, employees are likely to blame the organization itself for issues related to job insecurity. Placing blame on the organization is likely to lead to OCBO withdrawal.

Alternatively, to help maintain one's job, the second option employees may choose is to increase participation in OCBs. According to Lam et al. (2015), there is a curvilinear relationship between job insecurity and rates of reported OCB. Specifically, OCBs decline under conditions of job insecurity until the insecurity threat becomes too great. In extreme instances of job insecurity, OCB will increase as the employee attempts to use these behaviors as a form of impression management (Lam et al., 2015). However, it should be noted that the curvilinear relationship between job security and OCB is moderated by manager support and psychological capital. Feather and Rauter (2004) also found that completion of OCB was positively related to perceptions of job insecurity. In general, research does indicate that completing OCBs can help to improve individual's performance reviews and likeability (Grant, Parker, & Collins, 2009; Bolino et al., 2006), both of which may help employees keep their jobs when cuts are made. When jobs are on the line, employees may use OCBs to, "demonstrate the ability to bear the burden associated with costly OCBs… [and to] signal their otherwise unobservable capabilities to others" (Salamon & Deutsch, 2006, p.185). This collective information prompts one research question and two hypotheses:

RQ1: How will downsizing threat impact an employee's participation in OCBs?

H3a: If the addition of downsizing threat induces OCB withdrawal, withdraw of OCBO will be more prevalent than withdraw of OCBI.

H3b: The addition of downsizing threat will maintain or increase performance on job tasks

Contextual Combinations: A Multiplicative Effect

Outside of main effects for each of these situational factors, there is reason to believe that the combination of multiple changes to employees' work life may lead to even greater reductions in OCB than any one change alone. For example, in times of uncertainty (e.g., downsizing) employees may look to organizational fairness as a source of stability (Cropanzano et al., 2015; Van den Bos, 2002). If that employee's organization is also behaving unjustly, then the employee will not be able to rely on organizational justice as a form of support. Such a combination of low justice and high downsizing threat may result in even greater perceptions of instability, which is likely to have a more severe effect on the withdrawal of OCB. Taken together, organizational injustice and downsizing threat may have a stronger effect on employee behavior than either contextual variable would have alone.

Similar suggestions regarding support and stability can also be said for combination of organizational injustice or downsizing threat with interpersonal conflict. When employees are uncertain and cannot find support within their organization (either due to downsizing or organizational injustice), they may choose to seek support from their work group. The argument here suggests that even if an employee is unhappy with their organization, due to insecurity or injustice, they may be able to find support in a functioning work group and use this to justify continued OCB. Conversely, if there is

high interpersonal conflict, employees may use an organization's high justice to justify continued OCB.

Broadly, it appears that when change is occurring, one source of support (e.g., organization or work group) may be substituted for another, possibly acting as a shield against complete OCB withdrawal. In a situation of high interpersonal conflict, high downsizing threat and low organizational justice, employees may find fewer sources of organizational support, which is likely to result in the greatest withdraw of OCB. Overall, the more negative situational factors exist, the more negatively impacted an employee will be. Negative work contexts and lack of social support may lead to increased depersonalization, emotional exhaustion and psychological strain (Francis, Mary, & Barling, 2005; Hallbesleben, 2006). All of these factors could lead to the withdrawal of OCB. Thus, the fourth hypothesis:

H4: Negative work changes have a multiplicative impact on OCB withdrawal. The more negative work changes that occur the greater the amount of withdrawal. Specifically, the condition with high interpersonal conflict, high downsizing threat and low organizational justice should see the greatest amount of OCB withdrawal.

OCB Withdrawal and Motivation

Up until this point, the discussion of OCB withdrawal has largely surrounded the concept of reduced participation in OCB. However, it should be noted that the intentional withdrawal of OCB is likely a process of events rather than a single event where all OCB is withdrawn. The process of OCB withdrawal may include behaviors such as choosing to complete fewer OCBs, completing OCBs at a lower quality,

shifting one's motivations for completing OCBs, or withdrawing specific types of OCBs. An employee's choice in how to go about withdrawing OCB may depend on both the strength of the contextual factors present and the employee's individual characteristics, such as agreeableness (Illies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, & Johnson, 2009), conscientiousness (Dalal, 2005; Organ, 1988), positive affectivity (Iverson & Deery, 2001) or equity sensitivity (McNeely & Meglino, 1994).

Within the process of intentional OCB withdrawal, the idea that employees may shift their motivation for completing OCBs, rather than stop completing them, is particularly interesting. Recent research has indicated that differing motivations for completing OCBs may ultimately lead to different outcomes (MacDougall, 2015). Given this association, it is plausible that an employee who chooses to complete OCBs due to a negative motivation may still reap the negative outcomes that are associated with more explicit removal of OCB. As indicated by the motivational research conducted on OCBs, people tend to complete OCBs for explicit reasons (MacDougall, 2015). Expectancy theory specifically suggests that employees were motivated to complete OCBs if they 1) perceive a link between their effort and their performance, 2) they believe that their performance will yield certain outcomes and 3) if they believe that those outcomes were positive (Haworth & Levy, 2001). If the context that pushes an individual to complete OCBs shifts and the employee does not choose to stop completing OCBs, it is plausible that their motivation for completing those OCBs may instead shift to accommodate the new context. For example, employees may start completing OCBs because they are committed to an organization and care about the organization's success. However, if that organization begins to treat an employee

unfairly, it is unlikely that the employee will continue to complete OCBs out of a concern for the organization's wellbeing. Instead, this employee may continue to complete OCBs, but become more motivated by a sense of obligation to continue or for self-serving purposes.

Shifts in OCB motivations are potentially problematic, given that employee motivations for completing OCBs impact the outcomes that ultimately result from those OCBs (MacDougall, 2015; MacDougall et al., 2016; Takeuchi et al, 2015). In particular, if an individual has negative or involuntary motivations for completing OCB, the outcomes of that OCB are unlikely to be positive. For example, Bolino, Turnley, and Niehoff (2004) found that OCBs may have negative consequences for organizations and individual employees when the employee completes OCBs for self-serving reasons. In addition, research suggests that participation in OCBs that is motivated by obligation rather than by discretionary motives, is likely to yield negative consequences for employees (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Bolino et al., 2010). The consequences of these nondiscretionary OCBs may include greater job stress, increased turnover intention, negligent behavior, reduced creativity, decreased job satisfaction and burnout (Gangé & Deci, 2005; Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). Overall, if employees are changing their motivation for completing OCBs or completely withdrawing their OCB, the individual and organizational level outcomes that stem from this behavior may shift or disappear. It is important for organizations to understand if employees are responding to changes in their organizational environment by altering their OCB motives, and if these shifts fundamentally change individual and organizational level outcomes.

For the purposes of the present effort, the motivational typology for OCBs developed by MacDougall et al., (2016) was used. Over the last decade, a variety of motivations for completing OCBs have been identified (Batson, 1987; Francis, Mary, Barling, 2005). The typology developed by MacDougall et al., (2016) is arguably one of the most complete. Within this typology, MacDougall explicitly identified nine distinct motives related to the completion of OCB. These motives include prosocial values, organizational concerns, atonement, obligation, functionality, task avoidance, personal discontent, social interests, and image enhancement and maintenance. For the purposes of the present effort, attention will be given to the motivations of prosocial values, organizational concern, image enhancement and maintenance, obligation, and functionality. Although important motivations, personal discontent, atonement, and task avoidance are more complex in terms of their individual relevance, and they are less applicable to the contexts of interest. As a result, these motivations will not be presently investigated. Social interest was also excluded due to its potential for overlap with prosocial values.

Prosocial Values. Motivations related to prosocial values are defined as, "a strong moral compass and concern for the welfare of others" (MacDougall, 2015, p.10). These motivations often stem from a desire to help or benefit other people (Grant & Mayer, 2009; Rioux & Penner, 2001). Typically, prosocial values are thought to stem from the individual. However, it is important to note that these motivations can be developed by job structure (Grant, 2007). Participation in OCBs due to prosocial values is possibly considered the most traditional reasoning for completing OCBs. In line with

this traditional view, prosocial OCB motives are negatively related to job stress and work-family conflict (MacDougall, 2015; MacDougall et al., 2016).

Organizational concerns. Organizational concern motivations are defined as, "motives that arise due to allegiance and devotion to the organization and a desire for it to do well" (MacDougall et al., 2015, p. 11). Employees who are motivated by organizational concerns may feel compelled to complete OCBs due to feelings of commitment or pride for the organization (Rioux & Penner, 2001). Organizational concern motives are considered the organizationally relevant form of prosocial behavior. Instead of completing OCBs due to concern for individual welfare, employees motivated by organizational concerns are interested in the wellbeing of the organization itself. Given this, it is likely that the experience of organizational concern motives will be positive and result from positive feeling or associations with the organization. Such a positive motivation will likely yield positive outcomes that are associated with more traditional versions of OCB.

Obligation. Employees may be motivated by obligation when they face pressure to engage in OCBs (MacDougall, 2015). Feelings of obligation have often been tied to negative outcomes. For example, obligation can push OCBs to become compulsory, which may ultimately lead to increased role ambiguity, work overload, job stress, and work family conflict (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Bolino et al., 2010; MacDougall, 2015; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). According to self-determination theory, feelings of obligation and pressure are related to controlled motivation. Controlled motivation is known to have a variety of negative impacts on employee burnout (Merriman, 2014) and creativity (Gangé & Deci, 2005).

Functionality. Individuals may also be motivated to complete OCBs because doing so serves a functional purpose (Fandt & Ferris, 1990). According to MacDougall (2015), "functionality, holds that employees engage in citizenship behavior due to the perceived utility or benefit in doing so." (p. 18). If an employee is completing OCBs due to a functional motive, they are not necessarily completing these activities due to internal, self-generated motivation. Similar to obligation, motivations related to functionality may ultimately feel more controlled and result in more negative outcomes for individuals and their organizations.

Image Enhancement and Maintenance. Image enhancement is a more strategic motivation (Bolino, 1999). As its name suggests, individuals who are motivated by image enhancement or maintenance complete OCBs in order to paint themselves in a more positive light. These individuals want to be perceived positively by others, and they complete OCBs in an attempt to improve others perceptions of their selflessness and willingness to complete extra-role behaviors (Grant & Mayer, 2009; MacDougall, 2015; Yun, Takeuchi, & Lin, 2007). In relation to outcomes, it has been suggested that ingratiation and OCBs are relatively alike. However, managers will respond more favorably to behaviors they see as helping behaviors (e.g. OCBs) in comparison to behaviors that only serve to improve the employee's image (Eastman, 1994). When employees enhance their image through the use of OCB, they may avoid the negative perceptions that would have been present with ingratiation behaviors alone, assuming that the manager does not recognize this crafty use of OCBs (Halbesleben, Bowler, Bolino, & Turnley, 2010). Furthermore, in more competitive work environments, employees may use OCBs to signal superiority to other employees or to

signal to managers that they are worthy of organizational rewards (Salamon & Deutsh, 2006).

