IPA
International Journal of Psychology
Vol. 3, Nos. 1, 2, Summer & Winter 2009
PP. 120-145

Iranian **P**sychological
Association

The Moderating Effect of Nationality, Gender, Position, and Tenure on the Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) and Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs) among Iranian and Malaysian Automotive Workers: A Cross Cultural Study

Ali Mehdad, PhD[*]
Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Islamic Azad University
Khorasgan Branch

Arifin Hj. Zainal
Universiti Kebangsaan
Malaysia (UKM)

There are two main objectives in this study: first, to measure the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs); and second, to determine the moderating effect of nationality, gender, position, and tenure on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs. One thousand and fifty eight participants participated in this study. A set of questionnaires consisting of, demographic information of the respondents which includes nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure, which used as moderator variables, 16 OCBs questions developed by Lee and Allen (2002), and 45 CWBs questions developed by Fox and Spector (2002) were translated into Persian and Malay languages. The questionnaires were administered by the researchers in Iran and Malaysia. The findings of study showed that OCBs and CWBs are negatively correlated among the total sample ($r= -0.207$, $p<0.01$), Iranian sample ($r = -0.314$, $p<0.01$), and Malaysian sample ($r = -0.108$, $p <0.05$). It was also found that nationality ($\beta = 0.204$ $p <0.01$) and gender ($\beta = -0.07$ $p <0.05$) moderated the relationship between OCBs and CWBs. However, position and tenure did not. Based on these results, it was concluded that, OCBs and CWBs are negatively correlated; moreover nationality and gender moderated the relationship

[*] Email: amahdad@khuisf.ac.ir

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

between OCBs and CWBs. The limitations, implications and some suggestions for further studies are also mentioned.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), gender, position, organizational tenure, cross cultural study.

Two important areas have received considerable conceptual and practical interests to organizations by I/O practitioners and researchers which are Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) and Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs). OCB was originally defined as: intentional employee behavior that is discretionary and typically not recognized or rewarded but that nonetheless improves the functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988; Schnake, 1991). Organizational researchers have discovered that some employees contribute to the welfare or effectiveness of their organization by going beyond the duties prescribed in their jobs (Muchinsky, 2006). That is, they give extra discretionary contributions that are neither required nor expected.

On the other hand, Spector (2006) defined CWBs as behaviors intended to harm the organization and other people at work, such as co-workers, supervisors, and customers. CWBs can consist of aggression, hostile and nasty behavior directed at a co-worker, destruction of organizational property, purposely doing work incorrectly, theft, and withholding effort. In addition, CWBs was defined as intentional employee behavior that is harmful to the legitimate interests of an organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). In addition, CWBs has been studied under different labels from a variety of theoretical perspectives, such as aggression (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Neuman & Baron, 1997; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), deviance (Hollinger, 1986; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), revenge (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997), antisocial behaviour (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), and mobbing/bullying (Knorz & Zapf, 1996). The common theme is that, these

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

behaviors are harmful to the organization by directly affecting its functioning or property, or by hurting employees in a way that will reduce their effectiveness.

From a definitional perspective, therefore, OCBs and CWBs could be considered opposites in the sense that the former benefits the organization, whereas the latter harms it. Therefore, because of construct definitions one might expect that employees who typically engage in OCBs will tend not to engage in CWBs.

In this respect, Counterproductive work behaviors are significant issues facing organizations. Due to this, some empirical research has been focused on its antecedents and consequences. In addition, theoretical reviews have attempted to integrate the diverse literature on CWB and the effects of OCB on them (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Hoffman et al., 2007; Berry et al., 2007; Lee & Spector, 2006; Spector et al., 2005; Dalal, 2005, Macrus & Schuler, 2004; LePine et al., 2002; Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Based on all conducted research in Western countries, especially in the United States of America, Canada and Australia, there has been much interest in the relationship between the two domains and proved the existence of a strong negative relationship between the two variables (Bennett & Stamper, 2001; Sackett & DeVore, 2001), while others (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling, & Nault, 2002; Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczo, (2006) have found weaker relationships.

