

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature that is relevant to the present study. This chapter highlights the importance of trust in co-workers as well as the implications of co-workers' trustworthiness and social undermining behaviour on the employees' work experiences. The following sub-sections review previous studies on trust, trust in co-workers, and trustworthiness, as well as the social undermining behaviour in the workplace. The chapter also presents a review of literature on the three categories of employees' job performance, namely organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), and task performance.

2.2 Trust, Trust in Co-workers, and Trustworthiness

Trust can be defined as the willingness of individuals to be vulnerable based upon positive expectations about the intentions or actions of another (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Trust lies at the heart of interpersonal relationships among organisational members. It has important organisational and interpersonal consequences such as organisational performance (Salamon & Robinson, 2008) and individuals' OCB (Yakovleva et al., 2010). Since the late 1990s, considerable academic journals devoting special issues to this topic has accumulated such as the *Academy of Management Journal* (1995, Vol. 38, No. 1), *Academy of Management Review* (1998, Vol. 23, No. 3), *Organisation Science* (2003, Vol. 14, No. 1), *International Journal of Human Resource*

Management (2003, Vol. 14, No. 1), and *Personnel Review* (2003, Vol. 32 No. 5).

The factors that foster trust in leaders and the outcomes of this trust have received a great deal of scholarly attention. Nevertheless, studies on trust in co-workers are relatively sparse (Lau & Liden, 2008). Empirical trust research tends to focus on the trustworthiness as the antecedents of trust (e.g., Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000; Grant & Sumanth, 2009; Levin, Whitener & Cross, 2006; Tan & Lim, 2009), thus providing incomplete understanding of how co-workers' social undermining behaviour may affect trust in co-workers. Therefore, the role of trust in co-workers in mediating the effects of co-workers' trustworthiness and social undermining behaviour on employees' OCB, CWB, and task performance was investigated in this research.

Since the main focus of this study is trust in co-workers, it is necessary to review the trust literature and relevant studies that have been done in this field. The following sub-sections review the concepts of trust, trust in co-workers, and trustworthiness.

2.2.1 The Concept of Trust

Trust has been an important area of inquiry among organisational behaviour researchers (e.g., McAllister, 1995). Golembiewski and McConkie (1975), as cited in Hosmer (1995), state that, "...there is no single variable which so thoroughly influences interpersonal and group behaviour as does trust" (p. 131). Past research has found that trust has significant benefits for both organisations and organisational members (e.g., De Jong & Elfring, 2010; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011). Although there is a general agreement on the significance of trust within the organisational context, scholars do not quite agree on a single definition of trust (Hosmer, 1995; Kramer, 1999).

There are numerous definitions of trust, but there are two primary components in the conceptualization of trust. The first is the individual's expectation or belief that

one's interest will be protected, no matter whether he or she has the ability to monitor or control another party (Boon & Holmes, 1991; Frost, Stimpson, & Maughan, 1978; Hosmer, 1995). The second centres on the willingness of a party to accept risk and be vulnerable to the words or actions of another party (Currall & Judge, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). The willingness to be vulnerable derives from one party's perceptions of the other's trustworthiness such as ability, benevolence, and integrity (Mayer et al., 1995).

According to Lewis and Weigert (1985, p. 972), "...trusting behaviour may be motivated primarily by strong positive affect for the object of trust or by 'good rational reasons' why the object of trust merits trust, or, more usually, some combination of both. Trust in everyday life is a mix of feeling and rational thinking". Based on this, McAllister (1995) developed a conceptual framework that distinguishes two different types of trust, namely the affect-based trust and cognition-based trust.

Cognition-based trust refers to trust that is based on a careful, rational evaluation of an individual's ability to carry out obligations and, therefore, reflects beliefs about another party's capabilities, competency, responsibility, dependability, and reliability (Schaubroeck et al, 2011). On the other hand, affect-based trust refers to the subjective, emotional attachment that arises from the mutual care and concern that exists between individuals (McAllister, 1995). McAllister suggests that cognition-based trust influences affect-based trust. The affect-based trust, according to him, is more enduring and less superficial compared to cognition-based trust.

Although McAllister (1995) conceptualizes the development of trust as a discrete process, Mayer et al. (1995) view trust as a continuous process. Mayer and colleagues define trust as, "...the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party"

(p. 712). The authors developed one of the most well known models of trust, which separates trust from its antecedents. The model proposes that perceptions of trustees' ability, benevolence, and integrity as antecedents of trust.

This study incorporated Mayer and colleagues' (1995) integrative model of trust to examine the relationship between the co-workers' trustworthiness and trust in co-workers. The following sub-sections review literature on trust in co-workers and trustworthiness.

2.2.2 Trust in Co-workers

Although trust can be examined at multiple levels such as at the individual (e.g., supervisors, teammates, and co-workers), organisational, inter-organisational, and international levels, the present study focuses on trust in co-workers. Tan and Lim (2009) adapt Mayer et al.'s (1995) definition of trust and define trust in co-workers as, "...the willingness of a person to be vulnerable to the actions of fellow co-workers whose behaviour and actions that person cannot control" (p. 46).