It is thought that each of these motivations may develop under specific organizational contexts and each has a distinct relationship with individual and organizational outcomes (MacDougall, 2015; MacDougall et al., 2016). However, much is still unknown about the specific circumstances under which individuals may present each of these motivations and how these motivations may present themselves in light of OCB withdrawal. Contrary to assumptions often made in the current literature, the presence of OCB in organizations is not necessarily continuous. Since motivations for completing OCBs influence participation in these behaviors, it is likely that these motivations also influence the process of intentional OCB withdrawal. This collective information leads to Hypotheses 5a, 5b and 5c:

> *H5a: In situations of high interpersonal conflict, negative motivations (e.g., image enhancement, obligation and functionality) will be more strongly expressed as rationale for guiding an employee's behavioral responses than positive motivations (e.g., prosocial values and organizational concerns).*
>
> *H5b: In situations of low organizational justice, negative motivations (e.g., image enhancement, obligation and functionality) will be more strongly expressed as rationale for guiding an employee's behavioral responses than positive motivations (e.g., prosocial values and organizational concerns).*
>
> *H5c: In situations of high downsizing threat, negative motivations (e.g., image enhancement, obligation and functionality) will be more strongly expressed as*

rationale for guiding an employee's behavioral responses than positive motivations (e.g., prosocial values and organizational concerns).

Method

Sample

177 undergraduate psychology students from a large, Midwestern university voluntarily participated in this study for course credit. Individual participation was captured through a web-based data collection system. Participants were predominantly white (68.4%) and female (63%) with an average age of 19.6 (*SD* = 2.26) years.

Design

To test the proposed hypotheses, a 2 x 2 x 2 between-subjects design was used. Each of the independent variables (e.g., interpersonal conflict, organizational justice, and downsizing threat) were manipulated in a vignette that contained new information regarding shifts in the simulated organizational context. This vignette was provided to participants in the middle of the study following the first in-basket activity. Through the combination of these three manipulated variables, eight conditions were developed. Participants were randomly assigned to each of these conditions.

Procedures

A semi-qualitative survey was administered to participants online in a computer lab over a two-hour session period. Participants first completed the Big Five personality measure (John & Srivastava, 1999) and the trait Positive and Negative Affectivity Schedule (PANAS) measure (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Following the administration of these initial covariate measures, participants were embedded with a low-fidelity simulation where they were asked to take on the role of a marketing employee in a company named "InnoMark". The original organizational scenario

supplied participants with company background information, a description of their job role, and a description of their extra role activities (e.g., OCBIs and OCBOs). This initial scenario was taken from Johnson (2015) and modified for our purposes (see Appendix A).

Once embedded in the scenario, participants were presented with an in-basket exercise and the Lee and Allen (2002) OCB scale. Once these tasks were completed, participants were given a vignette detailing new information about their organizational context. This vignette served as the manipulation. After answering a few questions regarding their responses to this new information, participants were asked to complete a second in-basket measure and the Lee and Allen (2002) OCB scale was readministered.

Within each in-basket, participants were provided with a series short vignettes, each of which represented a different task that the participant would have the opportunity to complete. For each in-basket, these items included three job-related tasks, two OCBI tasks and two OCBO tasks. Although the in-baskets each contained distinct items, efforts were made to map the seven items from the first in-basket onto the seven items in the second in-basket. For example, OCBI item A1 within in-basket one is similar in length, complexity, and type of behavioral request made to that of item A2, which was in in-basket two (see Appendices B and C). For each of the in-basket measures, participants were instructed to allocate a fixed amount of time (6 hours) to the grouping of in-basket items, keeping in mind that they would not have time to complete all the tasks. In allocating their time, participants were asked both how much time it would take to complete the task if they had to, and how much of their 6 hours they were willing to allocate to the task. Following the time allocation section,

participants were asked to provide justification for their time allocations and to work on the items that they chose to devote time to. Following completion of the second in-basket measure and OCB scale, participants were provided with a measure of equity sensitivity (King & Miles, 1994), manipulation checks, and a series of demographic questions.

Manipulations

Before the second in-basket measure, participants were randomly presented with one of eight vignettes that corresponded to their condition. Each vignette contained new information about work group interpersonal conflict (high vs. low), organizational justice (high vs. low), and degree of downsizing threat within the organization (high vs. low). For the high interpersonal conflict condition, participants were told that they recently started working with a new project group, and that the members of the team had been bickering and gossiping about one another. In the low justice condition, participants received information about a manager, Brian, who had been distributing rewards unfairly and instituting unfair procedures. The aspects of injustice that were related to interactional justice were intentionally excluded from this manipulation in order to avoid potential overlap with the interpersonal conflict manipulation. For the high downsizing threat condition, participants were told that their company was merging with another firm and that there would be substantial downsizing. An example of the high interpersonal conflict, low organizational justice, and high downsizing threat condition can be found in Appendix D. An example of the low interpersonal conflict, high organizational justice, and low downsizing threat condition can be found in Appendix E.

Manipulation Checks. Likert scales were used to assess participant agreement (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*) with five statements related to each of the manipulations. One of the organizational justice items was later deemed invalid and excluded from the analyses. Following the removal of this item, manipulation checks were tested using independent sample *t*-tests. Participants in the high interpersonal conflict condition reported more work group conflict (M = 3.05, SD = .83) than those in the low conflict conditions (M = 1.88, SD = .76). Participants in the low organizational justice conditions also reported less perceived organizational justice (M = 2.77, SD = .59) than those in the high justice conditions (M = 3.86, SD = .85). Finally, participants in the high downsizing threat conditions reported feeling less secure in their job (M = 3.13, SD = .69) than those in the low downsizing threat conditions (M = 3.52, SD = .64).

Outcome Variables.

OCB Withdrawal. OCB withdrawal was measured in a variety of ways. To start, OCB was measured using the Lee and Allen (2002) OCB scale. This scale contained 16 items referencing how likely participants were to complete a series of OCBO and OCBI actions (1 = *never*; 7 = *always*). Instructions for this scale were modified from the original version to specifically reference OCBs that participants would be willing to complete within the organizational context provided. This scale was administered twice during the course of the study., once prior to study manipulation and once following the manipulation. This was done in order to establish a baseline for the measurement of change in OCB, and therefore OCB withdrawal, following the manipulation.

Additional measures of OCB withdrawal stem from the comparison of participant responses to OCB items within in-basket one to OCB items completed in the second in-basket. Specifically, changes in the types of items participants chose to allocate time to as well as the amount of time they chose to allocate were examined. Alongside these quantitative indicators, changes in the nature of participants' qualitative responses from time one to time two were examined for indications of OCB withdrawal. In particular, three trained graduate students rated participants' qualitative responses for each of the 14 in-basket items on organizational withdrawal (1 = *strong reengagement*, 3 = *neutral*, 5 = *strong withdraw*), negative affectivity (1 = *not negative affectivity*, 5 = *strong negative affect*), and priority given (1 = *low priority*, 5 = *high priority*). Interrater reliabilities (*r_{wg}) were examined for each of the 14 items. Organizational withdrawal, negative affectivity, and priority score reliabilities for each item were above .70 and the average reliability across items was .87 for organizational withdrawal, .98 for negative affectivity and .88 for priority.

Task Performance. Task performance was assessed through the evaluation of participants qualitative responses to each in-basket item that the participant chose to work on. Specifically, participant performance on each in-basket item was scored on a 5 point Likert scale for quality (1 = *poor quality*, 5 = *excellent quality*) and effort (1 = *very little effort*, 5 = *a great deal of effort*). Given that participants were only asked to work on items that they chose to allocate time to, participants who did not choose to allocate time to a particular item did not have a quality of effort score for that item. Responses were again rated by three trained graduate students. Training for these graduate students included frame-of-reference training (Bernardin & Buckley, 1981)

whereby raters received operational definitions and benchmark rating scales for all of the variables of interest. Interrater reliabilities (*r_{wg}) were examined for each of the 14 items. Quality and effort score reliabilities for each item were above .70, with the average reliability across items was .87 for quality and .86 for effort across items.

Motivation. In addition to measurements of OCB withdrawal and task performance, a series of open ended questions were used to measure participant motivation. These open-ended questions relate to participants' responses to the new organizational information presented in the manipulation. Specifically, participants were asked to reexamine the initial description of their work life that was provided at the start of the study, and to provide information about how they plan to respond to their work situation in light of the new organizational information provided. Specifically, participants were asked two questions 1) "*Looking back at this original description of your work activity, and in light of the new changes, how would you respond to this new information? Is there anything you would like to do differently?*" and 2) "*If you decided to make adjustments, please describe what motivated you to make these alterations*".

Participants' responses to these questions were then coded by a group of three undergraduate research assistants. Training for the research assistants included frame-of-reference training (Bernardin & Buckley, 1981) whereby raters received operational definitions and benchmark rating scales for all of the variables of interest. Variables coded included organizational withdrawal (1 = *strong reengagement*, 3 = *neutral*, 5 = *strong withdraw*), negative affect (1 = *no negative affectivity*, 5 = *strong negative affect*) and the presence of five motivations, including prosocial values (1 = *no demonstration of prosocial motive*, 5 = *strong presentation of prosocial motive*), organizational

concern (1 = *no demonstration of organizational concern*, 5 = *strong presentation of organizational concern*), image enhancement and maintenance motive (1 = *no demonstration of image enhancing motive*, 5 = *strong presentation of image enhancing motive*), obligation (1 = *no indication that response was driven by obligation*, 5 = *strong indication that response was driven by obligation*), and functionality (1 = *no indication that response was driven by functional motives*, 5 = *strong indication that response was driven by functional motives*). Interrater reliabilities (*r_{wg}) were calculated for each of the coded variables. Reliabilities for these variables are as follows: organizational withdrawal (.87), negative affect (.85), prosocial value motivation (.84), organizational concern motive (.78), image enhancement and maintenance (.82), obligation (.77), and functionality (.80).

Covariates

Big Five Personality Measure. Personality was assessed using the Big Five personality measure developed by John and Srivastava (1999). This scale asks participants to indicate their level of agreement (1 = *disagree strongly*, 5 = *agree strongly*) with a given list of 44 personality identifying items. Among this grouping of items are five personality subscales, including: agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, openness, and neuroticism. Of these subscales, agreeableness and conscientiousness were of particular interest given their ties to OCBs in the literature (Dalal, 2005; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Cronbach's α for the two personality subscales of interest are as follows: agreeableness (.80) and conscientiousness (.77).

