

Organizational citizenship behaviour vs counter productive work behaviour

¹Prof. G. Poornima, ²Prof. K. Muthukumar

¹ Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, Jai Shriram Engineering College/ Tirupur/ Tamilnadu/India

² Assistant Professor, Department Of Business Administration, Tirupur Kumaran College for Women/ Tirupur/ Tamilnadu/India

Email - ¹ poornimabba@tkcfw.ac.in , ² muthukumaar1990@gmail.com

Abstract: Recent times, with the development of the society, people are getting deeper understandings of the conception of operation. Ineffective work geste (CWB) and organizational citizenship Behaviour (OCB) are two putatively contrary types of active and voluntary actions. Experimenters devote their trouble not only in studying positive aspects of operation similar as the sense of responsibility and probative association, but also in studying negative actions like vituperative supervision and ineffective work geste

Despite the generally negative relationship between organizational citizenship actions and counter productive work actions, workers frequently engage in both. Psychologists have set up that when people engage in innocently estimable actions, they frequently grant themselves a moral license to bear immorally

Key Words: organizational citizenship, society, development, relationship.

1. INTRODUCTION :

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) :

The conception of OCB was defined by Organ(1988) as “ individual geste that's optional, not directly or explicitly honored by the formal price system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the association ”

2. Confines Of OCB :

1. Altruism/ helping geste – freely offering support to associates to palliate or help problems.
2. Organizational compliance – internalization and acceptance of organizational rules and morals, following them indeed when not covered.
3. Sportsmanship – readiness to tolerate difficulties and discomfort.
4. Organizational fidelity – readiness to save and promote the association's image.
5. Individual action – going above one's liabilities.
6. Civic virtue – readiness to come responsibly engaged in the association's life.
7. tone- development – voluntary actions aimed at adding one's knowledge and chops.
8. Courtesy – actions aimed at avoiding making problems for associates. Courtesy and altruism together form the dimension of helping geste .
9. meticulousness – actions reflecting constancy to the association, videlicet, going above the minimum conditions of one's position. When assaying OCB, attention must be given to its determinants.

3. Stylish Practices Of OCB At Workplace :

- Start With a Specific Vision.
- Explain the logic Behind Your New Idea.
- Take Small way Toward Change.
- Gather and Respond to Team Feedback.
- Share Success Stories With the Company.
- Encourage Innovation Among workers.
- Help Your Company Achieve New Heights.

4. Counter Work Productive Behaviour (CWB) :

The term Counter work productive Behaviour (CWB) stems from plant and organizational psychology (Sackett, 2002). ineffective work geste is considered to comprise voluntary conditioning that harm associations, guests, associates, and administrators. Counter work productive Behaviour (CWB) has been a problem since associations have hired workers. lately, there has been adding interest in explaining and addressing counter culturist geste in the plant.

Negative counterculturist actions include hand delinquencies similar as not following the director's instructions, designedly decelerating down the work cycle, arriving late, committing petty theft as well as not treating co-workers with respect and/ or acting rudely with co-workers. Unlike unethical geste that violates societal rules, negative counterculturist geste focuses on violation of significant organizational morals.

5. Confines of CWB :

1. Abuse against others – physical and cerebral aggression directed against associates, for illustration, pitfalls, disparaging commentary, ignoring others.
2. product deviance – purposeful divagation from or neglect of the standard in fulfilling one's liabilities.
3. Sabotage – purposefully destroying or damaging the association's property.
4. Theft – stealing the association's and/ or associates' property, together with a implicit aggressive response intended to harm the association.
5. pullout – limiting time spent at work to situations below the needed norm, for illustration, through unexcused absences, leaving work beforehand, taking breaks above the allowed time limit, or late advents. This model has been empirically vindicated in multitudinous studies.