Organisational members often rely on co-workers for vital information and valuable resources. Co-workers work alongside and interact with individual employees on a day-to-day basis in the workplace; they hold relatively similar positions or ranks to the employees (Fairlie, 2004; Tan & Lim, 2009; Yoon & Thye, 2000). According to Sherony and Green (2002), co-worker exchanges involve exchanges between employees and their co-workers who report to the same supervisor. Co-workers may be the employee's team members, but not necessarily so. The term "co-workers" in this study encompasses employees who work in the same department and report to the same boss; they do not necessarily belong to the same team.

The relationships between employees and their co-workers entail equality matching (Fiske, 1992). According to Fiske, if an individual provides emotional and behavioural resources to another party, the individual expects that the other party would return a similar and relatively equal amount of resource in the future, even with an unspecified obligation. This shows that interactions between employees and their co-workers are based on reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). Since there is no guarantee of reciprocation, trust is therefore central to exchanges between employees and their co-workers. When individuals trust their co-workers, they are more willing to help and support their co-workers because they expect their co-workers to reciprocate their help when required in the future.

Past studies have examined the antecedents of trust in co-workers. Ferrin et al. (2006), for example, suggest that co-worker's citizenship behaviour had a significant relationship with trust in the co-worker. Using Singaporean Chinese as samples, Tan and Lim (2009) report that co-workers' benevolence and integrity were significantly and positively related to trust in co-workers. The ability of co-workers was not related to trust in co-workers, according to them, perhaps because their Chinese samples tend to emphasis on positive attitudes toward others rather on co-workers' competency. They comment that this could perhaps be the reason why benevolence is the most significant trustworthiness in predicting trust in co-workers. In another study by Dirks and Skarlicki (2009) in Western Canada, trust was found to mediate the relationship between perceptions of a co-worker's trustworthiness and individuals' willingness to share resources with the co-worker.

Other authors have examined the role of third parties in shaping employees' trust in their co-workers. According to Lau and Liden (2008), leaders serve as important trust information transmitters who could influence trust judgements among co-workers. The

authors suggest that the extent to which leaders trust in their co-workers may be contagious because this trust could enhance employees' trust in co-workers. Similarly, Ferrin et al. (2006) report that trust transferability (i.e., the number of third parties who trust the co-worker) has a direct relationship with trust in co-workers.

A small group of research relates perceptions of organisational justice to employees' experience with their co-workers. These studies believed that employees would be more willing to engage in exchanges with their co-workers when they see that fairness exist in the organisation. For example, Forret and Love (2008) report that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice perceptions are related to trust in co-workers. According to Lin (2007), distributive justice is related to trust in co-workers, but procedural justice is not related significantly to trust in co-workers. Lin explains that procedural justice tends to predict specific organisational outcomes such as organisational commitment rather than interpersonal-related outcomes such as trust in co-workers.

Trust in co-workers has also been linked to organisational and individual outcomes. In Cook and Wall's (1980) view, trust among employees contributes to an overall workplace trust. Trust could facilitate an effective relationship between employees and their co-workers. Some research has found that trust in co-workers is related to interpersonal citizenship behaviour (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002) and organisational citizenship behaviour (Yakovleva et al., 2010), perceived organisational support, affective commitment, and intention to quit (Ferres et al., 2004). In addition, Parker et al. (2006) affirm the role of trust in co-workers in promoting proactive work behaviour such as actively solving problem and implementing ideas in the workplace. When employees trust their co-workers, they are more likely to try things beyond core tasks and take the risks of making mistakes.

In this study, it was hypothesized that the relationship between co-workers' trustworthiness and employees' job performance was mediated by trust in co-workers. The following sub-section reviews literature on the trustworthiness.

2.2.3 Trustworthiness

Blau's (1964) perspective on social exchange (as cited in Levin et al., 2006) suggests that trust develops as people interact, observe and evaluate each other's behaviour. Drawing on this notion, researchers tend to view that trustworthiness are the foundation for the formation of trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Mayer and associates drew a distinction between trust and trustworthiness. They define trustworthiness as the trustor's evaluation of how trustworthy the trustee is, and trust as the trustor's willingness to engage in a risky behaviour that stems from the trustor's vulnerability to the trustee's behaviour. Barney and Hansen (1994) explain that trustworthiness is an attribute of an individual actor involved in the relationships and trust is an attribute of the relationships.

Three characteristics appear to be most commonly related to a party's perceptions of the other party's trustworthiness, namely perceptions of other's ability, benevolence, and integrity (Mayer et al., 1995). Perceived ability refers to the trustor's belief that a trustee has relevant skills, competencies, and characteristics that allow the trustee to have influence in a specific domain (Mayer et al., 1995). Some studies refer ability as perceived expertise (Crosby, Evans, & Cowles, 1990) and competence (Aryee et al., 2002). According to Colquitt, Scott, and Lepine (2007), ability captures the "can-do" element of trustworthiness. An individual would trust the other party if he or she is well qualified or has much knowledge about the tasks at hand. Therefore, ability is context-specific. For example, an individual may trust an accountant in analyzing

financial information and preparing financial reports, but not in maintaining the computer systems and networks of an organisation. Since employees often interact and rely on each other for vital information and feedback, the knowledge and skills of other individuals could significantly affect them.

