

## ***The Consequences of Workplace Bullying Toward Employee Organizational Citizenship Behavior***

**Zulkarnain<sup>\*</sup>, Eka Danta Jaya Ginting, Ferry Novliadi, Agnes Oktavia Sebayang**

*Faculty of Psychology  
University of Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia  
Zulkarnain3@usu.ac.id<sup>\*</sup>*

**Abstract**— Pleasant or unpleasant experiences in the workplace appear to have an immense impact on organizational citizenship behavior. This study comes up with two research objectives. First is to find out the consequences of workplace bullying toward employee organizational citizenship behavior. Second is to find out the determinants of organizational citizenship behavior based on typical of workplace bullying such as work related bullying, personal bullying and physical intimidation. There were 150 public service employees involved in this study. The results showed that workplace bullying negatively impacted toward organizational citizenship behavior. Based on stepwise analysis, it showed that work related bullying; personal bullying and physical intimidation were contributed to decreasing of organizational citizenship behavior. Implication of this study are expected to provide an understanding of how workplace bullying impacted to employee organizational citizenship behavior and it could be the guidelines for the policy makers for implementation of better human resource policy.

**Keywords:** *workplace bullying, work-related bullying, personal bullying, physical intimidation, organizational citizenship behavior*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is quite important that has a positive impact to the organization, and also effect to the employees. According to Jahangir (2004), organizational citizenship behavior to be crucial for the life of the organization and contributed to improving the effectiveness of the organization's functions. Organizational citizenship behavior has benefits in improve labor productivity, improve productivity leader, increasing the organization's ability to retain the best employees and improve the stability of the organization's performance (Podsakoff, 2000). Sloat (1999) explains that there are several factors can affect organizational citizenship behavior, such as organizational culture and climate, personality and mood, perceptions of organizational support, and perception of interaction subordinate relationship. Some researchers believe that employees' OCB can be withheld if they suffer from workplace bullying (Zellars & Tepper, 2002). Liang (2012) explained the reason for this phenomenon; when employees are subject to unfavorable treatment such as workplace bullying, they might feel that their expectations of fair treatment are not being met by the organization. In return, they may withdraw

their OCB to stop helping others, or perform some negative behaviors that harm the organization.

According to survey conducted by the Institute of Bullying In The Workplace (Gholipour, Sanjari, Bod & Kozekanan, 2011) there are some form of bullying such as; case of charges (71%), nonverbal threat (68%), underestimate of others opinions (64%), person isolating (68%), avoiding giving praise even though they work well (58%), scathing criticism and set a different standard for task (57%), spreading rumors about someone (56%) and ask other people to treat employees unfairly (55%).

Bullying negatively affects for the organization, such reduces job satisfaction and lower commitment to the organization (Hoel & Cooper, 2000), lower productivity (Hoel, Einarsen & Cooper, 2003), increasing attendance (Vartia, 2001), and also the tendency to leaving work (McCormack, Casimir, Djurkovic & Yang, 2009). Bullying also causing employees are less able to cope with daily duties cooperate with others (Einarsen, 2000), tend to withdraw, reluctant to communicate because they fear criticism and loss of morale (Field, 1996). Studies on the prevalence of workplace bullying have shown extensive

consequences on Several levels on the individual level Several studies revealed dramatic consequences on victims, ranging from musculoskeletal complains to anxiety, insomnia and depression (Hogh, Mikkelsen & Hasen, 2011); on the organizational level there are Several costs like absenteeism, turnover and replacement, loss of motivation and productivity, amongst others (Hoel, Sheehan, Cooper & Einarsen, 2011). These arguments yielded the following hypothesis: (H1) workplace bullying negatively correlates with organizational citizenship behavior.

Another study examines the organizational citizenship behavior agree that organizational support will give effect to employees react to their work, such as job satisfaction, work involvement, reducing late behavior, truancy and turnover intention (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Cropanzano & Greenberg (1997) explained the reasons that led to turnover intentions related to justice. Some employees will stay in the organization depends on how they see Reviews their futures in the organization (Zulkarnain, 2013). Furthermore, the employee intentions to leaving from organization because they feel organization cannot provide well-being in the workplace (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). Moreover, comfortable working conditions for employees are part of the factors that can improve the organization support organizational citizenship behavior (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) said that justice is part of organizational support that can improve employee organizational citizenship behavior, because employee tends to have a significant willingness to devote himself to the organization if treated fairly by the organization (Lee & Yang, 2009). But injustice in organization is possible with given the excessive workload to employees. Giving an excessive workload is one of bullying behavior that can reduce employee organizational citizenship behavior.