Searches in all accessible databases specially in psychINFO and psychARTICLE on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs, found only three studies related to OCB or CWB, in Asian countries. The first was conducted by Grasmick & Kobayashi (2002) on deviant behaviors in Japanese and American employees; the second was conducted by Coyne & Ong (2007) who compared the level of OCB in three countries, Malaysia, England, and Germany with many different characteristics in the same organization; and the third one was conducted by Maria and Lin (2008) in China which included 2

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

studies. Study 1 investigated whether CWB in China is described by similar or different behaviors as in the Western literature, and Study 2 examined the importance that Chinese managers placed on task performance, with regard to OCB and CWB.

However, the association between OCB and CWB has not yet been investigated in developing countries especially in Asian countries. Hence, there is a substantial need to examine the OCBs and CWBs relationship in Iran and Malaysia as developing countries in Asia.

Consequently, in the current study at first step we examine the association between OCBs and CWBs and second, based on Dalal's (2005) suggestion to researchers to determine whether other variables will moderate the magnitude of the OCB and CWB relationship or not, we also examine the moderating effect of nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure on OCB and CWB relationship in the two mentioned countries. In accordance with previous research in western countries mentioned earlier, we expected that OCBs correlate negatively with CWBs, and nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure would moderate the relationship between the two.

The current study is the first study in Asian and Islamic countries in this field. Unfortunately, according to a prior study on this subject based on the available information and papers in all accessible websites especially in PsychINFO, PsychARTICLE and Science Direct, there were no evidence of the same research, especially in Asian countries related to the relationship between OCBs and CWBs and the moderating effect of nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure on this relationship. Therefore, nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure were considered as moderators, and their relationships to OCBs and CWBs have been studied.

For the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses are proposed and provided by the researchers and are categorised into two general groups.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

1- The Relationship between OCBs and CWBs

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), as an essential variable, has been shown to be highly and negatively correlated with CWBs in many past studies (Bennett & Robinson, 2002; Bennett & Robinson, 2001; Dalal, 2005; Dunlop et al., 2004; Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruursema, 2003; Hunt, 1996; Jermier, Knights, & Nord, 1994; Kelloway et al., 2002; Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002; Organ, & Paine, 1999; Puffer, 1987; Sackett et al., 2001; Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczo, 2006; Skarlicki et al., 1997; Spector, & Fox, 2002).

Dalal's (2005) meta-analysis, showed that the typical relationship between OCB and CWB was modestly negative; Puffer (1987) reported a high correlation; Sackett and DeVore (2001) summarised findings from two primary studies: (a) value of –0.59 from the military's Project A, and (b) a value of –0.67 derived from findings by Hunt (1996); and a meta-analysis by Viswesvaran, Schmidt, & Ones, (1999) reported a value of −0.57. Furthermore, Sackett, Berry Wiemann & Laczo (2006) found a moderate negative correlation, and Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998) found that their measure of CWB correlated at −0.24 and −0.46 with two different measures of OCB. In contrast, Miles et al. (2002) reported a correlation of –0.11 (which is low significant at $p< 0.05$); Kelloway et al. (2002) reported that OCBs and CWBs shared a significant negative association ($r= -0.20$, $p< 0.01$); and Bennett and Robinson (2000) reported correlations of –0.35 and –0.28 between OCB and interpersonal and organizational CWBs, respectively. Consequently, the following hypotheses are suggested:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant negative relationship between OCBs and CWBs.

Hypothesis 1a: There is a significant negative relationship between OCBs and CWBs of Iranian workers.

Hypothesis 1b: There is a significant negative relationship between OCBs and CWBs of Malaysian workers.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

2- The Moderating effect of nationality, gender, position and tenure on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs.

As mentioned earlier, based on the researchers' search in all accessible databases, in relation with the variables of the present study, only three studies were found in Asian countries.