According to Mayer et al. (1995), perceived benevolence refers to the trustor's belief that the other party has goodwill and cares about him or her. Synonyms of benevolence include loyalty, openness, caring, or supportiveness (Colquitt et al., 2007). Contrary to ability dimension, benevolence represents the "will-do" element of trustworthiness (Colquitt et al., 2007). This is because individuals can decide whether or not to use their abilities for the best interests of the trustor. Benevolence may create an emotional attachment to the trustee, with caring and supportiveness fostering a sense of positive affect. An example of benevolence includes holding good intentions towards others.

Perceived integrity refers to the extent to which a trustor perceives the trustee commits to a set of principles that trustor finds acceptable to him or her (Mayer et al., 1995). Integrity signifies the "will-do" element of trustworthiness and its synonyms include fairness, justice, consistency, and promise fulfilment (Colquitt et al., 2007). A sense of fairness or moral character provides a kind of long-term predictability that could help individuals to cope with uncertainty (Lind, 2001). According to Mayer and associates, integrity is judged by examining previous behaviour, reputation, and the consistency between words and actions. The trustor's perceptions of the other party's integrity are developed when the other party sticks to his or her word, or has a strong sense of justice (Mayer et al., 1995).

A rich body of literature supports the importance of the trustworthiness in predicting trust. The ability, benevolence, and integrity of managers, according to

Mayer and Davis (1999), contribute to the prediction of trust in management. Colquitt et al.'s (2007) meta-analysis of 132 independent samples also shows that these factors are significantly related to trust. In addition, Tan and Tan (2000) affirm that perceptions of supervisors' ability, benevolence, and integrity are significantly related to trust in supervisors.

Although evidence suggests that Mayer et al.'s (1995) three trustworthiness contribute to the prediction of trust in supervisor (e.g., Mayer & Davis, 1999; Mayer & Gavin, 2005; Poon et al., 2006; Tan & Tan, 2000), some researchers suggest that not all trustworthiness are important in predicting trust. In particular, they indicate that only benevolence and integrity are significantly related to trust in supervisors (Davis et al., 2000) and trust in co-workers (Tan & Lim, 2009). Given that the support for the importance of trustworthiness has been inconsistent in studies on trust, this study aimed to examine how co-workers' trustworthiness are related to trust in co-workers based on the experiences of Malaysian employees. The findings should enable the managers and employees to understand how trust in co-workers develops. The following section explains the concept of social undermining behaviour in the workplace.

2.3 Social Undermining Behaviour

Past research has focused on the positive aspects of workplace networks such as social support, workplace friendships, and communication network (e.g., Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Zohar & Tenne-Gazit, 2008). Relatively little attention has been devoted at the negative interactions in the workplace (Duffy et al., 2002). This study not only examined the relationship between perceived co-workers' trustworthiness and trust in co-workers, but also investigated how a particularly pertinent undesirable behaviour in the workplace, namely co-workers' social undermining behaviour is related to trust in

co-workers. This examination is necessary because individuals may react emotionally to being socially undermined at work (Crossley, 2009). In particular, social undermining behaviour often leads to negative emotional reactions (Duffy et al., 2002), that could in turn adversely influence employees' work attitudes and behaviour (Cole, Walter, & Bruch, 2008; Tepper, 2000).

The following sub-sections present the concept of social undermining behaviour, the conceptual distinctions between social undermining behaviour and its related constructs, as well as empirical studies of social undermining behaviour in the workplace.

2.3.1 The Concept of Social Undermining Behaviour

Although the moniker "social undermining" appears to be established by Vinokur and van Ryn (1993), it has been tagged in different terms by various authors such as "social conflict" and "social upset" (Duffy et al., 2002). According to Vinokur and van Ryn, social undermining refers to behaviour that is targeted at an individual and elicits negative emotions such as anger and distrust, negative assessment of the target's attributes, actions, and efforts, as well as other behaviours which could deliberately hinder the target's accomplishment of instrumental goals.

Duffy et al. (2002) refine the concept of social undermining and extend it to the workplace context. The authors define social undermining as behaviour that is intended to impair an employee's ability to build and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, to hinder his or her ability to accomplish goals, and to demolish his or her favourable reputation. They made some modifications and adaptations in social undermining behaviour scales to denote work-related social undermining behaviour. Some examples of social undermining behaviour in the workplace include intentionally

insulting someone at work, belittling others, competing with others for status and recognition, giving incorrect information about the jobs, delaying work to slow others down, and giving the silent treatment.