Positive and Negative Affectivity. Participants' trait tendency to experience positive or negative emotions was assessed using a positive and negative affect (PANAS) scale (Watson et al., 1988). Within this measure, participants were asked to evaluate a series of 20 affective words based on the degree to which the participant generally experiences each emotion (1 = *very slightly or not at all*; 5 = *extremely*). Cronbach's α for the positive affectivity sub-scale measure was .79 and alpha for the negative affectivity sub-scale was .86.

Equity Sensitivity. Participants' level of equity sensitivity was assessed using King and Miles (1994) ESI measure. This scale provided participants with five trade-off items, each of which asked participants to devote 10 points to a set of two statements. One of the statements for each item was always an ESI benevolence item and the other was an ESI entitled item. Point allocation to each of the two items indicated how much that particular statement resembled the participant. Two subscales were generated from participant responses to this measure. The first subscale was an ESI entitled measure, which had a Cronbach's α of .79, and the second was an ESI benevolence measure, which had a Cronbach's α reliability of .80.

Demographics. Sixteen demographic items were administered to participants. These demographics included questions on participant age, gender, ethnicity, and experience in marketing. Additionally, questions were asked regarding participants major, year in school, GPA, previous knowledge of the study procedures and what the participant thought the study was about.

Results

Prior to testing the hypotheses, the in-basket data were reviewed for influential outliers. Scores identified as extreme outliers based on a review of the descriptive statistics and data plots were examined for potential exclusion within part or all of the analyses. In addition, participant qualitative responses from the in-basket were reviewed for any written indication that the participant had misunderstood the directions, or had mistakenly mistyped their time allocations. For example, some participants allocated an excessive amount of time in the in-basket (e.g. 20 hours), which clearly demonstrated a misconception of the instructions to allocate a total of six hours. In the instances where the participant made clear that they mistyped their time allocation (i.e., "I meant to write 30 minutes, not 30 hours") their time allocations for the appropriate item were rectified in the data set. In total, this review process resulted in the exclusion of the time allocation scores and the Lee and Allen OCB scale scores for twelve participants. Although it was deemed appropriate to remove these participants from the analysis of the time allocations and from the Lee and Allen measure, the qualitative data scores from these participants (e.g., justification for task choices, task performance) were retained. Arguably, participant's scores for the number of items chosen, their justifications made regarding task choices, and their performance on those tasks were less disrupted by over allocations of time.

Following this outlier analysis, hypothesis testing was completed using the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Independent variables were categorical and contained two levels. Summaries of ANCOVA results can be found in Table 1 through Table 8. Table 9 provides correlations between significant study dependent and

covariate variables. Table 10 lists descriptive statistics for covariates contributing significantly to one or more of the outcomes across each condition.

OCB Withdrawal

Lee and Allen OCB Scale. The effect of condition on responses to the OCB scale at time two were derived by covarying out variance associated with participants' responses to the scale at time one. The OCB scores were regressed on the set of covariates and significant covariates retained. The benevolence scale for equity sensitivity was the only other significant covariate retained for both OCBI and OCBO ANCOVAS.

The effects of interpersonal conflict, organizational justice, and downsizing threat were tested at the main and interaction levels for both OCBI and OCBO. Results showed a significant main effect of downsizing threat on OCBO, $F(1,155) = 4.51$, $p = .035$, such that in the presence of downsizing threat, participants indicated that they would increase their participation in OCBO. The results also exhibited a significant main effect for organizational justice for both OCBI, $F(1, 155) = 4.85$, $p = .029$ and OCBO, $F(1, 155) = 4.29$, $p = .040$. These results indicate that contextual shifts towards lower organizational justice may lead employees to participate in fewer OCBOs and OCBIs. ANCOVA results for interpersonal conflict produced no direct or interaction effects. See Table 1.

Post hoc comparisons were conducted to examine if there were mean differences in the amount of participant engagement in OCBO and OCBI across the low organizational justice condition. Initial t-test comparisons suggested that participants in the low justice conditions indicated that they would participate in significantly more

OCBO (*M* = 41.82, *SD* = 9.50) than OCBI (*M* = 34.90, *SD* = 8.50). However, this trend was also exhibited by individuals in the high organizational justice condition, such that those in the high organizational justice conditions also indicated that they would complete more OCBO (*M* = 44.37, *SD* = 7.54) than OCBI (*M* = 36.51, *SD* = 7.49).

Task Choice. To begin, given the limited possible range in responses for these analyses (e.g., participation in either 0, 1, 2, or 3 items) the number of items for each task type that participants chose to complete at time one were excluded as a covariate for these analyses. The effect of all remaining potential covariates were examined by regressing the task choice scores on the set of covariates. Regression analysis suggested that participants' ESI Benevolence score be retained as an influential covariate for the number of OCBI items chosen. In addition, marketing experience was used as a covariate for the number of Job Task items participants chose to participate in. No additional covariates had a significant relationship to the number of OCBO items chosen at time two.

Following identification of appropriate covariates, the effect of condition on the types of tasks that employees chose to participate in at time two was obtained by running an ANCOVA for each item type. The results indicated a significant main effect for organizational justice on the number of Job Task items chosen, $F(1,168) = 5.485$, $p = .020$, such that participants in the low organizational justice condition chose to participate in fewer Job Task items than participants in the high organizational justice condition. In addition, there was a significant interaction effect of downsizing threat and interpersonal conflict on the number of OCBI items chosen at time 2, $F(1,168) = 4.491$, $p = .036$. However, the overall model for this variable grouping was non-significant

within the ANCOVA (p = .104), making this interaction non-interpretable. For a summary of ANCOVA results see Table 2.

Time Allocation. Conditional effects on the average amount time participants chose to allocate to each item type were derived by covarying out variance associated with time allocations made at time one. Trait positive affectivity was also retained as a significant covariate for the total amount of time allocated to OCBI items.

The effects of interpersonal conflict, organizational justice, and downsizing threat were tested at the main and interaction levels for OCBI, OCBO, and Job Tasks. No significant main or interaction effects were found for any of the independent variables as they related to the time allocations participant chose to make. For a summary of these results see Table 3.

Qualitative Responses. In conjunction with the quantitative measures of OCB withdrawal, participants' justification for their time allocations to each item type (OCBO, OCBI, and Job Task) and their qualitative performance on those items was recorded. The effect of condition on the scores for participant organizational withdrawal, negative affectivity, and level of priority given to each item type was assessed by covarying out the variance associated with participant scores on these variables at time one. In addition, variable scores for each item type were regressed on the set of covariates and significant covariates were retained. Based on the results of the regression, participants ESI benevolence score, ESI Entitled core, trait positive affectivity, and their level of prior knowledge about the study protocol were retained as covariates in the ANCOVA analyses for OCBI. ANCOVA analysis for OCBO kept the same covariates, except for participants ESI entitled score, which was not significantly

influential as a covariate for OCBO. Lastly, for the ANCOVA related to Job Tasks participant ESI benevolence score, ESI entitled score, trait positive affectivity, and level of marketing experience were used as covariates.

The effects of each independent variable were tested at the main and interaction levels for OCBI, OCBO, and Job Tasks. No significant conditional effects of negative affectivity, organizational withdrawal, or priority were found for any of the qualitative responses on OCBI, OCBO, or Job Task items. See Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6 for a summary of these results.

In addition to the scores for organizational withdrawal and negative affectivity that were gathered from the in-basket, participants also received a second score for these variables that stemmed from their qualitative responses to the manipulation vignette. The two questions that prompted these responses asked participants to indicate how they would respond to the new information presented and to provide justification for their response. For the analysis of organizational withdrawal and negative affectivity scores, regression analysis was again conducted to identify the covariate variables that had a significant impact on the relationship of condition to participant organizational withdrawal and negative affectivity scores. Following this analysis, participant ESI benevolence score was retained as a covariate in the ANCOVA analysis for both organizational withdrawal and negative affectivity.

Following the regression analysis, the effect of each condition was tested at the main and interaction levels. Results indicated a significant effect of organizational justice on the degree of negative affectivity expressed by participants following the manipulation $F(1,169) = 28.844$, $p = .000$. Specifically, participants in the low

organizational justice condition scored higher on negative affectivity (M = 1.99, SD = .077) than participants in the high organizational justice condition (M =1.39, SD = .082). See Table 8 for a summary of the ANCOVA results.

Task Performance

Conditional effects on the average level of quality and effort provided to participant work on each of the individual item types was assessed by covarying out the variance associated with participant score on these variables at time one. Regression analysis was also conducted to identify additional covariates that could be influential to the variation in participant task performance. Specifically, participant gender and conscientiousness were used as covariates in the ANCOVA analysis for quality scores on the different item types. Additionally, participant gender, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and ESI entitled scores were used as covariates in the ANCOVA analysis for effort given to the different item types.

The effects of interpersonal conflict, organizational justice and downsizing threat were examined at the main and interaction levels for OCBO items, OCBI items and Job Task items. Results of this analysis indicate a significant interaction effect of downsizing threat and interpersonal conflict on the quality of participant performance on Job Task items $F(1,166) = 4.962$, $p = .027$. No significant conditional effects were found for quality and effort scores on OCBI or OCBO items. For a summary of the ANCOVA results see Table 7.

To investigate the nature of the interaction between interpersonal conflict and downsizing threat post hoc analyses were conducted using independent t-tests. Results of this analysis were inconclusive. It is likely that although the interaction was

significant within the ANCOVA given the ability to account for covariate measures, the mean differences resulting from the quality scores provided to Job Task items were too small for a t-test to statistically differentiate.

Motivation

Scores for each motivation were regressed on the set of covariates and significant covariates were retained. Results of this analysis identified participant ESI benevolence score and ESI entitled score as significant covariates for the analysis of prosocial values, participant ESI Entitled score was significant for Image Enhancement and Maintenance scores, and gender was significantly influential for Functionality motive. No covariates were significantly related to the motives of organizational concern and obligation.

The effects of interpersonal conflict, organizational justice and downsizing threat were tested at the main and interaction levels for their influence on participant expression of prosocial values, organizational concerns, image enhancement and maintenance, obligation, and functionality motives as justification for their behavioral responses following the manipulation. Results from the ANCOVA analysis indicate a significant effect of organizational justice on participants' feelings of obligation $F(1,169) = 5.457$, $p = .021$, such that participants in the low organizational justice condition expressed stronger motives of obligation ($M = 1.85$, $SD = .071$) than those in the high organizational justice condition *(*$M = 1.60$, $SD = .075$). There was also an effect of downsizing threat on participants expressed level of felt obligation $F(1,169) = 10.013$, $p = .002$, such that participants in the high downsizing threat condition expressed stronger motives of obligation ($M = 1.89$, $SD = .074$) than participants in the

low downsizing threat condition (M = 1.56, SD = .073). In conjunction with the effects seen for obligation, there was also a significant effect of interpersonal conflict on participant expression of image enhancing motivation, $F(1,168) = 10.571$, $p = .001$. These results indicate that participants in the low interpersonal conflict conditions expressed stronger image enhancement motivation (M = 2.37, SD = .104) than participants in the high interpersonal conflict condition (M = 1.90, SD = .101). A summary of these results can be found in Table 8.