Wang (2014) showed that social support from superiors can affect attitudes and employee organizational citizenship behavior. Superiors as representatives of the organization responsible for regulating and assessing the performance of employees, so that they feel superiors appreciate their performance and provide a fun action for its employees more incentive to improve their

organizational citizenship behavior (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employee who feels the boss is always criticizing his/her work is part of the work related bullying that can reduce organizational citizenship behavior. Employees who feel unappreciated boss will be less positive experience emotions that cause employees are less willing to participate actively in thinking about organizational life. This will reduce organizational citizenship behavior of employees. These arguments yielded the following hypothesis: (H2) work related bullying negatively correlates with organizational citizenship behavior.

Individual factors have been largely associated with the occurrence of workplace bullying. As such, victims of bullying have been described as overachievers with an unrealistic view of their abilities and resources, conscientious, Numerous prior studies have documented evidence for the severe consequences of bullying for both bullied individuals and for organization in which bullying takes place. There is sufficient evidence indicating that bullied employees suffer the effects of stress (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001), On the other hand, bullies were seen as the product of complex social processes which created an antisocial personality characterized by the aggressive manipulation of other people (Randall, 1997); perpetrators have also been described as having an authoritarian or abrasive personality and acting as a petty tyrants (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Asforth, 1997). Victim personality may be related to bullying in several ways. Personality traits may increase the likelihood of a person displaying behaviors that are socially provocative, leading in turn to interpersonal conflict that may escalate into bullying (Einarsen, 2009) and may also play a role in people's perceptions of being a victim of bullying. Victims may use strategic behaviors to defend themselves from interpersonal mistreatment. Examples may include tactical revenge, social accounts and apologies and also organizational citizenship behaviors (Aquino & Bommer, 2003). These arguments yielded the following hypothesis: (H3) personal bullying negatively correlates with organizational citizenship behavior.

Bullying is not about isolated conflict episodes at work, but about acts of prolonged

negative treatment against one or more individuals, who actually are or perceive themselves to be inferior in the situation in question. The majority of employees are likely to have experienced negative incidents in one form or another at work (Hoel & Notelaers, 2009). Zellars and Tepper (2002) also found that abusive supervision is related to employees' organizational citizenship behavior, and that targets of abuse or bullying are more likely to withhold their organizational citizenship behavior than are employees with supportive leadership. Although abusive supervision is a low base-rate phenomenon, its effects are noteworthy. A small but growing body of empirical research suggests that abused subordinates report greater job and life dissatisfaction, intentions to quit their jobs, role conflict, and psychological distress, compared with their non-abused counterparts (Ashforth, 1997; Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), and that subordinates' perceptions of unfairness explain their responses to abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000). Hence, abusive supervision represents a source of injustice that has serious implications for organizations and employees (Bies & Tripp, 1998). Leymann (1996) believed that bullying behaviors at work occasionally involve physical dimensions. These arguments yielded the following hypothesis: (H4) physical intimidation negatively correlates with organizational citizenship behavior.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### *Participants*

The sample of this study was the employees of National Electricity Company in Medan, Indonesia. One hundred and seventy seven questionnaires were distributed among employees. The one hundred and fifty questionnaires of the employees returned the questionnaires. In this regard response rate was 85%.

### *Instruments*

#### *1. Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

The instrument was organizational citizenship behavior scale adopted from Organ, Podsakoff and McKenzie (2006). Subjects were requested to respond using five-point scaled response options. This scale has four dimensions,

including *helping behavior, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue*. This scale consists of 28 items and the Alpha Cronbach coefficient of reliability is 0.906.

#### *2. Workplace Bullying*

The instrument was bullying scale and consisted three typical of workplace bullying such as; work related bullying, personal bullying and physical intimidation suggested by Einarsen, Hoel & Notelaers (2009). The subjects of this study were requested to respond using five-point scaled response. This scale consists of 23 items and the Alpha Cronbach coefficient of reliability is 0.930.