Other studies on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs were conducted in Western countries, especially in USA, Canada, and one in Australia. Therefore, there exists a substantial need to examine the OCBs and CWBs in developing countries especially in Asia such as Iran and Malaysia. In this world order, understanding the impact of culture on various aspects of organizations and their practices will become more critical than ever to increase synergy, productivity and welfare of the workforce within and across countries (Aycan & Kanungo, 2001). Despite the increasing necessity of understanding the role of nationality and culture in workforce attitudes and productivity, the volume of research in the cross-cultural I/O psychology has not reached the level to guide practice. With regard to other moderator variables, all conducted research mentioned on the relationship between OCBs with gender, position and tenure, or CWBs with gender, position and tenure, separately. For instance, Kidder (2002), and Kidder and McLean Parks (2001) indicated that gender has an effect on OCB, with women being more likely to display OCB. Organ, & Ryan, (1995) explained gender could be considered as a determinant of OCB. Sun's (2001) empirical study indicated that gender shows a significant difference in OCB performance. Organ et al. (1995) stated that gender could be considered as a determinant of OCB and Morrison, (1994) found that women are more inclined to display interpersonal helping OCBs. Farrell & Finkelstein (2007) indicated that OCBs in general were expected more of women than of men. Concerning OCBs or CWBs and position, Wanxian and Weiwu (2007) demonstrated that the higher the position one holds in the organization, the higher the OCB in-role ratings for

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

him or her counts. Lam, Hui, & Law (1999). Who found small, but significant differences in supervisor and subordinate ratings of OCB items, with supervisors considering OCBs to be part of the teller's job to a greater extent than subordinates. Wanxian et al. (2007) suggested that the higher the position one held the higher frequency of OCB he or she counted as in-role. In relation to OCBs or CWBs and tenure, Morrison (1994) pointed out that the length of service (tenure) is positively related to altruistic behavior, job responsibility, and sportsmanship dimensions of OCB. Chiu and Tsai (2006) found that organizational tenure has a positive effect on OCB.

Unfortunately, there are no research yet conducted on the moderating effect of gender, position and tenure on the relationship between OCB and CWB. Therefore, based on Bennett and Stamper, 2001; Collins and Griffin, 1998; and Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997, who stated that OCBs and CWBs is a single continuum, that is OCB and CWB do not really represent distinct performance domains; rather, behaviors in the OCB and CWB domains can be located at different points on a single continuum. Accordingly, based on the results of reviewed studies, we expect that nationality, gender, position and tenure are more likely to moderate the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). On the basis of this discussion and consistent with this reasoning, we propose the following:

Hypothesis 2: nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure moderate the relationship between OCBs and CWBs.

Method

Research Design

The research design of this study is the cross-sectional field survey and a set of questionnaires was used at a single point of time. The present study is designed to examine the existing relationship between OCBs as independent the variables; CWBs as the dependent variables; and nationality, gender,

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

position and tenure as the moderators on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs in Iran and Malaysia. The study is exploratory in nature. It is used to determine and describe the degree of relationship between criterion and predictor variables, as well as the effect of moderator variables on the relationship between the dependent and independent variables in descriptive and quantitative terms.

Participants

The participants in this study were 1058 workers who were selected based on stratified purposive sampling from production lines workers; of whom 306 were Malaysian (out of 1870 workers) and 752 were Iranian (out of 20286 workers). In terms of gender, 87.5% of the participants were men, while 12.5% were women. As for position, 38% of the participants were executives and 62% were non-executives. In terms of nationality, 71.1% of the participants were Iranians and 28.9% were Malaysians. In terms of organizational tenure, 36.5% were 5 years and below, and 63.5% were 6 years and above.

Measures

A set of questionnaires that consists of three sections were used. Section 1 seeks demographic information of the respondents which includes nationality, gender, position, and organizational tenure. This information will be used as moderator variables. Section 2 consists of 16 questions for measuring organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), which are the independent variables. Section 3 consists of 44 questions for measuring counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), which are the dependent variables. OCBs and CWBs questionnaires were translated into Persian and Malay languages by the researchers. Then, each one was reviewed and back translates to English by two Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in Iran and Malaysia. After that, two versions were compared. The result of comparison showed no differences

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

between original version and back translated versions of questionnaires. Finally, the questionnaires administered to participants in Iran and Malaysia, separately.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Questionnaire

A 16-item self-report scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002) was used to measure OCB. This measure distinguishes the OCB directed towards the organization (OCB-O: eight items) from that directed towards fellow employees (OCB-I: eight items). Sample items from the OCB-O scale are as below:

"Attend functions that are not required, but help the organizational image"

"Show pride when representing the organization in public"

Whereas, sample items from the OCB-I scale are as below:

"Assist others with their duties"

"Go out of the way to make new employees feel welcome in the work group"

Participants were asked to indicate how often they engaged in these behaviors by using a 7-point Likert scale. Of the 16 items, eight were used for measuring OCB-I and the rest for measuring OCB-O. For scoring of the OCBs, responses to the appropriate items is summarised as follows: 1 = never, and 7 = always. The overall OCBs score was obtained from the summation of OCB-I and OCB-O (OCB-I, OCB-O combined). The minimum scores of OCB-I and OCB-O are eight and the maximum is 56. The minimum scores of OCB are 16 and the maximum is 112.