Although social undermining is perceived as negative and social support is perceived as positive workplace behaviours, these two constructs are distinct in conceptual dimensions (Vinokur, Price, & Caplan, 1996). According to O’Leary-Kelly, Duffy, and Griffin (2000), low level of social undermining refers to the absence of negative behaviour, but it does not denote the existence of positive behaviour.

In addition, social support and social undermining behaviours are often related to different outcomes. For example, social support is more likely to be associated with one’s well-being, but social undermining tends to be related to psychological ill-health (Ruehlman & Wolchik, 1988). Individuals with high levels of both supervisor support and supervisor undermining, according to Duffy et al. (2002), are associated with counterproductive work behaviour (CWB). This is because inconsistent cues from supervisors would erode trust in supervisor and trigger negative emotions such as uneasiness.

2.3.2 Social Undermining Behaviour and Other Related Constructs

Social undermining behaviour is conceptually related with different forms of negative behaviour in the workplace such as workplace deviance, aggression, incivility, bullying, and abusive supervision. According to Bowling and Beehr (2006), these terms refer to a similar construct. However, some evidence suggests that these constructs do not completely overlap with each other (e.g., Duffy et al., 2002; Griffin & Lopez, 2005). The constructs may differ in terms of the targets, the degrees of severity, the motives, and the consequences of the behaviour.

Workplace deviance is a form of negative behaviour which is similar to social undermining behaviour. Some researchers describe workplace deviance using different terms such as counterproductive work behaviour (e.g., Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006; Dalal, 2005; Sackett et al., 2006) and antisocial behaviour (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). Robinson and Bennett (1995) define workplace deviance as intentional behaviour that violates significant organisational norms that intimidates the well-being of an organisation and/or organisational members. According to the authors, interpersonal deviance is targeted at the organisational members and includes behaviour such as violence, gossips, and theft, whereas organisational deviance is targeted towards the organisation and includes actions such as damaging company property and withholding effort. Some behaviour included in interpersonal deviance overlaps with social undermining behaviour such as spreading rumours and insulting someone at work. Workplace deviance could be targeted only at the organisation and specific individuals, but social undermining behaviour is intended to harm only a particular person and not directed at the organisation.

Workplace aggression comprises of intentional behaviour that are aimed at harming others at work or their organisation (Neuman & Baron, 1998). It is a broader concept compared to social undermining behaviour. Workplace aggression includes more intense and overt physical or psychological form of behaviour, ranging from psychological aggression (e.g., gossiping) to violence acts such as beating up, homicide, sabotage, and vandalism (Greenberg & Barling, 1999). Both workplace aggression and social undermining behaviour are conceptualized as undesirable work behaviour, but social undermining behaviour includes less severe negative behaviour compared to workplace aggression and it excludes physical aggression (Hershcovis, 2011; Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001).

Workplace bullying is another type of negative work behaviour. The milder forms of this behaviour include spreading false rumours about work performance, failing to return phone calls, and intentionally withholding necessary information. The more overt types of workplace bullying include intentionally stealing, sabotaging work materials, and making aggressive or intimidating eye contact or physical gestures (Fox & Stallworth, 2005). Unlike social undermining behaviour, workplace bullying occurs repeatedly over an extended period of time and it often involves a perceived power imbalance between the perpetrator and the target such as between the supervisor and subordinate (Hershcovis, 2011).

Workplace incivility is also a construct closely related to social undermining behaviour. Andersson and Pearson (1999) define workplace incivility as, "...low-intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others" (p. 457). Examples of workplace incivility include paying little attention to other's statements and showing little interest in other's opinion (Cortina et al., 2001). An individual who engages in workplace incivility behaviour may have no clear intention to harm others (Lim & Lee, 2011). For example, the individual may claim that the incivility behaviour occurs as a result of ignorance or an oversight (Pearson et al., 2001). Unlike workplace incivility, social undermining behaviour occurs with a clear intentional motive to hinder the target's success on the job.

Abusive supervision refers to employees' perceptions of antagonistic verbal and non-verbal behaviours by the supervisors (Tepper, 2000). According to Tepper, this construct differs from other negative behaviour constructs because it focuses on one particular perpetrator (i.e., the supervisor). Examples of abusive supervision include

invading the subordinates' privacy, telling the subordinate that his or her thoughts or feelings are stupid, and intimidating the subordinate by use of threats of job loss (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). Similar to social undermining behaviour construct, abusive supervision excludes physical abusive behaviour. However, social undermining behaviour in the workplace could be perpetrated by both the supervisors and co-workers (Duffy, Ganster, Shaw, Johnson, & Pagon, 2006).

Taken together, social undermining behaviour construct overlaps with other forms of negative behaviour in the workplace. Specifically, social undermining behaviour is viewed as a set of behaviour that is designed with clear hostile intent to hinder the target's attainment of personal and/or social accomplishments (Duffy et al., 2002). The following sub-section discusses the implications of workplace treatment for organisations and employees.