## DATA ANALYSIS

This study examined the relationship between workplace bullying (work related bullying, personal bullying and physical intimidation) with organizational citizenship behavior. Furthermore, to find out the determinants of organizational citizenship behavior, a stepwise regression method was used.

## RESULT

The statistical analyses were computed using SPSS version 17.0 for Windows to extract the data and results. Pearson correlation was used to measure correlation between workplace bullying (work related bullying, personal bullying and physical intimidation) with organizational citizenship behavior. It showed that each of typical workplace bullying negatively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. The result showed in table 1.

To find out the determinants of organizational citizenship behavior, a stepwise regression method was used. Based on stepwise regression analysis, personal bullying was found to be of significance in explaining employee organizational citizenship behavior ( $\beta = -.302, p < 0.05$ ). The result showed in Table.2.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that workplace bullying proved to be a negative influence on employees' organizational citizenship behavior. It showed that bullying can reduce

employee organizational citizenship behavior. The result was consistent with Aquino and Bommer (2003) which stated that workplace bullying is negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior. Additionally, Martin, Clifford and John (2014) suggested that workplace bullying can directing individuals not to do organizational citizenship behavior. Furthermore, Aquino (1999) found that employees who get bullying have lower

of organizational citizenship behavior, compared with employees who do not get bullying.

According to Einarsen et al. (2009), workplace bullying is a dynamic process or escalated conflict involving interaction between two parties (victim(s) and perpetrator(s)), in which the victim is not a mere passive recipient but, rather, an active agent which can influence the process through the way he/she reacts to the bullying behaviour.

**Table 1. Correlations among variables**

No	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	OCB	101.940	13.968									
2.	Workplace bullying	36.140	12.459	-.482**								
3.	Work related bullying	8.693	3.529	-.395**	.859**							
4.	Physical intimidation	8.393	3.270	-.463**	.924**	.678**						
5.	Personal bullying	9.900	3.732	-.485**	.910**	.652**	.859**					
6.	age	36.846	10.680	-.051	.200*	.147	.242**	.167*				
7.	Sex (male = 0, female =1)	1.506	.501	.044	.063	.081	.082	.016	.007			
8.	Length of service	11.273	9.218	-.026	.189*	.104	.225**	.180*	.898**	.009		
9.	Marital Status (single = 0, married = 1)	1.606	.490	.049	.019	.019	.039	-.007	.692**	-.058	.584**	

\*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05

The results in this study suggest that targets of workplace bullying may indirectly use organizational citizenship behaviors instrumentally to defend themselves from bullying behaviors. As such, it may conclude that targets of workplace bullying may choose how to behave during the process and accordingly are able (at least in a certain degree) to have some control over the situation. There are three typical of workplace bullying such as; work related bullying, personal bullying and physical intimidation suggested by Einarsen, Hoel & Notelaers (2009). Work-related bullying is described as a competitive workplace, not friendly, and a lot of interpersonal conflict (Seigne, 1998) and also it can lower organizational citizenship behavior. This statement is in line with Mckinley and Scherer (2000) found that lower organizational citizenship behavior is a poor relationship with superiors and other colleagues, mutual distrust and mutual hostility. workplace bullying can have a negative influence on the target's organizational citizenship behavior When employees are subjected to workplace bullying,

Reviews their expectations of fair treatment are not met; in return, they may, therefore reduce Reviews their organizational citizenship behavior by

Withdrawing help to co-workers (Liang, 2012; Liu & Wang, 2013). Zellars and Tepper (2002) also found that abusive supervision is related to employees' organizational citizenship behavior, and that targets of abuse or bullying are more likely to withhold Reviews their organizational citizenship behavior than are employees with supportive leadership.

Person related bullying is a form of bullying that is more personal, such as when the victim and his colleagues attacked each self-image of each other, often characterized by intense emotional involvement (Einarsen, 1999). It would give rise to a sense of injustice, frustration, stress and decreased self-esteem of the victim (Neuman & Baron, 2003).

Workplace bullying may result in negative word of mouth reports about an organization,

which could influence the attractiveness of the organization for other workers. Employers or staff can offer information about Reviews their organization to other employees through a specific channel or source (Uen, Peng, Chen, & Chien,

2011). Therefore, targets of bullying might spread negative information in their social networks, which will reduce the attractiveness of the organization (Uen, Peng, Chen, & Chien, 2011).