The Alpha coefficients of the OCB-I and OCB-O scales were reported by Lee and Allen, (2002) are 0.83 and 0.77, respectively. In this study Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of OCBs, OCB-I and OCB-O among all participants were 0.938, 0.895, and 0.909, respectively. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of OCBs, OCB-I, OCB-O among Iranian participants were 0.934, 0.885, and 0.903,

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

respectively. While, Cronbach Alpha coefficients of OCBs, OCB-I, OCB-O among Malaysian participants were 0.934, 0.885, and 0.903, respectively.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors Questionnaire

For measuring counterproductive work behaviors, the 45-item Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C), which is a standard measure of employee intentional behaviors that harm organizations and people in organizations, developed by Fox and Spector (2002 cited from Spector's WEB) was used[*]. This measure includes CWB-I and CWB-O which were categorised as either behaviors targeting the organization (CWB-O) or other persons in the organization (CWB-I). Sample items of (CWB-O) are as below:

"Tried to look busy while doing nothing"

"Told people outside the job was a lousy place you work for"

While sample items of CWB-I are as below:

"Insulted someone about their job performance"

"Made fun of someone's personal life"

"Started an argument with a co-worker"

In this measure, responses are made on a 5-point frequency Likert scale. For scoring of the CWB-C, responses to the appropriate items is summarised as follows: 1 = the least frequent response (never) and 5 = the most frequent response (every day). The total score is the sum of all 45 items. The minimum score of CWBs in original version is 45 and the maximum is 225. However, in the present study, one of the items ("took money from your employer without permission") was omitted because of the lack in the face validity based on received feedbacks from all participants. This item is associated with jobs that are money related such as cashier, seller, and teller and so on. In this study, all participants were holding a manufacturing job and were working without any

[*] The questionnaire was used based on the permission from Fox & Spector.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

direct contact with employer's money. Consequently, the minimum score of CWBs, CWB-O and CWBI are 44, 20, and 24, while the maximum scores are 220, 100, and 120, respectively.

Spector, & Fox, (2005) reported high reliability coefficient Alphas for CWB-O and CWB-I is 0.84 and 0.85, respectively. In addition, Fox et al. (2002) reported high reliability with Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for CWB-O and CWB-I are 0.88 and 0.96, respectively.

In this study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of CWBs, CWB-I and CWB-O were 0.96, 0.96, and 0.91 respectively, for total samples. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of CWBs, CWB-I and CWB-O were 0.97, 0.96, and 0.91, respectively for the Iranian samples. While for the Malaysian samples, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of CWBs, CWB-I and CWB-O were 0.89, 0.81, and 0.88, respectively.

Procedures

The appropriate procedures in obtaining approval to conduct the research using human participants were followed to prevent any impression management and self-enhancement. In order to avoid any biases in obtainable data by participants and to get actual data as well as to control the response rate as the "biggest problem in conducting a survey" (Spector 2006), these questionnaires were administered directly by the researchers, within a period of one week for each factory. Researchers went to the fields of industrial factories in Iran and Malaysia and described the purpose and objectives of the research orally to participants. According to the arrangements made with factories' top-level managers, the researchers would administer the questionnaires at the factory's training center. The first step, one week was selected from the month by random selection. At the second step, among the employees who attended the scheduled training courses, those who were working in production line would be led by the training supervisor to the researcher's room at the end of the course. Finally, a survey was administered

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

directly by the researchers in either Persian or Malay language in a period of one selected week for each factory. While the participants were filling up the survey-questionnaires, the researchers answered all their questions.

Participant information sheets were given to the participants in order to inform them about the data collection process and the purpose of study. The researchers also described the purpose of the research to the participants as well as their rights, while focusing on confidentiality of the collected information. All measures were distributed simultaneously among participants in one session and were self-reported. Finally, the researcher collected the completed survey-questionnaires. No time limit was set for the filling of the questionnaires.