6. Prevention of Unethical Behaviour in Work place :

The stylish way to help counter culturist geste from getting the norm in the plant is for directors to set a clear tone that it won't be permitted and establish penalties for those who go down that road. It's the same with unethical geste in the plant. The tone at the top must be one that establishes clear prospects and promotes respectable geste while taking action against inferior geste. All too frequently in society one person or group in authority fails to act on unhappy, tone-serving geste that negatively affects those who play by the rules and morals maybe because they sweat the possible consequences of taking remedial action(i.e., attacks by unsympathetic groups, importunity, and suits). For the plant to be a productive terrain, leaders must lead. operation practitioner Peter Drucker said it stylish directors are leaders who do effects right; leaders are people who do the right effects. ”

7. The connections Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and ineffective Work geste :

In the 1930s, OCB was defined as voluntary conduct accepted by workers for the common good. still, more recent accounts conceptualize OCB as a complex and multidimensional psychosocial miracle Dalal(2005) stated that the links between OCB and CWB are related to social exchange proposition, the cerebral contract, and the social norm of reciprocity, as well as personality traits and organizational factors. therefore, different groups of factors determine hand actions.

It's delicate to unambiguously detect the determinants of positive or negative connections between OCB and CWB. individualities might parade different instantiations of their personality traits depending on the situation. These instantiations might also be responses to signals from the plant terrain (Tett & Burnett, 2003).

Dalal (2005) refocused out that the relationship between OCB and CWB might be moderated by the source of evaluation, that is, evaluations formed by the administrator of the hand(tone- regard) grounded on their prints. The administrator might assign high OCB low CWB conditions to an hand who makes a positive print and low OCB/ high CWB conditions to an hand who makes a negative print. also, workers engage in OCB and/ or CWB grounded on their pretensions. therefore, an hand might constantly help but also constantly harm others. Alternately, a hand might infrequently help and infrequently harm others, constantly help and infrequently harm others, or infrequently help and constantly harm others. This is because workers can impute different pretensions to these actions.

To expand the knowledge on the relationship between OCB and CWB, the current study examined whether CWB situations drop as the situations of individual OCB confines increase. also, total and individual dimension OCB and CWB scores were measured in the entire sample as well as in the distinguished groups. The results therefore contribute to the being knowledge about the relationship between OCB and CWB.

8. CONCLUSION :

Organizational citizenship Behaviour isn't commodity every hand will engage in, it can have tremendous benefits for both your pool and the association. As similar, it's worth looking for ' OCB implicit ' in campaigners during

the hiring process, laboriously involving directors in setting the right illustration, and redefining your performance operation to make organizational citizenship geste an natural part of company culture.

Organizations must do further than screen workers in order to successfully manage CWBs. Substantial exploration has demonstrated that CWBs arise out of situational factors that do in the day- to- day operations of an association, including organizational constraints, lack of prices, illegitimate tasks, interpersonal conflicts, and lack of organizational justice. Research has shown that individualities who are treated unfairly are more likely to engage in CWBs. One major step that associations can take to reduce the motivation for CWBs is thus to enhance organizational justice.

Maintaining dispatches and feedback, allowing participation of workers, and administrative training are other suggestions for mollifying CWBs. Organizations must also pay close attention to workers for signs and sources of interpersonal conflicts so that they can be linked and tended to as necessary.

REFERENCES:

1. Barabasz, A., & Chwalibóg, E. (2013). Refleksje nad konsekwencjami zachowań obywatelskich w organizacjach [Reflections on the consequences of citizenship behaviors in organizations]. *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Folia Oeconomica*, 282, 23–32.
2. Batson, C. D. (1990). *Affect and altruism*. Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
3. Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 107–122. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli0202_1
4. Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18–36). Sage.
5. Borman, W., & Motowidlo, S. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). Jossey-Bass.
6. Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). Employee personality as a moderator of the relationships between work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 12, 91–103. doi: 10.1037/a0017326
7. Brief, A., & Weiss, H. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279–307. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156
8. Dalal, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241–1255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241
9. Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A withinperson approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship–counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 1051–1066. doi: 10.5465/amj.2009.44636148
10. DeShong, H., Grant, D., & Mullins-Sweatt, S. (2015). Comparing models of counterproductive workplace behaviors: The Five-Factor Model and the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 74, 55–60. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.001
11. Dineen, B. R., Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2006). Supervisory guidance and behavioral integrity: Relationships with employee citizenship and deviant behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 622–635. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.622
12. Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 547–559. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.547
13. Folger, R. & Skarlicki, D. P. (1998). A popcorn metaphor for employee aggression. In R. W. Griffin, A. O’Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violent and deviant behavior* (pp. 43–81). JAI Press;
14. Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 291–309. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803