

Quality of Work Life, Work Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - A Study on Employees Engaged in the Corporate Sector

Trishita Biswas¹, Swaha Bhattacharya²

¹Research Student, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta, India

²Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta, India

Abstract: *The aim of the present investigation is to study the quality of work life, work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour of male and female employees working in the corporate sector. Accordingly, a group of 64 employees (32 male and 32 female) were selected as a sample for the study. General Information Schedule, Quality of Working Life Questionnaire, Individual Work Performance Questionnaire, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Checklist were used as tools for data collection. The findings revealed that quality of work life as perceived by the male employees is better than that of the female employees, while no gender difference was observed in the other variables. Additionally, quality of work life was found to have significant correlation with the domains of work performance as well as organizational citizenship behaviour. The present investigation reveals that working conditions can motivate employees to perform better while also engage in helpful behaviours to enable the organization to function at its best, which needs to be taken into consideration by employers.*

Keywords: quality of work life, work performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, corporate sector, gender

1. Introduction

Work is intricately associated with one's life. In current times, it is not just considered a means of subsistence, but it affects people's socioeconomic status, and forms a part of their social identity and their overall life. In the 21st century, the design of jobs and workplaces are changing constantly and workers have to keep their pace with it. The corporate sector, comprising of businesses, is structured differently compared to the public sector in terms of rules and regulations, working hours, job structure, job security, etc. It puts high emphasis on productivity and competition, which can lead to a highly stressful work environment. Thus, the behaviour of the organizations towards the workers and the way the workers reciprocate this treatment will differ owing to the nature of the sector. This makes the study of variables of organizational psychology like Quality of Work Life, Work Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in the corporate sector a unique area of interest.

The conditions under which employees carry out their work determine their overall experience of work. Hence, providing employees with favourable working conditions that leads to their job satisfaction is necessary, and this is where the idea of Quality of Work Life (QWL) comes in. Irving Bluestone first used the expression Quality of work life in the 1960s. He was employed by General Motors, who for the first time set up a programme in the US that allowed workers to participate in decisions related to their working conditions (Goode, 1989). At present, QWL can be assessed through employees' perceptions that they are safe, well satisfied, have good working relationships and are able to grow and develop themselves personally and professionally within the organization.

QWL is widely accepted as a multidimensional construct with different researchers putting forward different models

including the popular model of Walton (1973). Angus S. McDonald (2001) put forward a model of QWL which was used in the present study, consisting of 7 dimensions: support from manager/supervisor; freedom from work - related stress; salary and additional benefits; job satisfaction, challenge, use of skills and autonomy; relationship with work colleague; involvement and responsibility at work; and communication, decision making and job security. Different factors have been found to affect employee's QWL in an organization. It includes the social environment within the organization, the relationship between life on and off the job, the specific tasks they perform and the work environment. Providing safe and healthy working conditions aims to ensure the employee's good health. Thus, taking measures to improve QWL is expected to increase employee's motivation ultimately leading to the enhancement of performance and productivity (Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, 2013). It has been found that dissatisfaction might happen due to lack of recognition, tedious work, unhealthy peer relations, poor working conditions, low self - esteem, occupational stress, heavy work load, monotony, fatigue, time pressures, job insecurity, instability of job (Jeyarathnam & Malarvizhi, 2011). In private sector organizations, work condition and work complexity, organizational and interpersonal relations, employee involvement and commitment, and growth opportunities have the significant impact on QWL of the employees (Khetavath, 2015).

Employee performance is one of the core functions on which an organization and by extension, an economy stands. Work performance is considered an essential factor in human resource management. Work performance can refer to behaviours or actions that are relevant to the goals of the organization, where the focus is on the behaviour (Campbell, 1990). Outcomes or results of the behaviours can also come under the purview of performance (Viswesvaran & Ones,

2000). Work performance is viewed as a multidimensional construct with 3 major domains: task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviour (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000; Rotundo and Sacket, 2002).

- 1) Task performance: It involves fulfilling all requirements that are part of the employment contract.
- 2) Contextual performance: It consists of behaviours that are not usually included in the job description, such as showing initiative, being proactive, cooperating with the organization, etc., and contributes to achievement of the goals of the organization.
- 3) Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): It includes behaviours which prohibit the organization from reaching its goals or brings about undesirable consequences for it.