Results

Pearson's correlation coefficient between organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) along with scale means, and standard deviations of the Iranians, Malaysians and Total Samples in OCBs and CWBs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Pearson correlation coefficients, scale means, and SDs of OCBs and CWBs for the Iranians (N=752), Malaysians (N=306) and the Total Samples (N=1058)

Variables	Iranian sample			Malaysian sample			Total sample		
	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD
1 OCBs		5.61	1.42		4.46	.48		5.27	1.53
2 CWBs	-0.314**	1.17	0.46	-0.108*	1.09	0.17	-0.208**	1.17	.41

** $p<0.01$ *$p<0.05$

As shown in Table 1, there are significant negative relationships between OCBs and CWBs ($r = -0.208$, $p<0.01$) for the total sample, Iranian sample ($r= -0.314$, $p<0.01$), and Malaysian sample ($r = -0.108$, $p<0.05$). Furthermore, the

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

mean score of Iranian's OCBs are higher than Malaysian and the total sample. Moreover, means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of all variables are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Scale means, SDs and correlations between research variables

Variables	M	SD	OCBs	CWBs
1- OCBs	84.45	24.56		
2- CWBs	51.71	17.94	-0.208**	
3- Nationality	0.71	0.45	0.338**	0.129**
4- Gender	0.12	0.33	-0.056	-0.078*
5- Position	0.21	0.41	-0.017	-0.016
6- Tenure	0.63	0.48	-0.022	0.035

* $p<0.05$ **$p<0.01$

In accordance with previous studies (Bennett et al., 2002; Bennett et al., 2001; Dalal, 2005; Dunlop et al., 2004; Fox et al., 2003; Hunt, 1996; Jermier et al., 1994; Kelloway et al., 2002; Miles et al., 2002; Organ et al., 1999; Puffer, 1987; Sackett et al., 2001; Sackett et al., 2006; Skarlicki et al., 1997; Spector et al., 2002), organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are negatively correlated with counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) (r=-0.208, p<0.01). In addition, OCBs are positively correlated with nationality (r = 0.338, p <0.01), negatively correlated with gender (r= -0.056 *ns*), negatively correlated with position (r= -0.017 *ns*), and negatively correlated with tenure (r= -0.022 *ns*). Moreover, CWBs are positively correlated with nationality (r= 0.129, p <0.01), and negatively correlated with gender (r= -0.078, p <0.05), and negatively correlated with position (r= -0.016 *ns*), and negatively correlated with tenure (r = 0.035 *ns*).

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the moderating effect of nationality, gender, position, and tenure on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs. Results of the analysis showed that nationality (β= 0.204, p< 0.01) and gender (β= -0.07, p< 0.05) did moderate the relationship between

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

OCB and CWB. Details of the analysis were shown in Table 3.

Table 3
The results of hierarchical regression analysis for Nationality, Gender, Position, and Tenure as Moderators

Independent variables	Dependent variables: counterproductive work behaviors(CWBs)					
	B	β	R	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step1 OCBs	-0.152**	-0.208	0.208	0.043	_	_
Step2 Nationality	-0.247**	-0.338				
OCBs ×Nationality [1]	0.081**	0.204	0.260	0.068	0.024	27.623**
Step1 OCBs	-0.156**	-0.218	0.218	0.048	_	_
Step2 Gender	-0.154**	-0.215				
OCBs × Gender [2]	-0.043*	-0.07	0.229	0.052	0.005	5.258*
Step1 OCBs	-0.161**	-0.228	0.228	0.052	_	_
Step2 Position	-0.157**	-0.223				
OCBs × Position [3]	-0.017	-0.035	0.231	0.053	0.001	1.317
Step1 OCBs	-0.152**	-0.208	0.208	0.043	_	_
Step2 Tenure	-0.157**	-0.215				
OCBs × Tenure [4]	0.008	0.021	0.209	0.044	0.000	0.431

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

[1] 1= Iranian 0= Malaysian
[2] 1= Male 0= Female
[3] 1= non- executive 0= executive
[4] 1= 5 years and below 0= 6 years and above

Simple slope analysis of the moderating effect of nationality and gender on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs are shown in Figures 1 and 2. As could be shown in Table 3, position and tenure did not moderate the relationship between OCB and CWB ($p > 0.05$).