2.3.3 Consequences of Workplace Mistreatment

Past research has revealed that workplace mistreatment has adverse effects on employees' work outcomes. Penney and Spector (2005), for example, reveal that the experience of incivility at work is related to lower job satisfaction and increased propensity to engage in counterproductive work behaviour. Cole, Walter, and Bruch (2008) conducted a field study to understand the consequences of teams' dysfunctional behaviour to team performance. Using a sample of 61 work teams, Cole and associates show that dysfunctional team behaviour (i.e., the behaviour that is intended to adversely affect team functioning) is associated with team members' negative affective reactions such as anger, anxiety and fury, and subsequently, poorer team performance.

In addition, Lim and Lee (2011) report that 91 percent of 180 full-time employees in Singapore experienced some form of workplace incivility from their

supervisors, co-workers, or subordinates in the past five years. According to Lim and Lee, workplace incivility would result in reduced job satisfaction, lower perceived fairness in the workplace, and greater psychological distress.

Studies on abusive supervision show that such act is related to lower levels of satisfaction, commitment, and justice perceptions, as well as higher levels of turnover, role conflict, psychological distress, and fewer organisational citizenship behaviour (Tepper, 2000; Zellars et al., 2002). When individuals experience abusive supervision, they often feel frustrated, vulnerable, and alienated (Ashforth, 1997). These individuals would retaliate not only towards those who harm them, but also react in negative ways towards the organisation and other employees (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007).

Others researchers have examined the effects of workplace mistreatments on individuals or third parties who witness such act. Although these individuals may not be the target of the mistreatment, the negative events often negatively affect those bystanders (Ferguson & Barry, 2011). For example, individuals who witnessed workplace treatment report lower job satisfaction, greater job insecurity, and more interpersonal conflicts (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007). According to Low, Radhakrishnan, Schneider, and Rounds (2007), awareness of ethnic harassment of one's co-workers is associated with detrimental consequences such as greater dissatisfaction with their co-workers and supervisors, decreased self-esteem, poorer health conditions, and lower satisfaction with their health.

Similar to other forms of workplace mistreatment, social undermining behaviour in the workplace often triggers a range of undesirable outcomes. Duffy and associates observe that supervisors' and co-workers' social undermining behaviour have detrimental personal and organisational consequences such as increased depression and

counterproductive work behaviour, decreased self-esteem, lower job satisfaction, and higher intentions to quit their jobs (Duffy et al., 2002; Duffy et al., 2006).

In summary, past research on a range of mistreatment at work has linked negative behaviour with various undesirable personal and organisational outcomes. According to Duffy et al. (2002), employees may receive support and being undermined by others in the workplace at the same point of time. This study therefore aimed to investigate the effects of co-workers' trustworthiness and social undermining behaviour on employees' job performance, via the intervening mechanism of trust in co-workers.

2.4 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Researchers in organisational behaviour and industrial-organisational psychology have consistently recognised the importance of promoting organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among organisational members (e.g., De Cremer, van Dijke, & Mayer, 2010; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004). OCB is a form of individual performance which includes discretionary behaviour that contributes towards organisational effectiveness (Organ, 1988). Some examples of OCB include assisting others with their duties, attending functions that are not required, and offering ideas to improve the functioning of the organisation (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

2.4.1 The Concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Since Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) established the term "citizenship behaviour" to describe unrewarded employee behaviour, OCB has garnered tremendous attention among scholars. OCB is described differently across many studies; they include prosocial organisational behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), extra-role behaviour (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), contextual

performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), and organisational spontaneity (George & Jones, 1997).

Organ (1988) defines OCB as discretionary contributory actions that are not explicitly or formally rewarded by the organisations and may enhance organisational effectiveness. However, subsequent research has demonstrated that managers take OCB into account when rating employees' performance and allocating rewards (e.g., Lowery & Krilowicz, 1996; Orr, Sackett, & Mercer, 1989; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Organ (1997) subsequently revises his earlier definition of OCB and defines OCB as behaviour that contributes, "...to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance" (p. 91). This definition is similar to the definition of contextual performance introduced by Borman and Motowidlo (1997). They define contextual performance as behaviour that maintains or improves the social and psychological context within which core tasks are performed.

Past research has found that job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Moorman & Blakely, 1995), as well as individual factors such as proactive personality, positive affectivity, collectivism, and empathic concern (Johnson et al., 2010; Kamdar, McAllister, & Turban, 2006; Lavelle et al., 2009; Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010) are related to OCB. Besides, workplace settings and events in the workplace are also important predictors of OCB.

According to the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; as cited in Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), there is an unspoken obligation to reciprocate quality social interactions. Consistent with the theory, past research has noted that employees are more likely to engage in OCB whenever they trust that their employer would act in their interests (Organ, 1998). Subsequent research similarly find that subordinates' perceptions of procedural justice and supervisory leadership practices are related to subordinates' OCB

(e.g., Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999; Tepper & Taylor, 2003; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010). In addition, studies on workplace social exchange relationships suggest that employees tend to exhibit OCB to reciprocate high quality leader-member exchange relationships (Ilies et al., 2007). Likewise, employees are more likely to help others in their groups when they have high quality team-member exchange (Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007).