Person - specific variables like cognitive abilities, knowledge and experience can be important factors for determining task performance (Sonnetag, Volmer & Sychala, 2008). On the other hand, the correlation between personality and job performance has been found to be very low (Kanfer & Kantowitz, 2002). Cognitive processes have also been evident in the expression of CWB (Lee & Allen, 2002). CWBs may occur as a form of protest against the organization to express dissatisfaction or in an attempt to resolve injustice within the organization (Kelloway et al., 2010). Among organizational factors, quality of work life has been found to have a strong relationship to performance (Rubel & Kee, 2014; Daniel, 2019). Relationship with supervisors also exert a strong influence on performance (Maertz et al., 2007; Rubel & Kee, 2014) and was found to be a strong predictor of CWB (Suyasa, 2017).

The optimal functioning of a workplace requires employees to engage in behaviours which go beyond the requirements of the job description. These behaviours include prosocial actions which help the organization to function more effectively, even though they may not be officially recognized. Organ and his colleagues in the early 1980s used the term organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) to describe such behaviours. OCB means doing more for an employer than the minimum requirements of the organization (Schultz & Schultz, 2010). It consists of various kinds of behaviour such as helping others, volunteering for tasks outside of job duties, participating in organizational processes, etc. Strong relationships have been found between OCB and factors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, fairness, trait conscientiousness, and leader support (LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002). It was also found to correlate with the strength of friendships with co-workers, a strong sense of empathy and affective commitment (Bowler & Brass, 2006; Payne & Webber, 2006). A meta-analytic study found that OCBs are related to a number of individual-level outcomes, including managerial ratings of employee performance, reward allocation decisions, and a variety of withdrawal-related criteria as well as to a number of organizational-level outcomes such as, productivity, efficiency, reduced costs, customer satisfaction, and unit-level turnover (Podsakoff et al., 2009). OCB is a variable which is not traditionally included in workplace assessment of performance but exerts considerable influence on the growth of workers as well as

organizations and thus, needs to be studied in - depth so that ways for its improvement in workplaces can be devised.

Gender is one of the important individual factors which determines the experience of an employee at the workplace. Male and female employees may perceive their organizations differently depending on the treatment they receive and consequently reciprocate in different ways in terms of fulfilling their work requirements and facilitating the achievement of the organizational goals. Some studies have found gender differences with respect to QWL, work performance as well as OCB (Daskalova, 2009; Agarwal, 2020; Ramilo, 2004; Heilman & Chen, 2005). Others have found no gender differences with respect to the variables under study (Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy, 2013; Uzonwanne, 2014; Edgar, Blaker & Everett, 2020). Such contradictory findings show that the role of gender in influencing the variables under study needs further exploration.

Thus, variables like Quality of Work Life, Work Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour are crucial to the functioning of organizations as well as growth of employees. The operation of these variables in the corporate sector, their relation to gender along with their interrelationships form the crux of the present study.

Objectives

- 1) To study the quality of work life, work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour of employees engaged in the corporate sector.
- 2) To study the difference between male and female employees engaged in corporate sector in terms of quality of work life, work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour.
- 3) To study the relationships among quality of work life, work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour of employees engaged in the corporate sector.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I (a): Male and female employees engaged in corporate sector differ significantly in terms of quality of work life.

Hypothesis I (b): Male and female employees engaged in corporate sector differ significantly in terms of work performance.

Hypothesis I (c): Male and female employees engaged in corporate sector differ significantly in terms of organizational citizenship behaviour.

Hypothesis II (a): There is significant correlation between quality of work life and work performance among employees engaged in the corporate sector.

Hypothesis II (b): There is significant correlation between quality of work life and organizational citizenship behaviour among employees engaged in the corporate sector.

Hypothesis II (c): There is significant correlation between work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour among employees engaged in the corporate sector.

Sample: A group of 64 employees (32 male and 32 female) were selected as sample using purposive sampling technique. The pertinent characteristics of the sample are as follows:

- 1) Age: 25 – 35 years
- 2) Educational Qualification: Graduate and above
- 3) Duration of service: minimum 2 years

Tools Used:

- 1) **General Information Schedule** - It consisted of preliminary details of to be entered by the subject such as, Name, Age, Sex, Address, Educational Qualification, Designation and Duration of service.
- 2) **Quality of Working Life Questionnaire** – It was developed by Angus S. McDonald (2001) and uses 53 items to measure workers’ assessment of their working conditions. The internal consistency reliability of the scale was found to be 0.94.
- 3) **Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ)** –It is an 18 - item measure of three dimensions of work performance: task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviour,

developed by Linda Koopmans et al. (2016). The internal consistencies were found to be 0.79, 0.83 and 0.89 for the task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive work behaviour scales respectively.