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]




Figure 1
Interaction between organizational citizenship behaviors and nationality on counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs).




Figure 2
Interaction between organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and gender on counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs).

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

Discussion

This study is the first investigation in Asian and Islamic countries, namely Iran and Malaysia, to demonstrate that organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are highly correlated. In addition, it was also found that nationality and gender do moderate the relationship between OCB and CWB; however, position and tenure do not. This study found differences between the two nations as cross nations results, where Iranians were higher than Malaysian, in OCBs and in CWBs.

The results of this study showed that there are significant negative relationships between OCBs and CWBs among the total, Iranian, and Malaysian samples. These findings are consistent with those of past studies which found that OCBs and CWBs were negatively correlated. for example, Bennett and Robinson (2000), Bennett et al. (2002), Bennett et al. (2001), Dalal (2005), Dunlop and Lee (2004), Fox et al. (2003), Hunt (1996), Jermier et al. (1994), Kelloway et al. (2002), Miles et al. (2002), Organ et al. (1999), Puffer (1987), Sackett (2002), Sackett et al. (2001), Skarlicki et al. (1997), Spector et al. (2002), and Viswesvaran et al. (1999).

Also, consistency in the findings of present and past research was found despite the many differences in cultures, nationalities, values, attitudes, social and economy in the samples. This can be explained by looking at the similarities in human beings and work values. Workers all over the world are looking for identity, satisfaction, justice and equity from their work. All the mentioned factors are antecedents of OCBs and CWBs in reverse direction, as emphasized in Dalal (2005), Berry, Ones, & Sackett, (2007), Mehdad (2008), Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, (2006), Sackett (2001), and Spector (2006), who stated that OCBs and CWBs are affected by situational and dispositional factors. Thus, the presence and prevalence of these behaviors can partly be a function of situational factors such as injustice, inequity, and dissatisfaction in all workplaces worldwide.

The present study indicates that nationality does moderate the relationship

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

between OCB and CWB. This means that the relationship between the OCB and CWB differs as a function of nationality ($\beta = 0.204$ $p < 0.01$). Also, the relationship between OCB and CWB among Iranian and Malaysian are -0.314, and -0.108, respectively (see Table 1). The reason why nationality does moderate the relationship between OCB and CWB may be explained by population composition in Iran and Malaysia. Malaysia is a multi-culture, multi-racial, and multi-religion country with differences in values and attitudes, and the composition of Malaysian population based on Malaysia government statistics (2008) are: Malay 50.4%, Chinese 23.7%, indigenous 11%, Indian 7.1%, and others 7.8%. In addition, 60.4% of them are Muslims and the rest are Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, and others. Whereas Iran is a single culture and the composition of Iranian population based on Iran government statistics (2008) are, 100% Persian and 98% of them are Muslims and more fundamental (non-secular) than Malaysian. Therefore, these significant differences between the two countries in the relationship between OCB and CWB, could explain the moderating effect of nationality on the relationship between OCB and CWB.

This study also found that gender does moderate the relationship between OCB and CWB. This means that the relationship between OCB and CWB differs as a function of gender (($\beta = -0.07$, $p < 0.05$). Also, the correlation coefficients between OCB and gender, CWB and gender are -0.056, and-0.078, respectively (see Table 2). How can we explain the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between OCBs and CWBs of this study? There are two possible explanations: First, it could be due to the men's traditional and economical responsibility in families, as shown by the sample of this study, especially in Iran. In Iran, the need for job security among women is higher because job opportunities for women are less than for men. While, in Malaysia, men and women have equal opportunities. In addition, in Iran, more jobs allocated for men, and women's jobs are mostly limited to the fields of education and health.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

Therefore, these significant differences between women and men in the relationship between OCB and CWB could explain the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between OCB and CWB.

Secondly, it is also important to explain how OCB is related to gender. The main reason for this explanation is that the aim of the study is to assess the relative impact of each predictor in explaining the criterion variable. In the current study OCB is a main predictor and gender as a moderator is a second predictor and CWB is a criterion variable.