Hypothesis Testing

Interpersonal Conflict. Results from the analysis of OCB withdrawal within the in-basket do not support an effect of interpersonal conflict on the withdraw of either OCBO or OCBI. Therefore, Hypotheses 1a and 1b, which refer to the withdrawal of OCB in the context of interpersonal conflict, are not supported.

Organizational Justice. Hypothesis 2a was supported by the examination of the effects of organizational justice on participants responses to the Lee and Allen (2002) OCB scale. These results suggest that when work context shifts lead to low organizational justice, individuals will choose to do less OCBI and OCBO. Despite this initial support for Hypothesis 2a, further analysis did not yield support for Hypothesis 2b, which suggested that participants in the low organizational justice conditions would withdraw more OCBO than OCBI.

Downsizing Threat. Research on downsizing threat supports the potential for variety of results regarding the effects of this contextual variable on OCB withdrawal. As a result, Research Question 1 suggests that in contexts of increasing downsizing threat employees may respond in one of two ways: 1) employees may pull away from

the organization by withdrawing their OCB, 2) employees may increase their rate of OCB completion in an effort to keep their job by demonstrating their usefulness to the company. The results discussed partially support the latter. Specifically, in the high downsizing threat conditions, participants suggested that they would complete more OCBO than in the low downsizing threat conditions. However, the same results were not found for OCBI. This suggests that employee's increased participation in OCB in times of high downsizing threat may be targeted towards OCBOs, which are arguably more useful in making it appear that the employee is especially useful to the organization itself. OCBIs may not be as visible to supervisors or other decision makers within the organization.

In addition to the research question on downsizing threat, Hypothesis 3a suggested that if employees did withdraw their OCB in conditions of high downsizing threat, that they would withdraw OCBOs more so than OCBI. Given that participants did not withdraw their OCB when confronted with downsizing threat, Hypothesis 3a was not supported. Hypothesis 3b suggested that in contexts of increased downsizing threat, participants would increase their performance on job related tasks. Trends in the data suggest that this may be the case. Although there was no main effect of downsizing threat on task performance at time two, there was a significant interaction between downsizing threat and interpersonal conflict on the quality of participant written responses. For this interaction, post hoc mean comparisons were not significant, however the quality of participant performance on the Job Task items was higher in the presence of high downsizing threat (M = 2.90, SD = .634) and high interpersonal conflict (M = 2.92, SD = .634) compared to conditions where both downsizing threat

and interpersonal conflict were high (M = 2.79, SD = .487) or low (M = 2.744, SD = .474). Such findings indicate the potential for an effect of downsizing threat on increased employee task performance given other stable work conditions. However, this remains a suggestion and cannot be explicitly concluded.

Multiplicative Effect. Hypothesis 4 suggested that negative work changes may have a multiplicative effect on OCB withdrawal, such that the more negative work changes that occur, the more employees will withdraw their OCB. Overall, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Where conditional effects of one independent variable were present, they were often isolated from conditional effects of the other independent variables. In addition, no interaction effects for OCB were evidenced throughout the results.

Motivation. Hypotheses 5a through 5c refer to participant motivation for their behavior, and they were tested by examining participant written responses to the manipulation. Specifically, this grouping of hypotheses argues that in the presence of negative changes to an employee's work context (i.e., high interpersonal conflict, low organizational justice, high downsizing threat), that an employee's behavioral responses will be more strongly guided by negative motivations (i.e., image enhancement, obligation functionality) than positive motivations (i.e., prosocial values, organizational concerns). To start, Hypothesis 5a which refers to contexts of increased interpersonal conflict, was not supported for any of the negative motivations discussed. In fact, the reverse was supported for image enhancement. Specifically, participants in the high interpersonal conflict conditions actually scored significantly lower on image enhancing motivation than participants in the low interpersonal conflict conditions. In contrast to

these findings for interpersonal conflict, results for organizational justice (Hypothesis 5b) and downsizing threat (Hypothesis 5c) were partially supported. In particular, participants in the low organizational justice conditions and participants in the high downsizing threat conditions scored higher on the motive of obligation than those in the high organizational justice or low downsizing threat conditions. Results for the other motivations do not support Hypothesis 5b and 5c.

Discussion

Limitations

Before discussing any practical and theoretical implications of this effort, it is important to note some key limitations that may have influenced the results. To begin, there were a number of potential issues related to the sample chosen for this research. Overall, the sample was comprised of undergraduate students, most of whom were relatively young and had little work experience (M = 3.2 years). Given their limited employment experience, these individuals may not have been able to accurately indicate how much OCB they would participate in given the organizational context. For example, although the study instructions gave some indication as to what types of activities were discretionary, it may have been difficult for participants to differentiate OCBs and job tasks within the in-basket. Research suggests that the degree to which individuals define their OCB behavior as in-role behavior rather than extra-role behavior will alter the nature of their continued participation in that behavior (McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison, & Turban, 2007; Morrison, 1994; Tepper & Tayler, 2003). Specifically, if employees define an OCB as part of their job role, then they may no longer see this behavior as discretionary, and their participation in that behavior may continue within contexts in which people do not typically complete OCBs. If

participants did not perceive the OCBs in the in-basket to be discretionary, then they may have responded to the items in different ways than expected. In addition, research suggests that some OCBs that are perceived to be related to conscientiousness or courtesy may be less often perceived as extra-role behavior by employees (Vey & Campbell, 2004). Such a distinction could have been especially difficult to make for those with little job experience in general, and little to no experience as a marketing employee.

In addition to difficulties in defining one's job role, lack of job experience within the sample may have also contributed to participants' generation of overly optimistic solutions to the complex work scenarios provided. For example, a number of participants in the low organizational justice conditions indicated that they would either meet with or confront their unfair boss, Brian, and suggest that he change his behavior. Similarly, a number of participants in the high interpersonal conflict conditions suggested that they would organize a group meeting with their bickering work group to rectify the interpersonal issues together. Given the complexities provided by the social contexts within these scenarios, these solutions appear relatively unrealistic. If participants held an unrealistic mindset regarding interpersonal relations at work, they may have artificially inflated the amount of OCB they suggested that they would have completed in these contexts. Furthermore, participants may also have been overly idealistic about the altruistic nature of their own behavior within negative work contexts. In general, people maintain self-esteem by thinking of themselves in a positive light and it is known that OCB makes people feel good about themselves (Chancellor, 2013). Given that this was a hypothetical scenario, and therefore low stakes,

participants may have maintained their own self-esteem by indicating that they would continue to participate in OCB, even within a strongly negative context.

Along with limitations induced by lack of work experience and idealistic self-projections, this research involved a low-level simulation, which may not have been as salient as a real workplace context. Research suggests that the relationship between negative work contexts, such as those induced by interpersonal conflict, organizational injustice or downsizing, and OCB may be a function of emotional exhaustion (Cole, Bernerth, Walter, & Holt, 2010; Jamillo, Mulki, & Boles, 2011; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Piccoli, 2015). Given that participants were only provided with descriptions about negative work contexts, they did not have to actually experience the negative contexts themselves, and certainly not for any strenuous length of time. Based on the limitations of such a simulation, participants may not have experienced the emotional exhaustion that could have led to more explicit demonstrations of withdrawal behaviors, including withdrawal of OCB. Similarly, the potential outcomes of threats and change may not have been as salient within a simulation, causing participants to behave more agreeably than they would have in a real-world context. To a degree, these points are supported by the presence of a significant effect for justice on participant negative activity following the manipulation, and a lack of a significant effect for negative affectivity within the in-basket measures. The negative affectivity elicited by portions of the manipulation clearly did not carry over into the in-basket that followed. Despite the restrictions noted with the use of this specific simulation with this particular sample, it should be noted that low fidelity simulations have often proved useful in predicting future performance

(Lievens, Keer, & Volckaert, 2010; Weekley, Hawkes, Guenole, & Ployhart), and that their overall usefulness should not be discredited.

The collective weight of these limitations may work to provide sound reasoning as to why many of the hypotheses presented by this effort garnered little or no support from the results. Arguably, it is more theoretically sound to suggest that undergraduate students may have difficulty forecasting their own behavior and defining their job roles than it is to argue that employees who begin experiencing job insecurity, interpersonal conflict, and organizational injustice will behave in the same manner as employees who are not experiencing such difficulties. Such an argument is also supported by the lack of results to confirm well known findings regarding employee OCB and withdrawal. For example, it is well known that contexts of organizational injustice, interpersonal conflict, and job insecurity can influence rates of traditional withdrawal behaviors, such as turnover and absenteeism (Buch, 1992; Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Colquitt et al., 2001; Giebels & Janssen, 2004; Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002; VanYperen, Hagedoorn, Zweers, & Postma, 2000). Yet, no results were found for organizational withdrawal. Overall, the use of an organizational sample may have proved far more useful in examining potential effects of OCB withdrawal. Although the effects seen within these results should not necessarily be ignored, it is likely that different or potentially stronger results may have been seen with an organizational sample.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Despite these limitations, there is some valuable knowledge to be gained from the results presented by this research. Overall, these findings indicate that employee participation in OCB may be more complex than traditionally thought. Specifically, in

the face of decreasing organizational justice, employees may choose to withdraw their participation in both OCBIs and OCBOs, while also reducing the number of job tasks they chose to complete. Alternatively, when confronted with downsizing threat, employees may increase their participation in OCBOs. Broadly, these results suggest that participation in OCB at one point in time does not indicate continuous participation across changes in organizational context. Rather, employees may be more strategic when choosing to participate, or continue participating, in OCBs.

In addition, the findings for motivation suggest that in contexts of organizational injustice and downsizing threat, employees are more motivated by feelings of obligation than by positive motives such as prosocial values or organizational concerns. These findings are of note given the association of felt obligation with negative individual and organizational outcomes. For example, research on work motivation suggests that feelings of obligation are a central component of controlled motivation, which is known to increase employee burnout (Merriman, 2014) and reduce creativity (Gangé & Deci, 2005). Furthermore, OCBs which have become compulsory due to a sense of felt obligation or pressure have been shown to be positively associated with job stress, turnover intentions, negligent behavior, organizational politics, and burnout (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). Similarly, compulsory OCBs (i.e., CCBs) are also negatively related to innovation, job satisfaction and formal performance (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). In general, this suggests that even if employees continue to complete OCBs in the face of organizational injustice and downsizing threat, these behaviors may not result in positive outcomes for the employee or for the organization.