- 4) **Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB - C)** – It was developed by Fox et al. (2012) consisting of 20 items which measures the frequency of OCB displayed by the employees. The co - efficient alpha of the scale was reported to be 0.94 indicating high reliability.

Administration, scoring and statistical treatment:

Questionnaires were administered to selected group of subjects by giving proper instructions. Data was collected and properly scrutinised. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis was done. Product moment correlation and t - test were used.

2. Results and Discussion

The present investigation intends to study the quality of work life, work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour of employees engaged in the corporate sector.

Table 1: Comparison between male and female employees in terms of Quality of Work Life

	Male		Female		t - value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Overall Quality of Work Life (QWL)	202.69	12.89	178.50	23.69	5.07***
1) Support from manager/supervisor (SMS)	38.81	4.65	31.40	6.80	5.08***
2) Freedom from work - related stress (FWS)	29.09	3.32	27.12	6.39	1.55*
3) Salary and additional benefits (SAB)	19.97	1.62	15.69	3.63	6.09***
4) Job satisfaction, challenge, use of skills and autonomy (JSC)	50.09	3.67	40.87	7.90	5.99***
5) Relationship with work colleagues (RWC)	21.28	1.76	20.00	3.04	2.06**
6) Involvement and responsibility at work (IRW)	10.25	2.48	10.31	2.43	0.10*
7) Communication, decision making and job security (CDS)	33.31	6.49	34.62	6.30	0.82*

*Difference is insignificant **p<0.05***p<0.01

Data inserted in Table 1 reveals that the t - value showing comparison between the groups for overall Quality of Work Life was found to be significant, with men experiencing a higher quality of work life compared to women. This could have happened because men receive more support from manager/supervisor, get higher salary and additional benefits, experience greater job satisfaction, challenge, use of skills and autonomy and have better relationship with work colleagues. When comparison was made between the two groups, significant difference was observed. Thus, Hypothesis I (a) which states, ‘Male and female employees engaged in corporate sector differ significantly in terms of quality of work life’ is accepted in the present study.

Table 2: Comparison between male and female employees in terms of Work performance

Work Performance	Male		Female		t - value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Task Performance	17.56	1.08	16.81	2.14	1.77*
Contextual Performance	20.28	2.85	20.25	4.52	0.33*
Counterproductive work Behaviour	2.28	1.53	1.75	1.64	1.33*

*Difference is insignificant

Among the scales of work performance in Table 2, it can be seen that both groups exhibit high levels of Task Performance indicating that they could plan and carry out their work efficiently. The t - value comparing the two groups in terms of task performance was not significant. The results imply that although traditionally men are thought to be better performers in the workplace, such assumptions may not be found to be true in the present working scenario as women are contributing equally to job tasks. Corporate sector, in particular, puts high emphasis on employees’ level of performance. Pay, promotion and other benefits depend on the extent to which the employees are fulfilling their tasks. As a result, all employees are motivated to work harder to achieve their goals, and no sex difference can be observed in task performance. In case of Contextual Performance, both male and female employees engaged in actions beneficial for their organizations outside of their job tasks to a moderate extent. The t - value indicating the difference between male and female employees in terms of contextual performance was found to be not significant. As such, gender roles may not have a strong impact in determining contextual performance. The mean value for male and females in terms of Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) was found to be is very low, indicating

that both groups engaged in few counterproductive work behaviours. The t - value showed that the difference between the two groups was not significant, indicating that gender may not have a strong influence on CWB. When comparison was made between the two groups, the significant difference was not observed. **Thus, Hypothesis I (b) which states, ‘Male and female employees engaged in corporate sector differ significantly in terms of work performance’ is rejected in this investigation.**

Table 3: Comparison between male and female employees in terms of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

	Male		Female		t - value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)	64.31	11.28	62.59	10.84	0.62*

*Difference is insignificant

Analysis of data in Table 3 reveals that both groups exhibited organizational citizenship behaviours to a moderate extent, including positive behaviours toward the organization, as well as toward other individuals. The t - value showing the comparison between the two groups was found to be not significant. This can happen since male and female employees may engage in different types of citizenship behaviour owing to gender roles, but they do not differ generally in the level of OCB they exhibit. **Thus, Hypothesis I (c) which states, ‘Male and female employees engaged in corporate sector differ significantly in terms of organizational citizenship behaviour’ is rejected in this investigation.**