Findings of this study are consistent with those of Organ et al. (1995), Morrison (1994), Sun (2001), Kidder and Parks (2001), Kidder (2002), Farrell et al. (2007), Maria and Lin (2008). Geen (1990) have shown that men are more aggressive than women. Furthermore, Hershcovis, Turner, Barling, Arnold, Dupré, Inness, LeBlanc, & Sivanathan, (2007) indicated that sex is a stronger predictor of interpersonal than of organizational aggression. Furthermore, Bettencourt, & Miller (1996) mentioned the propensity to aggress under provocation of the men. The consistency in the findings of the present and past studies is more related to dispositional antecedents of OCB and CWB. It was found by the researchers mentioned above that gender could be considered as a correlate of OCB, as women might be expected to render more forms of OCB, especially the altruism and courtesy factors and men might be expected to render more forms of CWB. Gender stereotypes of women being more altruistic, nurturing and helpful could create managerial expectations that women employees will engage in more OCBs and they are more inclined to display interpersonal helping OCBs. Besides, OCBs in general were expected more in women than in men and CWB more in men than in women.

Therefore, these significant differences between women and men in the relationship between OCB and CWB could explain the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between OCB and CWB. Moreover, why in this study, the negative relationship between OCB and CWB is significant among

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

men and is higher than that of women? It could be more related to economical responsibility of men in families, at least in samples of this study, especially in Iran. As mentioned earlier, the need for job security among Iranian women is higher than for men, due to the fact that job opportunities for women are lower than for men, whereas in Malaysia, men and women have equal opportunities. In addition, in Iran, more jobs allocated to men, and women's jobs more limited in education and health.

Limitations and Implication

There are two limitations in the present study. First, this study is cross-sectional in its design, and hence it recognized and predicted OCBs and CWBs intentions, only among sample. Future research would need to employ longitudinal designs or use behavioural observations and real data on CWBs and OCBs from organizational statistics files.

The second limitation is more related to the generalizability of the findings. Several major constraints of this study limit the generalizability of its findings. Firstly, although a large size of sample from three major organizations in two the countries were obtained, the sample may not be representative of the working population there. Secondly, the findings are exploratory in nature and need to be confirmed in future research before broad generalizations can be made. Finally, the findings may be conditioned by the nature of the work of the respondents in this study. Consequently, the findings of this study were based on the limited population from the total Iranian and Malaysian population. Thus, this study does not attempt in any way to generalize its findings to the general population of Iranians and Malaysians.

The findings of this study can be used by practitioners and scientists in the field of I/O psychology. On the practical side, organizations can use this study as a reference to know which aspects of this study is the most important in determining their organization performance and productivity. Thus, organizations can work to increase OCBs and to decrease CWBs. In regard to

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

science, this study has presented a platform for a comparison and cross-cultural study, not only between Iranians and Malaysians, but also for other Asian and Islamic developing countries in future research. In addition, the findings of this study have definitely added more understanding to the cultural differences that exists in the world. Thus, this current study will assist, even though in a very small way, the mission of I/O psychology field.

In sum, the findings of this study clearly suggest the need for future research to further explore the relationships in different organizations and in different countries. Thus, this study hopes to be a reference for future cross-cultural studies. However, this study should not be used as the only guideline while making decisions and conclusions regarding factors that would relate to the relationship between OCBs and CWBs.

References

Aycan, Z. & Kanungo, R. N. (2001). *Cross-cultural industrial organizational psychology*. In N.Anderson, D.Ones, H.Sinangil, & C.Viswesvaran (Eds.), Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology 2, 564–561. London: Sage.

Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85, 349–360.

Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2002). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J.Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (2nd ed). 247–281. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bennett, R. J. & Stamper, C. (2001). Corporate citizenship and deviancy: A study of discretionary work behavior. In C. Galbraith & M. Ryan (Eds.), *International research in the business disciplines: Strategies and organizations in transition* 13, 265–284.

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S. & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology 92 (2)*, 410–424.

Bettencourt, B. A., & Miller, N. (1996). Sex differences and aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 422–447.

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.* 18–36. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Collins, J. M. & Griffin, R.W. 1998. The psychology of counterproductive job performance. In R.W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violentand deviant behavior*. 219–242. Stamford, CT: JAI.