Alongside the motivational findings for obligation, the results found for image enhancing motivation suggest that in certain contexts the behavioral motivations employees have may shift in order to accommodate the contextual factors. Specifically, when interpersonal conflict is high, employee's behavior is less motivated by image enhancement than when interpersonal conflict is low. Conceivably, behavior motivated by image enhancement may be less useful when trying to navigate though and manage work group interpersonal conflict.

Suggestions for Future Research

The present effort presents preliminary evidence for the presence of OCB withdrawal within certain contexts of change. However, this research is far from exhaustive or conclusive. Additional research will be needed to further verify the presence and impact of OCB withdrawal within the contexts of shifting organizational justice. Additionally, more research is needed to further clarify the relationship of downsizing threat to increased employee participation in OCB. Given the sample limitations expressed here, later research should be conducted with organizational samples.

Future research should also consider other contexts in which employees may withdraw their OCB. Although none of the contextual combinations presented here were significant, there may be other contextual factors that, when combined, could have a multiplicative effect on OCB withdrawal. The findings of this research also suggest that in negative contexts, employees may harbor negative motivations for completing OCBs. Research tends to indicate that OCBs result in positive outcomes for individuals and organizations (Podsakoff et al., 2009; Allen & Rush, 1998). It remains unclear how

the outcomes of OCB shift with different motivations for completing these behaviors, or how OCB outcomes are altered when these behaviors are withdrawn. Future research should examine the outcomes for OCB withdrawal and shifting OCB motivations at various organizational levels and with various degrees of OCB withdrawal. Additional research is also needed to investigate how employees and managers perceive the withdrawal of OCB in others.

Conclusion

This effort presents some empirical support for the idea that certain contextual changes (e.g. organizational injustice) induce OCB withdrawal, while others (e.g. downsizing threat) may increase OCB participation. Furthermore, this effort suggests that when there is organizational injustice or downsizing threat, employees may feel obligated to complete OCBs and job tasks. Alternatively, when employees are experiencing interpersonal conflict, they may shift their motivations so that their behavior is less guided by image enhancement. Such a shift suggests that employee motivation may be strategically used as a method for successfully navigating one's environment. Overall, this suggests that employee participation in and motivation for OCBs may be more intentional and strategic than previously considered. Attention should be given to these strategic behavioral and motivational shifts because they may ultimately change the outcomes that stem from organizational behavior within certain contexts. The specific downstream consequences of these intentional OCBs for individuals and their organizations remain unclear and should be further investigated. Generally, organizations should pay more attention to how organizational context

influences their employees' strategic use of OCB in order to more accurately anticipate the usefulness of OCB outcomes.

References

Adams, J.S. (1963) Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*(5), 422-436.

Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(2), 247-260.

Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32*(4), 803-829.

Ball, G. A., Treviño, L. K., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(2), 299-322.

Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 20*, 65-122.

Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1078-1095.

Bergeron, D., Ostroff, C., Schroeder, T., & Block, C. (2014). The dual effects of organizational citizenship behavior: Relationships to research productivity and career outcomes in academe. *Human Performance*, *27*(2), 99-128.

Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management, 39*(4), 958-984.

Bernardin, H. J., & Buckley, M. R. (1981). Strategies in rater training. *Academy of Management Review*, *6*(2), 205-212.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review, 24*(1), 82-98.

Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H. -H, Harvey, J., & Lepine, J. A. (2015). "Well, i'm tired of tryin'!" organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(1), 56-74.

Bolino, M. C. & Turnley, W. H. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Executive, 17*(3), 60-71.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, *27*(4), 505-522.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B., & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(6), 835-855.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). The other side of the story: Reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 14*(2), 229-246.

Bolino, M. C., Varela, J. A., Bande, B., & Turnley, W. H. (2006). The impact of impression-management tactics on supervisor ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(3), 281-297.

Bowler, W. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(1), 70-82.

Buch, K. (1992). How does downsizing affect employee involvement? *The Journal for Quality and Participation, 15*(1), 74-79.

Chancellor, J. A. (2013). *Ripples of generosity in the workplace: The benefits of giving, getting, and glimpsing.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Riverside.

Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1082-1103.

Chiu, S., & Tsai, M. (2006) Relationships among burnout, job involvement and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychology*, *140*(6), 517-530.

Chory, R. M., Horan, S. M., Carton, S. T., & Houser, M. L. (2014). Toward a further understanding of students' emotional responses to classroom injustice. *Communication Education*, *63*(1), 41-62.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86*(2), 278-321.

Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Walter, F., & Holt, D. T. (2010). Organizational justice and individuals' withdrawal: Unlocking the influence of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Management Studies*, *47*(3), 367-390.

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*(3) 425-445.

Cropanzano, R., Fortin, M., & Kirk, J. F. (2015). How do we know when we are treated fairly? Justice rules and fairness judgments. In M. R. Buckley, A. R. Wheeler, J.

R. B. Halbesleben (Eds.) *Research in personnel and human resources Management* (Vol. 33, pp.279-350). Amsterdam: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 160-169.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(6), 1241-1255.

Eastman, K. K. (1994). In the eyes of the beholder: An attributional approach to ingratiation and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(5), 1379-1391.

Ellington, J. K., Dierdorff, E. C., & Rubin, R. S. (2014). Decelerating the diminishing returns of citizenship on task performance: The role of social context and Interpersonal skill. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(4), 748-758.

Falkenburg, K., & Schyns, B. (2007). Work satisfaction, organizational commitment and withdrawal behaviors. *Management Research News*, *30*(10), 708-723.

Fandt, P. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). The management of information and impressions: When employees behave opportunistically. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 45*(1), 140-158.

Farmer, S. M., & Dyne, L. Van. (2014). The contextualized self : How team-member exchange leads to coworker identification and helping OCB. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 583-595.

Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(1), 81-94.

Francis, L., Mary, S., & Barling, J. (2005). Organizational injustice and psychological strain. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, *37*(4), 250-261.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. (2005) Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 331-362.

Giebels, E., & Janssen, O. (2004). Conflict stress and reduced well-being at work: The buffering effect of third-party help. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *14*(2), 137-155.

Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 393-417.

Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 900-912.

Grant, A.M., Parker, S.K. & Collins, C. (2009) Getting credit for proactive behavior: supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. Personnel *Psychology, 62*(1), 31 -55.

Grant, A. M., & Schwartz, B. (2011). Too much of a good thing: The challenge and opportunity of the inverted U. *Perspective on Psychological Science, 6*(1), 61-76.

Greenburg, J. (1993a) The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.) *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1134-1145.

Halbesleben, J. R. B., Bowler, W. M. M., Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2010). Organizational concern, prosocial values, or impression management? How supervisors attribute motives to organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(6), 1450-1489.

Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2015). To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*(6), 1628-1650.

Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1990) Job attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of retirement and other voluntary withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37*(1), 60-78.

Haworth, C. L., & Levy, P. E. (2001). The importance of instrumentality beliefs in the prediction of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*(1), 64-75.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2011) Conservation of resource caravan and engaged settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84* (1), 116-122.

Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. D. (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 945-959.

Iverson, R. D., & Deery, S. J. (2001). Understanding the “personological" basis of employee withdrawal: The influence of affective disposition on employee

tardiness, early departure, and absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 856.

Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P., & Boles, J. S. (2011). Workplace stressors, job attitude, and job behaviors: Is interpersonal conflict the missing link? *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *31*(3), 339-356.

Johnson, G. (2015) Emotions and sensemaking: How anger, guilt, and emotion regulation impact ethical decision making. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oklahoma, Norman.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In S. Srivastava, & O.P. John (Eds.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol.2, pp.102-138). New York: Guilford Press.

Kiker, D. S., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1999). Main and interaction effects of task and contextual performance on supervisory reward decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(4), 602-609.

King, W. C., & Miles, E. W. (1994). The measurement of equity sensitivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *67*(2), 133-142.

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W., & Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: Understanding rewarded and unrewarded organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(2), 277-290.

Koys, D. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, *54*(1), 104-114.

Lam, C. F., Liang, J., Ashford, S. J., & Lee, C. (2015). Job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior: Exploring curvilinear and moderated relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 499-510.

Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). The association of distributive and procedural justice with organizational citizenship behavior. *The Prison Journal*, *93*(3), 313-334.

Lerner, M. J. (1980) The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion. New York: Plenum.

Lerner, M. J., Miller, D. T., & Holmes, J. G. (1976) Deserving and the emergence of forms of justice. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 133 - 162) New York, NY: Academic Press.

Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 131-142.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of organizational behavior*, *9*(4), 297-308.

Lepine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship cehavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 52-65.

Leventhal, G. S. (1976) The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 91-131) New York, NY: Academic Press.

Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.) *Justice and social interaction* (pp. 167 -218). New York. NY: Springer-Verlag.

Lievens F., Van Keer E., & Volckaert E. (2010) Gathering behavioral samples through a computerized and standardized assessment center exercise. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9*(2), 94-98.

MacDougall, A. E. (2015). *Role of Employee Motives in Determining the Type and Consequences of OCBs.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oklahoma, Norman.

MacDougall, A. E., Buckley, M. R., Johnson, G., & Mecca, J. (2016, January). Examining motives in organizational citizenship behavior: Introducing the OCB-Intentionality Scale. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2016, No. 1, p. 14931).

McAllister, D. J., Kamdar, D., Morrison, E. W., & Turban, D. B. (2007). Disentangling role perceptions: How perceived role breadth, discretion, instrumentality, and efficacy relate to helping and taking charge. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(5), 1200-1211.

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(6), 836-844.

Merriman, K.K. (2014) The psychological role of pay systems in choosing to work more hours. *Human Resource Management Review*, *24*, 67-79.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management*, *41*(3), 351-357.

Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(6), 1543-1567.

Noruzy, A., Shatery, K., Rezazadeh, A., & Hatami-shirkouhi, L. (2011). Investigation the relationship between organizational justice, and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, *4*(7), 842–848.

Olkkonon, M. E., & Lipponen, J. (2006) Relationships between organizational justice, identification with organization and work unit, and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *100*(1), 202-215.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 85-97.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(4), 775-802.

Piccoli, B., & De Witte, H. (2015). Job insecurity and emotional exhaustion: Testing psychological contract breach versus distributive injustice as indicators of lack of reciprocity. *Work & Stress*, *29*(3), 246-263.

Pierce, J. R., & Aguinis, H. (2011). The too-much-of-a-good-thing effect in management. *Journal of Management*, *39*(2), 313-338.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 122-141.

Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(6), 1306-1314.

Rosse, J. G. & Noel, T. W. (1996), Leaving the organization: Individual Differences in employee withdrawal and adaptation. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual difference and behavior in organizations*, (pp. 451-491). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Salamon, S. D., & Deutsch, Y. (2006). OCB as a handicap: An evolutionary psychological perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(2), 185-199.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Are they opposite forms of active behavior? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *59*(1), 21-39.

Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: A meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *7*(3), 242-264.

Takeuchi, R., Bolino, M. C., & Lin, C. (2015). Too many motives? The interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(4), 1239-1248.

Tekleab, A. G., Quigley, N. R., & Tesluk, P. E. (2009). A longitudinal study of team conflict, conflict management, cohesion, and team effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*(2), 170-205.

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(1), 97-105.

Tett, R. P., & Mayer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*(2), 259-293.

Van den Bos, K. (2002) Assimilation and contrast in organizational justice: The role of primed mindsets in the psychology of the fair process effect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(1), 866-881.

VanYperen, N. W., Hagedoorn, M., Zweers, M., & Postma, S. (2000). Injustice and employees' destructive responses: The mediating role of state negative affect. *Social Justice Research*, *13*(3), 291-312.

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*(4), 952.

Vey, M. A., & Campbell, J. P. (2004). In-role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, *17*(1), 119-135.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior: Theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome in organizations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, *36*(1), 77-93.

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*(3), 377-405.

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*(6), 1063-1070.

Weekley, J. A., Hawkes, B., Guenole, N., & Ployhart, R. E. (2015). Low-fidelity simulations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *2*(1), 295-322.

Yun, S., Takeuchi, R., & Liu, W. (2007). Employee self-enhancement motives and job performance behaviors: Investigating the moderating effects of employee role ambiguity and managerial perceptions of employee commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 745-756.

Appendix A: InnoMark Case

You will now be asked to participate in an activity. Below is some preliminary information to keep in mind.

You work for InnoMark Inc., a nation-wide organization based in Houston, Texas that specializes in marketing and advertising research. Within InnoMark, there are a number of market research departments, each focusing on different types of industries such as automobiles, telecommunications, travel, service industry, and pharmaceuticals.

Your job is an entry-level position within one of the marketing groups focused on service industry clients. This position involves working on a project team doing tasks such as collecting and analyzing data on customers' buying habits and product needs and on competitors' use of sales and marketing approaches. In addition, your job involves using this information and other data to determine the potential success of a marketing campaign. Occasionally you are tasked create effective advertising campaigns based on the data collected through market research. **Although it's not formally part of your job you also sometimes help others in your group brainstorm new marketing ideas, mentor new project members, or share helpful resources with your team.**

You have been in this position with InnoMark for a little less than a year. Overall, InnoMark has always treated you fairly and you have enjoyed your time spent working there. **On your own time you have even helped organize meetings to improve work operations or attended weekend events to boost the company's public image.**

Appendix B: In-Basket One Tasks

OCBI Item (A1): New market analysis software has recently been introduced in your office and one of your new coworkers, Cynthia, has been struggling to figure it out. She has asked for your assistance in helping her learn the new system.

OCBI Item (B1): Li is the youngest member of your team. At the end of the month she will be giving her first marketing proposal presentation. She is a bit nervous, and has asked you to meet with her to review basic formatting guidelines for this type of proposal.

OCBO Item (C1): Members of an allied global marketing company are coming this Thursday to give a seminar about research on best practices for new marketing strategies. While it's not required, all employees are encouraged to attend.

OCBO Item (D1): Earlier this week an intern, Jasmine, asked to set up a lunch meeting with you to talk about the field of Marketing. You don't know Jasmine that well, but you do know she is bright and that the company is looking to hire her at the end of the summer. You consider taking some time to find Jasmine and talk to her about how good the company actually is.

Job Task Item (E1): Your project team just received a new assignment. The hotel chain, Seaside Heights Inn and Suites, is undergoing a massive remodeling project for their Dallas market. City expansion has caused increased competition and led to a steady decline in profits for the chain. The organization is hoping a new hotel concept and marketing campaign will help their company gain advantage over the strong completion in that area. The current hotel theme is beach resort style. Your team would

like you to provide some initial thoughts about the direction your group should take the project.

Job Task Item (F1): Last week you were a little busier than usual. As a result, your email has gotten quite backed up. Sometime this week you are hoping to work through the backlog.

Job Task Item (G1): A few months ago, your team launched an advertising campaign for an international travel agency. The campaign features the slogan "Get out and do it!" Since the campaign's introduction, you have been gathering customer reaction data. You now have enough data to run some preliminary analyses to check on customer reactions and overall effectiveness of the campaign. The client is hoping to see your campaign performance report soon.

Appendix C: In-Basket Two Tasks

OCBI Item (A2): Your coworker, Anthony, has just come back from a week-long vacation. He has asked you to catch him up on the details for the new hotel remodeling project he missed in his absence.

OCBI Item (B2): Your department has recently hired a new intern, Benjamin, for a semester-long work-study program. Benjamin will be working in your department and often directly with your project team. Generally, interns are paired with a mentor to provide guidance during their first few months on the job. Today, you receive an email from your boss asking for volunteers who would be willing to take on a mentee.

OCBO Item (C2): This Wednesday, you have been invited to attend a seminar about process improvement within the organization. While attendance is voluntary, management is hoping for representation across the different divisions within the organization.

OCBO Item (D2): A local business magazine is running a story on marketing in the 21st century. The magazine editor has asked you and a few of your coworkers to provide information on what it's like to work for a large marketing company like InnoMark.

Job Task Item (E2): Your boss, Brian, has asked for your input on a new project. BSH Restaurateurs is a new client who is planning on opening a restaurant in the Oklahoma City area. The group has been successful in the past with several different restaurant locations around the United States, all having their own theme and menu. They are looking to develop a moderately priced restaurant that will cater to local customers. Brian wants you and your project team to develop the concept of the restaurant and outline a marketing strategy for its grand opening.

Job Task Item (F2): Last Friday you missed a few client calls when you were on site meeting with a local customer. When you got back to the office it was too late to call back. You are hoping to work through those messages and phone calls sometime this week.

Job Task Item (G2): Your team recently met with a car manufacturing client, Reliable Motors, who was looking to redo their advertising campaign. After having met with the company's representative, Dwain, you all realize the project is going to be more work that you initially thought. This week you need to develop a data collection plan to survey current and potential customers. You also need to start working on organizing a series of focus groups to collect information about local perceptions of the manufacturer and. Dwain is hoping to see a progress report next week.

Appendix D: High Interpersonal Conflict, Low Organizational Justice, and High Downsizing Threat Condition

As with many jobs, your work life at InnoMark is bound to change over time. As changes occur, you generally try to adjust to them. Below is a description of a few recent developments affecting your work at the company. Please take a moment to review this new information and to consider how this may affect your work situation.

You have recently started a new marketing assignment and as a result your work group was been rearranged. Ever since you started the project, things with your work group have been different. People on the team have started bickering and gossiping about one another. Group meetings have become particularly tense and uncomfortable. You yourself have received a few very rude emails, and you are beginning to think this group is going to be particularly hard to work with. Overall the team just feels very strained and disagreeable. Progress is still being made on the group's project, but your group is not as friendly as they were a few months ago. You are beginning to wonder how much longer the group can go on like this.

Additionally, a new manager, Brian, has recently been put in charge of your project group. Brian is a very pleasant person, and even takes you and your coworkers out to lunch on occasion. While you like your new manager, you've noticed that he doesn't always do things in a fair way. You've been waiting to hear back about your new project proposal for three weeks now. However, Kristina (who only put her proposal in a week ago) has already been approved. Also, last week he gave Enrico the "employee of the month gift card" despite that fact that Enrico worked only two weeks this month, and the rest was spent on vacation. To top it off, yesterday your coworker

Chris was given the lead on a new project assignment for a high-end client, a project you have been working towards for the past month. You wonder if Brian knows how much effort you have been putting in on this client. Hoping that there may still be a chance you can be put on the project team, you try to set up a meeting with Brian, but get shot down when he tells you Chris has already picked a project team.

Along with this, you recently learned that there have been some changes in the local economy, and that InnoMark has decided to merge with another firm. Unfortunately, this merger means that the company will be doing some substantial downsizing. Your manager has not yet said who is going to be let go. You are starting to wonder about your role in the company and if your need to start looking for a new job. According to office whisperings a few of your coworkers have started looking in to other positions. Few of them have had much success, if any success at all. InnoMark was one of the biggest firms in the area. If your firm is downsizing, you are concerned there may not be space for you at another company either. It's unclear how long this merger will take, or how many people will be let go from each department.

Appendix E: Low Interpersonal Conflict, High Organizational Justice, Low Downsizing Threat Condition

As with many jobs, your work life at InnoMark is bound to change over time. As changes occur, you generally try to adjust to them. Below is a description of a few recent developments affecting your work at the company. Please take a moment to review this new information and to consider how this may affect your work situation.

You have recently started a new marketing assignment and as a result your work group has been rearranged. There have been very few changes to your work group since you all started this new project. People on the team are communicating well with each other and meetings are going as smooth as ever. You have also noticed how pleasant email conversations have been, and you are beginning to think this group is going to be particularly easy to work with. Overall, the team just feels very agreeable. You know that sometimes switching up project teams can change the functioning of a group. However, you are happy to find that your group is just as friendly as they were a few months ago. It feels great that your group can get along so well.

Additionally, a new manager, Brian, has recently been put in charge of your project group. Brian is a very pleasant person, and takes you and your coworkers out to lunch on occasion. You like your new manager, and have noticed how he tries to do things in a fair way. You've been waiting to hear back about your new project proposal for three weeks now. Kristina put in a proposal last week, but Brian made sure to review yours first since you had been waiting. Also, last week he gave Enrico the "employee of the month gift card" for his persistent work in roping in 3 new clients. On top of that, yesterday your coworker Chris was given the lead on a new project assignment for a

high end client. You have been working with this client for the past month. Although you had been working for that opportunity, you thought Chris was a good choice for the assignment. After the announcement Brian pulled you aside to explain how he appreciated your hard work and dedication, but Chris was better qualified to take on this big client. Even though you can't be the team lead, you hope there may still be a chance you can be put on the project team. You know it's company policy to allow project leads to pick their assignment team, so you set up a meeting with Chris for tomorrow afternoon.

Along with this, you recently learned that there have been some changes in the local economy, and that InnoMark has decided to merge with another firm. There was some initial concern that a merger would mean downsizing. However, corporate informed your manager that no employees would have to be let go due to the merger. With this information you are secure in your position at the company. According to office whisperings a few of your coworkers may use this opportunity to change positions. You believe a few of them will have decent success. It's unclear how long this merger will take or how big your department will be by the time it's done. InnoMark is one of the biggest firms in the area. If your firm is merging, you wonder what other firms may decide to merge.