Table 4: Correlations among Quality of work life, Work performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

	Task Performance (TP)	Contextual Performance (CP)	Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB)	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)
Overall Quality of Work Life (QWL)	0.76**	0.34**	- 0.46*	0.27*
Support from Manager/ Supervisor (SMS)	0.55**	0.28*	- 0.35**	0.33**
Freedom from work - related stress (FWS)	0.60**	0.23	- 0.53**	0.09
Salary and additional benefits (SAB)	0.54**	0.14	- 0.21	0.23
Job satisfaction, challenge, use of skills and autonomy (JSC)	0.61**	0.21	- 0.20	0.24
Relationship with work colleagues (RWC)	0.16	0.03	- 0.07	0.06
Involvement and responsibility at work (IRW)	0.05	0.28*	- 0.01	0.37**
Communication, decision making and job security (CDS)	0.50**	0.35**	- 0.54**	0.07
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)	0.34**	0.25*	- 0.17	-

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

Quality of work life (QWL) was found to have a strong and significant positive correlation with task performance. This can occur because improvement of the QWL of the workplace increases motivation and job satisfaction of the workers which leads to enhanced performance and productivity (Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, 2013; Rubel & Kee, 2014). Task performance also has significant correlations with the dimensions of QWL including support from manager/supervisor, freedom from work related stress, salary and additional benefits, job satisfaction, challenge, use of skills and autonomy, and communication, decision making and job security. Contextual performance was found to have significant positive correlation with QWL and its dimensions of support from manager/supervisor, involvement and responsibility at work and communication, decision making and job security. Counterproductive work behaviour has significant negative correlation with QWL and its dimensions including support from manager/supervisor, freedom from work - related stress and communication, decision making and job security. CWB has been found to be associated with negative emotions (Spector & Fox, 2002). Dissatisfactory organizational conditions can lead to negative emotions which may result in retaliatory behaviours like CWB. So, when the working conditions are favourable, such as when QWL is high, such retaliatory behaviours may not occur, which may explain the negative correlation between the two variables found in the present study. **Thus, Hypothesis II (a) which states, ‘There is**

significant correlation between quality of work life and work performance among employees engaged in the corporate sector’ is accepted in this study.

QWL was found to have significant positive correlation with organizational citizenship behaviour. Additionally, the dimensions of support from manager/supervisor and involvement and responsibility at work were also found to have significant correlation with OCB. The results indicate that as QWL increases, it brings about improvement in the workplace, which makes employees willing to contribute to the organization in ways which may not be explicitly stated. Furthermore, QWL has been found to have a strong effect on factors like job satisfaction (Rubel & Kee, 2014), which in turn is a strong predictor of OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Such mediating variables can explain the correlational findings in the present study. **Thus, Hypothesis II (b) which states, ‘There is significant correlation between quality of work life and organizational citizenship behaviour among employees engaged in the corporate sector’ is accepted in this investigation.**

OCB has significant positive correlation with task performance and contextual performance. Task performance and OCB have been found to be influenced by common variables such as quality of work life and job satisfaction (Daniel, 2019; Rubel & Kee, 2014), which may have

resulted in the correlation in the present study. Contextual performance and OCB are similar constructs, although they may be conceptualised in different ways consisting of different dimensions (Organ, 1988; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). In the present study, contextual performance includes positive actions carried out towards the organization which contributes to its overall functioning, whereas OCB includes both actions towards the organization as well as other individuals. Thus, some overlap between the two constructs may have resulted in them having significant correlation in the present study. Correlation between OCB and CWB was found to be not significant in the present study. Studies which isolated the effects of measurement artifacts have shown that there is very little correlation between the two variables, contrary to what was initially understood (Dalal, 2005; Spector, Bauer & Fox, 2010). This can explain the insignificant correlation found between CWB and OCB in the present study. Thus, Hypothesis II (c) which states, 'There is significant correlation between work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour among employees engaged in the corporate sector' is accepted except CWB in the present study.

3. Conclusion

The findings of the study indicate that male and female employees differ significantly in terms of quality of work life, whereas no gender difference was found with respect to work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. Significant gender differences in quality of work life indicates men and women perceive that they are treated differently by their organization. The modern workplace should work on developing adequate quality of work life programmes to improve various aspects of the organization such as, supervisory support, pay and benefits, job satisfaction, job design, and autonomy for women in order to establish an egalitarian organization, which the present study highlights.