Coyne, I. & Ong, T. (2007). Organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention: a cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 18 (6), 1085-1097.

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.

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.

Dunlop, P. & Lee, K. (2004). Organizational citizenship and workplace deviant behavior: Are they distinct? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 25, 67-80.

Farrell, S. K. & Finkelstein, L. M. (2007). Organizational citizenship behavior and gender: Expectations and attributions for performance. *North American Journal of Psychology* 9 (1), 81-96.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

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.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., & Bruursema, K. (2003, April). *An empirical study of voluntary work behavior (VWB): Do parallel frameworks underlie counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior*? Paper presented at the 18th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Fox, S. & Spector, P. E. (2002) CWB-C measure. Cited by permission from Spector's Web: *http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector*

Geen, R. G. (1990). *Human aggression*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Giacalone, R. A. & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grasmick, H. G., & Kobayashi, E. (2002). Workplace deviance in Japan: Applying an extended model of deterrence. *Deviant Behavior*. 23(1), 21-43.

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M. LeBlanc, M.& Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92 (1), 228-238.

Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74, 273–279.

Hollinger, R. C. (1986). Working under the Influence: Correlates of employees' use of alcohol and other drugs. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 24, 489-454.

Hunt, S. T. (1996). Generic work behavior: An investigation into the dimensions of entry-level, hourly job performance. *Personnel Psychology* 49, 51–83.

Jermier, J. M., Knights, D. & Nord, W. (1994). *Resistance and power in organizations*. London: Routledge.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J. & Nault, A. (2002). Organizational citizenship and counterproductive behaviors: Separate but related constructs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 10, 143–151.

Kidder, D. L., Parks, J, M. (2001). The good soldier: Who is s(he)? *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22(8), 939-959.

Kidder, D. L. (2002). The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management* 28, 629–648.

Knorz, C., & Zapf, D. (1996). Mobbing—Eine extreme Form sozialer Stressoren am Arbeitsplatz, [Mobbing—An extreme form of social stressors in the workplace]. Zeitschrift fuer Arbeits-und *Organizationspsychologie,* 40**,** 12–21.

Lam, S. S. K., Hui, C. & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84, 594–601.

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

Maria, R. & Lin, X. j. (2008). Understanding the domain of counterproductive work behaviour in China. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 19 (5), 856-877.

Mehdad, A. (2008). *Industrial and organizational psychology* (6th Ed). Jungle Publication, Tehran, Iran.

Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 10, 51–57.

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

Muchinsky, P. M. (2006). *Psychology Applied to Work* (8th Ed). Wads Worth,

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

USA.

Neuman, J. H. & Baron, R. A. (1997). Aggression in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* 37–67. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review* 21, 225–253.

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

Organ, D. W. & Paine, J. B. (1999). A new kind of performance for industrial and organizational psychology: Recent contributions to the study of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 14, 337–368.

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

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 72, 615–621.

Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal* 38, 555–572.

Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal* 41, 658–672.

Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationship with facets of job performance.

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

International Journal of Selection and Assessment 10, 5–11.

Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N.Anderson, D.Ones, H.Sinangil, & C.Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* 1, 145–164. London: Sage.

Sackett, P. R., Berry, C. M., Wiemann, S. A., & Laczo, R. M. (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive work behavior: Clarifying relationships between the two domains. *Human Performance* 19, 441–464.

Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda. *Human Relations* 44, 735–759.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The role of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82, 434–443.

Spector, P. E. (2006). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (4th Ed). John Wiley & Sons, INC.

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, 269–292.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). A model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets.* 151–174. Washington, DC: APA.

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 446-460.

Sun, S. (2001). Predicting job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior with individualism-collectivism in P. R. China and the United States. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.*

Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (1999). The role of halo error

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]

in interdimensional ratings: The case of job performance ratings examined via meta-analysis. Unpublished manuscript.

Wanxian, Li. & Weiwu, W. (2007). A demographic study on citizenship behavior as in-role orientation. *Personality & Individual Differences* 42 (2), 225-234.

Received: 2 / 3/ 2010
Revised : 4 / 7/ 2010
Accepted: 27 / 9/ 2010

[Downloaded from mail.ijpb.ir on 2026-11-21]