Table 1. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Covariates on Anticipated Participation in OCBI and OCBO at Time Two*

	OCBI			OCBO		
	F	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	22.823	**.000**	.570	21.127	**.000**	.551
Intercept	.673	.413	.004	.272	.603	.002
ESI Benevolence	5.359	**.022**	.033	10.050	**.002**	.061
Time 1 OCBI score	139.314	**.000**	.473	-	-	-
Time 1 OCBO score	-	-	-	150.627	**.000**	.493
Organizational justice	4.850	**.029**	.030	4.286	**.040**	.027
Interpersonal conflict	3.156	.078	.020	.062	.803	.000
Downsizing threat	.433	.511	.003	4.508	**.035**	.028
Organizational justice x interpersonal conflict	1.752	.188	.011	.335	.563	.002
Organizational justice x downsizing threat	.391	.533	.003	.005	.943	.000
Interpersonal conflict x downsizing threat	.191	.663	.001	.316	.575	.002
Organizational justice x interpersonal conflict x downsizing threat	2.338	.128	.015	.254	.615	.002

Note. Significant effects are highlighted in bold. OCBI R Squared = .570 (Adjusted R Squared = .545). OCBO R Squared = .551 (Adjusted R Squared = .525). Dashes indicate instances where the time 1 variable was not used as a covariate.

Table 2. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Significant Covariates on The Number of Items Participants Chose to Complete in In-Basket Two*

	Number of OCBI items Chosen			Number of OCBO Items Chosen			Number of Job Task Items Chosen		
	F	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2
Corrected Model	1.690	.104	.074	.933	.483	.037	2.362	**.020**	.101
Intercept	21.446	**.000**	.113	865.302	**.000**	.837	87.992	**.000**	.344
ESI Benevolence	4.057	**.046**	.024	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marketing Experience	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.115	**.005**	8.115
Organizational Justice	.116	.734	.001	1.308	.254	.008	5.485	**.020**	.032
Interpersonal Conflict	.988	.322	.006	1.098	.296	.006	.025	.875	.000
Downsizing Threat	.065	.799	.000	1.174	.280	.007	.058	.810	.000
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict	2.292	.132	.013	1.911	.169	.011	.039	.844	.000
Organizational Justice x Downsizing Threat	.002	.968	.000	.916	.340	.005	3.485	.064	.020
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing threat	4.491	**.036**	.026	.292	.590	.002	1.372	.243	.008
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.990	.321	.006	.042	.837	.000	.149	.700	.001

Note. $N = 177$. Significant relationships are listed in bold. Dashes indicate instances where that specific variable was not used as a covariate. Number of OCBI Items Chosen at Time 2 R Squared = .074 (Adjusted R Squared = .030). Number of OCBO Items Chosen at Time 2 R Squared = .037 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003). Number of Job Task Items Chosen at Time 2 R Squared = .101 (Adjusted R Squared = .058).

Table 3. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Significant Covariates on The Time Allocated to Items in In-Basket Two*

	Time Allocated to OCBI Items			Time Allocated to OCBO Items			Time Allocated to Job Task Items		
	F	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2
Corrected Model	15.271	**.000**	.451	2.967	**.004**	.132	.852	.559	.042
Intercept	9.819	**.002**	.056	29.390	**.000**	.159	185.290	**.000**	.543
Time allocated to OCBI at Time 1	111.293	**.000**	.400	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time Allocated to OCBO at Time 1	-	-	-	19.002	**.000**	.109	-	-	-
Time Allocated to Job Tasks at Time 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.545	.113	.016
Trait Positive Affectivity	10.920	**.001**	.061	-	-	-	-	-	-
Organizational Justice	.054	.816	.000	.312	.577	.002	.151	.698	.001
Interpersonal Conflict	.000	.998	.000	.792	.375	.005	1.073	.302	.007
Downsizing Threat	.169	.681	.001	.697	.405	.004	.130	.719	.001
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal conflict	.497	.482	.003	1.737	.189	.011	1.005	.318	.006
Organizational Justice x Downsizing threat	1.580	.211	.009	.729	.395	.005	.536	.465	.003
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing threat	1.330	.250	.008	.286	.594	.002	.020	.889	.000
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal conflict x Downsizing Threat	.458	.499	.003	.024	.876	.000	.048	.827	.000

Note. 12 participants were identified as outliers for these analyses and have been removed from these analyses ($N = 165$). Dashes indicate instances where that specific variable was not used as a covariate. Time Allocated to OCBI Items at Time 2 R Squared = .451 (Adjusted R Squared = .422). Time Allocated to OCBO Items at Time 2 R Squared = .261 (Adjusted R Squared = .221). Time Allocated to Job Task Items at Time 2 R Squared = .042 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007).

Table 4. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Responses to OCBI Items in In-Basket Two*

	Organizational Withdrawal			Negative Affectivity			Priority Given to OCBI Tasks		
	F	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2
Corrected Model	1.296	.243	.065	2.432	**.010**	.128	1.076	.383	.055
Intercept	120.785	**.000**	.420	16.071	**.000**	.088	5.880	**.016**	.034
Time 1 Organizational Withdrawal	.006	.936	.000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time 1 Negative Affectivity	-	-	-	.294	.588	.002	-	-	-
Time 1 Priority Given	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.551	.112	.015
ESI Benevolence	6.550	**.011**	.038	-	-	-	-	-	-
ESI Entitled	-	-	-	7.497	**.007**	.043	-	-	-
Prior Knowledge of Study Protocol	-	-	-	6.695	**.011**	.039	-	-	-
Trait Positive Affectivity	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.768	**.030**	.028
Organizational Justice	.372	.543	.002	.338	.562	.002	.032	.858	.000
Interpersonal Conflict	.141	.708	.001	2.794	.097	.017	.044	.834	.000
Downsizing Threat	.065	.799	.000	.425	.515	.003	.141	.708	.001
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict	2.883	.091	.017	.062	.803	.000	.617	.433	.004
Organizational Justice x Downsizing Threat	.006	.940	.000	.002	.968	.000	.069	.794	.000
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	1.260	.263	.007	3.556	.061	.021	.042	.838	.000
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.003	.956	.000	1.978	.161	.012	.086	.769	.001

Note. $N = 177$. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate. Organizational Withdrawal R Squared = .065 (Adjusted R Squared = .015). Negative Affectivity R Squared = .128 (Adjusted R Squared = .075). Priority Given R Squared = .055 (Adjusted R Squared = .004).

Table 5. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Responses to OCBO Items in In-Basket Two*

	Organizational Withdrawal			Negative Affectivity			Priority Given to OCBO Tasks		
	F	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2
Corrected Model	1.395	.194	.070	1.390	.196	.070	2.103	**.023**	.123
Intercept	36.491	**.000**	.179	152.771	**.000**	.478	10.323	**.002**	.059
Time 1 Organizational Withdrawal	3.750	.055	.022	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time 1 Negative Affectivity	-	-	-	.056	.813	.000	-	-	-
Time 1 Priority Given	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.425	.121	.014
ESI Benevolence	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.271	.072	.019
Prior Knowledge of Study Protocol	-	-	-	6.934	**.009**	.040	5.583	**.019**	.033
Trait Positive Affectivity	2.143	.145	.013	-	-	-	2.153	.144	.013
Organizational Justice	1.264	.263	.008	.385	.536	.002	.179	.673	.001
Interpersonal Conflict	.026	.873	.000	3.183	.076	.019	.099	.754	.001
Downsizing Threat	1.689	.196	.010	.421	.517	.003	2.996	.085	.018
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict	1.716	.192	.010	.012	.913	.000	2.849	.093	.017
Organizational Justice x Downsizing Threat	.839	.361	.005	.484	.488	.003	.432	.512	.003
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.466	.496	.003	.056	.814	.000	.843	.360	.005
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.011	.916	.000	.633	.427	.004	.016	.899	.000

Note. $N = 177$. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate. Organizational Withdrawal R Squared = .070 (Adjusted R Squared = .020). Negative Affectivity R Squared = .070 (Adjusted R Squared = .020). Priority Given R Squared = .123 (Adjusted R Squared = .064).

Table 6. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Responses to Job Task Items in In-Basket Two*

	Organizational Withdrawal			Negative Affectivity			Priority Given to Job Tasks		
	F	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2
Corrected Model	2.828	**.004**	.132	5.014	**.000**	.251	5.028	**.000**	.193
Intercept	115.112	**.000**	.408	533.146	**.000**	.764	134.692	**.000**	.445
Time 1 Organizational Withdrawal	14.548	**.000**	.080	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time 1 Negative Affectivity	-	-	-	.006	.937	.000	-	-	-
Time 1 Priority Given	-	-	-	-	-	-	35.133	**.000**	.173
ESI Benevolence	-	-	-	34.646	**.000**	.174	-	-	-
ESI Entitled	-	-	-	41.917	**.000**	.203	-	-	-
Trait Positive Affectivity	2.143	.145	.013	2.882	.091	.017	-	-	-
Marketing Experience	5.335	**.022**	.031	-	-	-	-	-	-
Organizational Justice	.851	.358	.005	1.634	.203	.010	.397	.530	.002
Interpersonal Conflict	.542	.462	.003	2.657	.105	.016	.257	.613	.002
Downsizing Threat	.632	.428	.004	.162	.688	.001	3.411	.067	.020
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict	3.785	.053	.022	.101	.751	.001	1.441	.232	.009
Organizational Justice x Downsizing Threat	1.416	.236	.008	.438	.509	.003	.591	.443	.004
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.467	.495	.003	1.697	.194	.010	.273	.602	.002
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.009	.924	.000	1.388	.240	.008	.372	.543	.002

Note. $N = 177$. Significant relationships are listed in bold. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate. Organizational withdrawal R Squared = .132 (Adjusted R Squared = .085). Negative Affectivity R Squared = .251 (Adjusted R Squared = .201). Priority given R Squared = .193 (Adjusted R Squared = .155).