Additionally, quality of work life was found to have significant correlation with all domains of work performance and organizational citizenship behaviour, whereas organizational citizenship behaviour correlated significantly with task and contextual performance. The present study shows that high quality of work life creates a positive organizational environment for employees and they may reciprocate by improving their performance and engaging in higher level of organizational citizenship behaviours. It may also lead to lower instances of counterproductive work behaviours. Thus, the findings of the present study can be put to use by organizations by focusing on enhancing organizational conditions and improving performance and participation of the employees.

References

- [1] Agarwal, A., Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2013). Impact of Quality of Work Life on Employee Trust. *International Journal of Management Research*, 4 (1), 54 - 65.
- [2] Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In: . Schmitt, N. & Borman, W. C. (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, 71–98.
- [3] Bowler, W. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (1), 70–82
- [4] Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In: Dunnette MD, Hough LM, eds. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 687 - 732.
- [5] Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta - analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241–1255.
- [6] Daniel, C. (2019). Analysis of Quality Work Life on Employees Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 8 (2), 60 - 65.
- [7] Daskalova, N., (2009). Gender differences in quality of work and life; Institute for Social and Trade Union Research (ISTUR), Bulgaria, Nov
- [8] Edgar, F., Blaker, N. M., & Everett, A. M. (2021). Gender and job performance: linking the high performance work system with the ability–motivation–opportunity framework. *Personnel Review*, 50 (1), 47 - 63
- [9] Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85 (1), 199–220.
- [10] Goode, D. A. (1989). Quality of life, quality of work life. W. E. Kiernan & R. L. Schallock (Eds) - *Economics, Industry and Disability: A look ahead*, 337 - 349.
- [11] Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behaviour, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (3), 431 - 441.
- [12] Jeyarathnam, M. & Malarvizhi, V. R. (2011). Quality of work life among sugar mill employees – a study in Tamil Nadu. *Zenith International Journal of Business Economics & Management Research*, 1 (3), 89 - 96
- [13] Kanfer, R., & Kantrowitz, T. (2002). Ability and Non-Ability Predictors of Performance. In *Psychological Management of Individual Performance* (pp.27 - 50). John Wiley & Sons.
- [14] Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20 (1), 18–25
- [15] Khetavath, P. S. (2015). An Empirical Analysis of Quality of Work Life of Employees in Indian Private Sector Organizations. Paper presented at International Conference on Trends in Economics, Humanities and Management March 27 - 28, Singapore
- [16] Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., De Vet, H. C., & Van Der Beek, A. J. (2016). Cross - cultural adaptation of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Work*, 53, 609 - 619.
- [17] LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta -

- Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), 52–65
- [18] Maertz, C. P., Griffeth, R. W., Campbell, N. S., & Allen, D. G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28 (8), 1059 - 1075.
- [19] Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. S. (2013). Review of literature on quality of work life International. *Journal for Quality Research*, 7 (2), 201–214.
- [20] Organ, D. W. (1988). A Restatement of the Satisfaction - Performance Hypothesis. *Journal of Management*, 14 (4), 547 - 557
- [21] Payne, S. C., & Webber, S. S. (2006). Effects of service provider attitudes and employment status on citizenship behaviors and customers' attitudes and loyalty behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (2), 365–378
- [22] Podsakoff, N. P. (2009). Individual - and Organizational - Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta - Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94 (1), 122 - 141.
- [23] Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of performance: a policy capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), 66 - 80.
- [24] Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2010). *Psychology and work today*. Routledge.
- [25] Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion - centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12 (2), 269–292.
- [26] Rubel, M., & Kee, D. (2014). Quality of Work Life and Employee Performance: Antecedent and Outcome of Job Satisfaction in Partial Least Square (PLS). *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 31 (4), 456 - 467.
- [27] Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., & Sychala, A. (2008). Job performance. *Micro approaches (Sage handbook of organizational behavior)*, 1, 427 - 447.
- [28] Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement Artifacts in the Assessment of Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Do We Know What We Think We Know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95 (4), 781 - 790
- [29] Suyasa, P. T. (2017). The role of quality of work life as a predictor of counterproductive work behavior. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 32, 169 - 183.
- [30] Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8 (4), 216 - 226.
- [31] Uzonwanne, F. C. (2014). Organizational citizenship behaviour and demographic factors among oil workers in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 19 (8), 87 - 95
- [32] Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: What is it? *Sloan Management Review*, 15 (1), 11 - 21.
- [33] Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in - role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.