There are also some published studies on OCB in Malaysia. Lo, Ramayah, and Kueh (2006), in a study of executives and managers from ten manufacturing organisations in Sarawak, show a positive relationship between leader-member exchange and subordinates' OCB. In addition, according to Omar, Zainal, Omar, and Khairudin (2009), transformational and transactional leadership behaviours are positively related to OCB.

Existing research has demonstrated the positive consequences of OCB. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, and Blume (2009) summarize studies on the relationships between OCB and their outcomes. Their meta-analytic review shows that employees who engage in OCB are more likely to earn higher managers' ratings of employees' performance and reward allocation decisions. This finding suggests that OCB has implications on managers' evaluation of employees' performance. According to them, OCB is negatively related to employees' turnover intentions, actual turnover, and absenteeism. They also report that organisations with employees who engage in high levels of citizenship behaviour accomplish higher organisational-level outcomes such as productivity, efficiency, profitability, and customer satisfaction. This supports Organ's (1988) contention that OCB has influential effects on organisational effectiveness.

In summary, OCB has been recognized as essential to the success of the organisation (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988). The following sub-section discusses the different dimensions of OCB.

2.4.2 The Dimensionality of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Scholars have expanded the concept of OCB in a number of ways. With semi-structured interviews with 67 managers, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) identify a two-dimension framework of OCB. According to the authors, generalized compliance reflects compliance with general organisational rules, norms, and expectations (e.g., being punctual, not taking extra breaks, and giving advance notice if unable to come to work); whereas altruism represents behaviour that an individual exhibits intentionally to help other organisational members (e.g., helping others who have been absent, orienting new people even though it is not required, and assisting supervisors with his or her work).

Subsequently, Organ (1988) proposes a five-dimension OCB model consisting of altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Organ defines altruism as voluntary behaviour that is aimed at helping another individual with his or her work-related problems (e.g., instructing a new employee on how to use equipment, helping a co-worker to catch up with a backlog of work). According to Organ (1988), conscientiousness refers to behaviour that exceeds the minimum requisite level of matters such as attendance, punctuality, and housekeeping (e.g., being punctual, exhibiting high attendance); sportsmanship refers to employees' willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances and does not complain unnecessarily (e.g., not complaining about trivial matters); courtesy refers to employees' attempt to prevent creation of problems for others (e.g., passing along information, consulting with others

before taking action); and civic virtue refers to employees' involvement in the life of their organisation in a responsible manner (e.g., keeping up with matters that affect the organisation, making constructive suggestions). Two years later, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) developed OCB scales based on the five-dimension framework. Since then, several empirical studies have used their measures (e.g., Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002; Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996).

Organ (1990) later expands his five-factor model to include another two dimensions, namely peacekeeping and cheerleading. He defines peacekeeping as actions that prevent and resolve interpersonal conflicts (e.g., acting like a peacemaker when others have disagreements); and cheerleading entails behaviour that encourages the professional development and accomplishment of others (e.g., encouraging others when they are down).

Williams and Anderson (1991) suggest a reconstruction of the dimensions of OCB according to the targets or directions of the behaviour. They categorize OCB into two broad categories. The first category, individuals directed OCB (OCBI) refers to interpersonal helping behaviour that captures altruism and courtesy behaviour. OCBI also includes other authors' dimensions of OCB such as Van Scotter and Motowidlo's (1996) interpersonal facilitation, and Farh, Earley, and Lin's (1997) helping co-workers and interpersonal harmony constructs. Some examples of OCBI include helping others with heavy workloads and those who are absent. The second category, organisation-directed OCB (OCBO) includes the conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue dimensions. OCBO corresponds with Graham's (1991) organisational loyalty, and Van Scotter and Motowidlo's job dedication constructs. Some examples of OCBO include

attending voluntary events pertaining to the organisation and offering ideas to improve the functioning of the organisation.

According to Lee and Allen (2002), organisation-directed OCB (OCBO) is more cognitive driven, whereas individuals directed OCB (OCBI) is more affective driven. Furthermore, empirical studies generally support that organisation-directed OCB (OCBO) rather than individuals directed OCB (OCBI) is more likely to be influenced by organisational factors such as a pleasant working condition (Williams & Anderson, 1991), participative leadership behaviour (Huang et al., 2010), psychological contract fulfilment (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007), and procedural justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). OCBI may have stronger relations with interpersonal exchange and attitudinal variables such as leader-member exchange (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007), concern for others (McNeely & Meglino, 1994), and prosocial values motives (Rioux & Penner, 2001).

This study adopted Williams and Anderson's (1991) conceptualization of OCB and distinguished employees' OCB according to the targets of their behaviour, namely co-workers directed OCB (OCBC) and organisation-directed OCB (OCBO). According to them, it is important to make the distinctions between OCBO and OCBI as some prior work did not incorporate both dimensions in their studies. The following section describes the concept of counterproductive work behaviour, another important behaviour of employees at work.