Table 7. *ANCOVA Results for Independent Variables and Covariates on Quality and Effort Scores for Each Item Type in In-Basket 2.*

	OCBI Items						OCBO Items						Job Task Items					
	Quality of Performance			Effort Expended			Quality of Performance			Effort Expended			Quality of Performance			Effort Expended		
	F	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2	*F*	*p*	η_π^2
Corrected Model	4.726	**.000**	.245	5.814	**.000**	.263	9.370	**.000**	.379	9.966	**.000**	.421	11.329	**.000**	.381	8.620	**.000**	.319
Intercept	10.514	**.001**	.067	3.393	.067	.023	41.325	**.000**	.230	2.424	.122	.017	61.931	**.000**	.272	86.118	**.000**	.342
Time 1 Quality	24.997	**.000**	.146	-	-	-	58.619	**.000**	.298	-	-	-	73.227	**.000**	.306	-	-	-
Time 1 Effort Expended	-	-	-	30.159	**.000**	.170	-	-	-	61.823	**.000**	.311	-	-	-	54.033	**.000**	.246
ESI Entitled	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.321	**.023**	.037	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender	5.419	**.021**	.036	-	-	-	8.648	**.004**	.059	-	-	-	8.429	**.004**	.048	9.829	**.002**	.056
Conscientiousness	3.889	**.051**	.026	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.523	**.004**	.059	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agreeableness	-	-	-	6.276	**.013**	.041	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Organizational Justice	1.032	.311	.007	.851	.358	.005	.193	.661	.001	.032	.858	.000	.028	.868	.000	.061	.805	.000
Interpersonal Conflict	.728	.395	.005	.542	.462	.003	.094	.760	.001	.144	.705	.001	.064	.800	.000	.961	.328	.006
Downsizing Threat	.096	.757	.001	.632	.428	.004	.316	.575	.002	1.045	.308	.008	.198	.657	.001	.113	.737	.001
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict	1.174	.280	.008	3.785	.053	.022	2.473	.118	.018	.837	.362	.006	.792	.375	.005	3.573	.060	.021
Organizational Justice x Downsizing Threat	.187	.666	.001	1.416	.236	.008	1.242	.267	.009	.592	.443	.004	.016	.898	.000	.000	.987	.000
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.001	.976	.000	.467	.495	.003	.786	.377	.006	.035	.853	.000	4.962	**.027**	.029	2.436	.120	.014
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	1.045	.308	.007	.009	.924	.000	.054	.817	.000	.001	.970	.000	.021	.885	.000	.453	.502	.003

Note. *N* sizes for quality and effort scores were dependent on how many participants chose to work on specific types of items. For OCBI *N*= 157; Quality of performance R Squared = .245 (Adjusted R Squared = .193); Effort expended R Squared = .263 (Adjusted R Squared = .217). For OCBO *N* = 148; Quality of performance R Squared = .379 (Adjusted R Squared = .339); Effort expended R Squared = .421 (Adjusted R Squared = .379). For Job Tasks *N* = 176; Quality of performance R Squared = .381 (Adjusted R Squared = .347); Effort expended R Squared = .334 (Adjusted R Squared = .293). Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate.

Table 8. *ANCOVA Results of Independent Variables and Covariates on Participant Scores for Qualitative Responses to New Contextual Information.*

	Organizational Withdrawal			Negative Affectivity			Prosocial			Organizational Concern			Image Enhancement and Maintenance			Obligation			Functionality		
	F	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Corrected Model	1.445	.181	.064	5.131	**.000**	.175	2.754	**.005**	.129	1.077	.380	.043	2.887	**.005**	.121	2.483	**.019**	.093	1.743	.092	.077
Intercept	119.718	**.000**	.416	899.355	**.000**	.842	24.488	**.000**	.128	725.208	**.000**	.811	28.088	**.000**	.143	1112.776	**.000**	.868	193.688	**.000**	.536
ESI Benevolence	5.638	**.019**	**.032**	5.638	**.019**	.032	15.278	**.000**	.084	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ESI Entitled	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.256	**.008**	.042	-	-	-	7.691	**.006**	.044	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.982	**.002**	.056
Organizational Justice	.434	.511	.003	28.844	**.000**	.146	2.094	.150	.012	1.706	.193	.010	.095	.758	.001	5.457	**.021**	.031	1.270	.261	.008
Interpersonal Conflict	2.106	.149	.012	.116	.734	.001	2.300	.131	.014	3.224	.074	.019	10.571	**.001**	.059	.001	.979	.000	1.231	.269	.007
Downsizing Threat	.116	.734	.001	2.860	.093	.017	.855	.357	.005	1.023	.313	.006	2.269	.134	.013	10.013	**.002**	.056	1.209	.273	.007
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict	.383	.537	.002	.542	.462	.003	.042	.838	.000	.209	.648	.001	.117	.733	.001	.443	.507	.003	.000	.988	.000
Organizational Justice x Downsizing Threat	.692	.407	.004	1.837	.177	.011	.313	.577	.002	.316	.575	.002	.273	.602	.002	.282	.596	.002	.662	.417	.004
Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	.017	.897	.000	.214	.644	.001	.032	.858	.000	.988	.322	.006	.888	.347	.005	.589	.444	.003	.000	.987	.000
Organizational Justice x Interpersonal Conflict x Downsizing Threat	1.380	.242	.008	.308	.580	.002	2.024	.157	.012	.054	.817	.000	.450	.503	.003	.413	.521	.002	.104	.747	.001

Note. N = 177. Significant relationships are listed in bold. Dashes indicate instances where the specific variable was not used as a covariate. Organizational withdrawal R Squared = .064 (Adjusted R Squared = .020). Negative Affectivity R Squared = .175 (Adjusted R Squared = .141). Prosocial Values R Squared = .129 (Adjusted R Squared = .082). Organizational Concern R Squared = .043 (Adjusted R Squared = .003) Image Enhancement and Maintenance R Squared = .121 (Adjusted R Squared = .079). Obligation R Squared = .093 (Adjusted R Squared = .056). Functionality R Squared = .077 (Adjusted R Squared = .033).

Table 9. *Intercorrelations Among Significant Dependent and Covariate Variables*

	M	*SD*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*
1. Time 1 OCBI Score	37.34	7.12	(.832)												
2. Time 1 OCBO Score	44.02	6.67	.364**	(.854)											
3. Time 2 OCBI Score	35.86	8.26	.729**	.237**	(.877)										
4. Time 2 OCBO Score	43.32	8.62	.316**	.699**	.439**	(.923)									
5. Number of Job Task Items Chosen in In-Basket 2	2.81	.519	.021	.070	-.012	.064	-								
6. Time 1 Quality of Performance on Job Tasks	2.956	.574	.062	.131	.006	.120	.093	-							
7. Time 2 Quality of Performance on Job Tasks	2.843	.519	.142	.140	.070	.174*	-.009	.573**	-						
8. Negative Affectivity Displayed Following Contextual Change	1.71	.805	.044	-.185*	-.036	-.281**	-.071	-.032	-.034	-					
9. Image Enhancing Motive Displayed Following Context Change	2.128	1.002	-.182*	.017	-.185*	.038	-.022	.233**	.217**	-.028	-				
10. Obligation Motive Displayed Following Contextual Change	1.731	.705	-.043	.137	-.079	.074	-.039	.309**	.302**	-.037	.405**	-			
11. ESI Entitled	22.57	6.39	-.437**	-.179*	-.401**	-.275**	-.056	-.040	-.166*	.095	.202**	.003	(.797)		
12. ESI Benevolence	27.09	6.45	.348**	.152*	.379**	.276**	.044	.020	.170*	-.104	-.157*	-.005	-.879**	(.801)	
13. Gender	-	-	-.286**	-.140	-.196**	-.211**	-.012	-.147	-.252**	-.012	.141	.009	.349**	-.304**	-

Note. * = Significant at .05 ** = Significant at .01. Reliabilities are listed on the diagonal. Dashes indicate information that could not be provided or were unreasonable to include.

Table 10. *Condition Counts and Descriptive Statistics for Participant's Scores on Significant Dependent Variables.*

	Interpersonal Conflict		Organizational Justice		Downsizing threat	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
N	85	80	78	87	82	83
OCBI Score						
Mean	36.402[a]	34.889[a]	36.588[a]	34.704[a]	35.928[a]	35.363[a]
Std. Error	0.594	0.609	0.619	0.587	0.606	0.601
Lower Bound	35.229	33.686	35.366	33.544	34.731	34.175
Upper Bound	37.576	36.092	37.810	35.863	37.125	36.551
OCBO Score						
Mean	42.945[b]	43.179[b]	44.037[b]	42.087[b]	44.061[b]	42.064[b]
Std. Error	0.655	0.671	0.682	0.647	0.666	0.662
Lower Bound	41.652	41.854	42.691	40.809	42.745	40.756
Upper Bound	44.239	44.504	45.384	43.365	45.376	43.371
Number of Job Task Items Chosen						
Mean	2.806[c]	2.818[c]	2.901[c]	2.723[c]	2.821[c]	2.803[c]
Std. Error	0.053	0.054	0.055	0.052	0.054	0.054
Lower Bound	2.701	2.71	2.792	2.62	2.714	2.697
Upper Bound	2.911	2.925	3.01	2.826	2.928	2.908
Number of OCBI Items Chosen						
Mean	1.480[d]	1.380[d]	1.413[d]	1.447[d]	1.443[d]	1.417[d]
Std. Error	0.07	0.071	0.073	0.069	0.071	0.07
Lower Bound	1.342	1.239	1.269	1.311	1.302	1.278
Upper Bound	1.617	1.521	1.557	1.582	1.583	1.556
Quality of Performance on Job Tasks						
Mean	2.846[e]	2.830[e]	2.843[e]	2.833[e]	2.852[e]	2.824[e]
Std. Error	0.044	0.046	0.046	0.044	0.045	0.045
Lower Bound	2.759	2.74	2.752	2.746	2.763	2.735
Upper Bound	2.934	2.92	2.935	2.92	2.941	2.912
Negative Affectivity Displayed Following Contextual Change						
Mean	1.707	1.669	1.386	1.99	1.593	1.783
Std. Error	0.079	0.08	0.082	0.077	0.08	0.079
Lower Bound	1.552	1.51	1.224	1.838	1.435	1.627
Upper Bound	1.862	1.828	1.547	2.143	1.751	1.939
Image Enhancement Motive Displayed Following the Contextual Change						
Mean	1.899[f]	2.371[f]	2.112[f]	2.157[f]	2.244[f]	2.026[f]
Std. Error	0.101	0.104	0.106	0.100	0.103	0.102
Lower Bound	1.699	2.166	1.903	1.960	2.04	1.824
Upper Bound	2.099	2.575	2.321	2.354	2.448	2.227
Obligation Motive Displayed Following the Contextual Change						
Mean	1.724	1.726	1.604	1.846	1.889	1.561
Std. Error	0.072	0.074	0.075	0.071	0.074	0.073
Lower Bound	1.581	1.58	1.456	1.706	1.743	1.418
Upper Bound	1.866	1.872	1.753	1.986	2.034	1.705

Note. N = number of participants. Upper and Lower bound refer to the 95% confidence interval. a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: ESI = 27.10, Time 1 OCBI Score = 37.18. b. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: ESI Benevolence = 27.10, Time 1 OCBI Score = 43.78. c. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: previous marketing experience = 1.89. d. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: ESI Benevolence score = 27.090. e. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Time 1 quality score for job task items = 2.9586, Gender = 1.36. f. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: ESI Entitled score = 22.57.

Figure 1. Quality of Performance on Job Task Items Based on Downsizing Threat and Interpersonal Conflict