2.5 Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Researchers have become increasingly interested in counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), as evidenced by publication of special issues in academic journals. Among others, they include the *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*

(2002, Vol. 10, No. 1-2), *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, (2009, Vol. 13, No. 2), and *Human Resource Management Review* (2010, Vol. 20, No. 1). This is not surprising as CWB generally exists in the workplace and has the potential to adversely affect the well-being of organisational members (Penney & Spector, 2005). The following sub-sections discuss the concept and different dimensions of CWB.

2.5.1 The Concept of Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) encompasses actions that violate organisational norms and has the potential to harm organisations and/or other organisational stakeholders such as co-workers, supervisors, and customers (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Sackett, 2002). CWB is described as an aspect of job performance (e.g., Rotundo & Sackett, 2002); a behavioural strain, a form of retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997); and a type of protest behaviour in the workplace (Kelloway, Francis, Prosser, & Cameron, 2010).

CWB has been described differently in many studies such as antisocial behaviour (Aquino & Douglas, 2003), dysfunctional workplace behaviour (Cole et al., 2008), workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), organisational misbehaviour (Vardi & Wiener, 1996), organisational delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Fox & Spector, 1999), and organisational retaliatory behaviour (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). These detrimental, potentially destructive acts may take different forms, from minor acts such as taking excessive breaks to serious acts such as theft.

According to Baron and Neuman (1996), there are two categories of CWB, namely organisation-targeted CWB (CWBO) and individuals targeted CWB (CWBI). Some examples of organisation-targeted CWB (CWBO) include trying to look busy

while doing nothing and coming to work late without permission; whereas individuals targeted CWB (CWBI) include behaviour such as insulting someone about their job performance and starting an argument with a co-worker (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001).

The occurrence of CWB has serious implications for the organisations and employees such as lost productivity, increased insurance costs, lost or damaged property, as well as greater dissatisfaction, job stress, and turnover (Penney & Spector, 2005). According to Bowling and Gruys (2010), CWB could result in substantial financial and personal costs to the organisations and its members. When an employee engage in workplace deviant behaviour such as acting rudely toward someone at work and intentionally working slower, the performance of business units is likely to suffer (Dunlop & Lee, 2004).

As CWB is associated with negative outcomes, researchers have exerted much effort towards understanding the determinants of CWB. Past research has focused on individual differences such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, and negative affectivity (Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006), and organisational environmental factors such as organisational injustice, interpersonal conflict at work, and detrimental behaviour in organisation (Penney & Spector, 2005; Fox et al., 2001) as antecedents of CWB.

As injustice or mistreatment could come from different sources, employees tend to target their CWB towards the particular source that mistreats them (Jones, 2009). For example, Bruk-Lee and Spector (2006) report that conflict with co-workers is positively and significantly related to individuals targeted CWB (CWBI). According to Jones, interpersonal and informational justices are related to supervisors targeted CWB. This is because employees tend to seek revenge against the sources of interpersonal and informational injustice, which most often are their supervisors.

Using a sample of 162 civil servants in a public organisation in Malaysia, Omar et al. (2011) show that job stress and job dissatisfaction are related to CWB. Their findings were consistent with the findings of similar past studies. According to Penney and Spector (2005), job stressors such as heavy workload, interpersonal conflict, and organisational constraints could elicit negative emotions such as anger, because the job stressors could prevent employees from achieving desired objectives, and may in turn lead to job strains such as CWB. Mount et al. (2006) report that job dissatisfaction is related to both the organisation-targeted CWB (CWBO) and individuals targeted CWB (CWBI). This is because when individuals are dissatisfied with their jobs, they are likely to reciprocate with negative work behaviour or exert less effort in their work.

In summary, CWB could adversely affect the organisation or other members of the organisation. It is therefore in the best interests of organisations to prevent the occurrence of CWB. The following sub-section discusses the different dimensions of CWB.

2.5.2 The Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Robinson and Bennett (1995) propose a four-category typology of CWB as shown in Figure 2.1. The first and second quadrants entail serious organisationally harmful behaviour (labelled property deviance) and minor organisationally harmful behaviour (labelled production deviance), respectively. The third and fourth quadrants consist of minor interpersonally harmful behaviour (labelled political deviance) and serious interpersonal harmful behaviour (labelled personal aggression), respectively. Based on this typology, Bennett and Robinson (2000) develop a 19-item measure of workplace deviant behaviour. The instrument makes distinctions between organisation-targeted CWB and individuals targeted CWB.

depression are more likely to leave work earlier or take excessive breaks, while those with anger and frustration tend to abuse someone at work.

Neuman and Baron (1998) classify CWB based on the target of the behaviour, namely individuals targeted CWB (CWBI) and organisation-targeted CWB (CWBO). Evidence suggests that there are distinctive differences between CWBI and CWBO (e.g., Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006; Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002). There are also differences within each of the interpersonal dimensions of CWB. Some studies combine the target of CWB such as both co-workers and supervisors (e.g., Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Penney & Spector, 2002), while others focused only on specific targets such as supervisors targeted CWB (e.g., Inness, Barling, & Turner, 2005; Jones, 2009) or co-workers targeted CWB (e.g., Hitlan & Noel, 2009; Hung, Chi, & Lu, 2009).

This study adopted Gruys and Sackett's (2003) two-factor model in distinguishing between co-workers-targeted CWB (CWBC) and organisation-targeted CWB (CWBO). Although CWB can also be described by dimensions such as minor and severe harmful behaviours (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), individual and organisational dimensions of CWB have consistently emerged in many conceptual and empirical works on CWB.

The following sections describe the concept of task performance and the importance of employees' job performance.

2.6 Task Performance

Traditionally, researchers have evaluated job performance in terms of task performance or in-role behaviour. Task performance refers to activities that are directly involved in the accomplishment of core job tasks (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). It

involved activities that are formally recognized by organisational reward systems (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Organ and Paine (1999) consider task performance as, "...part and parcel of the workflow that transforms inputs of energy, information and materials into outputs in the form of goods and services to the external constituency" (p. 357). A bank teller, for example, would be involved in activities such as accepting cash and cheques for deposit, preparing money orders, exchanging foreign currency, processing cash withdrawals and money transfer, as well as receiving loan and utility bills payments. These activities are recognized by his or her formal job requirements or formal reward systems.

Literature suggests that there are differences between task performance and OCB. According to Borman and Motowidlo (1997), task performance varies across jobs, whereas contextual performance is common across numerous jobs. Employees' job-relevant knowledge is more highly correlated with task performance compared to their contextual performance, whereas personality variables are linked more strongly to contextual performance criteria such as helping others than to task performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

The antecedents of task performance have been the subject of much research. Turnley, Bolino, Lester, and Bloodgood (2003), for example, show that psychological contract fulfilment is positively related to task performance. Other factors such as organisational embeddedness (Lee, Mitchell, Sablinski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004), occupational embeddedness (Ng & Feldman, 2009), job engagement (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010), trust in the supervisor (Mayer & Davis, 1999), as well as ethical leadership and individual's effort (Piccolo, Greenbaum, Hartog, & Folger, 2010) are

positively related to task performance. The importance of job performance is discussed in the following section.

2.7 The Importance of Job Performance

Past research has demonstrated that employees' job performance can significantly influence their performance appraisal (Conway, 1999; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008). This is because employees' performance generally serves as a basis for the supervisor's performance evaluations decisions. Performance appraisals may in turn affect employees' career development, promotions, and rewards allocation such as pay increments (Spence & Keeping, 2010).

Rotundo and Sackett (2002), for example, evaluate the relative importance of task performance, OCB, and CWB in managers' ratings of subordinates' overall job performance. They indicate that task performance, OCB, and CWB contribute towards the overall job performance ratings. In a cross-cultural research on performance by Rotundo and Xie (2008), task performance, OCB, and CWB were found significantly predicted the ratings of the employees' overall job performance.

According to Lapierre, Bonaccio, and Allen (2009), task performance, supervisor directed OCB, and co-workers targeted CWB are related to supervisors' willingness to mentor. Therefore, employees who wish to get favourable appraisals or supervisor mentorship should strive to achieve high task performance, engage in OCB, and commit less CWB at work.

Research on OCB has focused mainly on its consequences on organisational effectiveness (Organ, 1988). Managers should value OCB because it contributes to organisational productivity (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). According to Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, and Ensley (2004), co-workers' OCB is

positively related to employees' job satisfaction and affective commitment when employees perceive that their co-workers have good intentions. Furthermore, Hui, Lam, and Law (2000) report that employee self-ratings and supervisor ratings of OCB are related to employees' promotion.

Research on CWB also focused on its detrimental outcomes. Employees who frequently engaged in CWB are less likely to engage in OCB (Dalal, 2005). According to Dunlop and Lee (2004), CWB is negatively associated with supervisors' ratings of the performance of the business units. Nevertheless, Krischer, Penney, and Hunter (2010) suggest that some forms of CWB may be beneficial for employees and organisations because they could serve as a means for employees to cope with job stressors like interpersonal conflict, role ambiguity, work overload, lack of social support, and perceptions of injustice. For example, taking occasional longer breaks may help employees to reduce burnout at work.

Taken together, researchers typically recognized that job performance is a multidimensional construct; it includes three broad categories, namely task performance, OCB, and CWB (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Le et al., 2011; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). Given that improved job performance benefits the organisations and employees, it is not surprising that researchers and practitioners alike have tried to find ways to foster positive work behaviour and enhance employees' capability to perform assigned tasks.

2.8 Conclusion

Chapter 2 described the research constructs and presented literature review on trust, trust in co-workers' trustworthiness, social undermining behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), and task

performance. It also highlighted the importance of employees' job performance. The next chapter discusses the rationale for the study and the hypothesized relationships among the variables in the study.