Table 2. Results for Stepwise Regression Analysis

Variabel	B	SE B	$\beta$	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	F
Model 1				.156	.156	27.345**
Constant	115.528	2.803				
Work related bullying	-1.563	.299	-.395**			
Model 2				.071	.216	21.521**
Constant	120.051	2.962				
Work related bullying	-.593	.391	-.150			
Physical intimidation	-1.543	.421	-.361**			
Model 3				.023	.250	16.180**
Constant	121.543	3.012				
Work related bullying	-.439	.393	-.111			
Physical intimidation	-.540	.628	-.128			
Personal bullying	-1.130	.534	-.302*			

\*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05

Physical intimidation in the workplace is a relatively rare occurrence in most sectors and industries (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997). The fact that physical harassment is relatively rare, may be a result of the fact that the most common types of work-related task in today’s world of work are not very physical in nature. Thus, physical harassment is more likely to occur among freight workers. Another reason for this may be that such behavior is more likely to be condemned by others, since this type of acts is more easily observed, and since it leaves behind telltale signs to a greater extent than what indirect acts do. One may also argue that physical harassment in many cases constitute a type of acts not covered by the term of bullying, since it often involves isolated, but also serious incidents (Einarsen, Hoel & Notelaers, 2009).

Bullying may affect basically men and women, young and old and superiors as well as employees. Findings from several surveys indicate that just as many men as women are subjected to bullying (Einarsen et al., 2009). One possible difference however is that women are being bullied by frequent attacks, while men to a greater extent are being bullied by more infrequent attacks (Einarsen et al., 2009). Women are being bullied by both men and women, while men are mainly being bullied by other men (Einarsen et al., 2009), something which

again, of course is caused by the fact that the world of work is still largely gender segregated, and that there are fewer female than male superiors. Gender is important to the study of organizational citizenship behavior as it has been argued to have an important effect on gender specific behaviors. Heilman and Chen (2005) argued that one of the female gender stereotypes is being helpful, which is captured by the altruism sub-construct of organizational citizenship behavior. Meanwhile, Farrell and Finkelstein (2007) suggested that civic virtue can be considered assertive and independent behavior, which is more frequently associated with the male gender stereotype.

The connection between bullying and age may however be caused by cultural differences, as opposite results were found in Britain, where younger workers state that they are the ones most subjected to bullying, while the least likelihood of being the victim of bullying exist among persons over 55 years old (Hoel & Cooper, 2000). Differences in national practice relating to young workers’ entry into the labor force and older workers exit from the labor force may have an effect here. In accordance with the principles of the Inclusive Workplace Agreement it is however important to prevent older workers from being excluded from workforce participation because of

bullying. Several previous empirical studies have investigated the age and organizational citizenship behavior relationship. Li and Wan (2007) investigated how age influences an individual's perception of organizational citizenship behavior as in-role behavior or as extra-role behavior. These researchers revealed that organizational citizenship behavior was associated with age and the older employees were, the more they perceived organizational citizenship behavior as in-role behavior. Although length of service has not received much attention, compared to age and gender, by organizational citizenship behavior researchers, it has been assessed its impact on organizational citizenship behavior. For instance, when investigating whether organizational citizenship behavior reduces job performance of those employees who are encouraged to adhere to pre-specified job procedures. Ehigie and Otukoya (2005) examined how perceived organizational support and perceived fair interpersonal treatment relates to organizational citizenship behavior by controlling the effect tenure and found that tenure contributed significantly to the variance of organizational citizenship behavior. When examining group-level organizational citizenship behavior, Choi (2009) found that diversity in tenure increases the degree of group-level organizational citizenship behavior.

Marital status in this study had not a significant relationship with organizational citizenship behavior. Our findings showed that single and married employees have a same organizational citizenship behavior in their workplace. Yaghoubi (2010) have showed that marital status has not statistical relationship with organizational citizenship behavior.

### CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this paper is given the association between citizenship behaviors and workplace bullying is that employees are not completely powerless to defend themselves against bullying. Therefore, organizations should develop bullying prevention policies that communicate to employees that bullying is unacceptable and it will not be tolerated. Educating newcomers on these policies, continuous education and training is worthwhile. Bullying can

make someone feel anxious and humiliated. Feelings of anger and frustration at being unable to cope may be triggered. Some people may try to retaliate in some way. Others may become frightened and de-motivated. Stress, loss of self-confidence and self-esteem caused by bullying can lead to job insecurity, illness, absence from work, and even resignation. To deal with cases of bullying, organizations might need to establish an effective grievance and complaints system. Employees should know how to report cases of bullying without fear of repercussion. Workplace bullying has been related to health and safety at work and accordingly should be managed in a proactive way to ensure employees a safe and secure work environment. The strategies should be drawn to influence attitudes towards bullying and inappropriate behavior at work, to develop an organizational culture where there is no room for bullying and to introduce policies and procedures for prevention.

### REFERENCES

- Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of negative affectively, hierarchical status, and self-determination on workplace victimization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 142, 260-272.
- Aquino, K., & Boomer, W. H. (2003). Preferential mistreatment: How victim status moderates the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and workplace victimization. *Organization Science*, 14(2), 374-385.
- Ashforth, B. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14, 126-140.
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1998). Two faces of the powerless: Coping with tyranny. In R. M. Kramer & M. A. Neale (Eds.), *Power and influence in organizations* (pp. 203-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Brodsky, C. (1976). *The Harassed worker*, Toronto, Lexington Books, D.C. Health and Company.
- Choi, J. (2009). Collective dynamics of citizenship behavior: What group characteristics promote group-level helping? *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 1396-1420.

- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining and social support in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 331-351.
- Ehigie, B.O. & Otukoya, O.W. (2005). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a government-owned enterprise in Nigeria. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *14*, 389-399.
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, *20*, 16-27
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression and Violence Behavior*, *4*(5), 379-401.
- Einarsen, S. and Raknes, B.I. (1997). Harassment at work and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, *12*, 247-63.
- Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*, 185-201.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work; Validity, factor structure and psychometric of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work and Stress*, *23*(1), 24-44.
- Einarsen, S.; Hoel, H.; Zapf, D. & Cooper, G. (2003). The concept of Bullying at work: the European Tradition. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C. (Eds): *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 3-30). London: Taylor and Francis
- Farrell, S., & Finkelstein, L. (2007). Organizational citizenship behavior and gender: Expectations and attributions for performance. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *9*, 81-96.
- Field, E.M. (1996). *Bully Bussing*. Lane Cave, NSW: Finch Publishing Pty.
- Gholipour, A., Sanjani, S. S., Bod, M., & Kozekanan, S. F. (2011). Organizational bullying and women stress in workplace. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *6*(6), 234-241.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2), 268-279.
- Heilman, M., & Chen, J. (2005). Same behavior, difference consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 431-441.
- Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (2000). Destructive conflict and bullying at work. *Study Report*. Manchester: University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.
- Hoel, H., Einarsen, S., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). Organizational effects of bullying. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspective in research and practices* (pp. 145-161). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Hoel, H.; Sheehan, M.; Cooper, G. & Einarsen, S. (2011). Organizational effects of workplace bullying. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C.L. (Eds.), *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 129-147). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Lawrence, C. (2001). Social psychology of Bullying in the Workplace. In Tehrani, N. (Eds): *Building a Culture of Respect: Managing Bullying at work*. London: Taylor & Francis
- Lee, L., & Yang. (2009). The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behavior and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance, leadership. *Organization Development Journal*, *30*(1), 53-86
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(2), 165-184.
- Li, W., & Wan, W. (2007). A demographic study on citizenship behavior as in-role orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*, 225-234.

- Liang, Y.-W. (2012). The relationships among work values, burnout, and organizational citizenship behaviors: A study from hotel front-line service employees in Taiwan. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(2), 251-268.
- Liu, X. Y., & Wang, J. (2013). Abusive supervision and organizational citizenship behaviour: Is supervisor-subordinate guanxi mediator? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(7), 1471-1489
- Martin, L., Clifford, B., & John, M. (2014). *Workplace bullying and its influence on the perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior among faculty and staff in the public higher education in Minnesota system* (Dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis.
- McCormak, D., Casimir, G., Djurkovic, N., & Yang, L. (2009). Workplace bullying and intention to leave among schoolteachers in China: The mediating effect of affective commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(9), 2106-2127.
- McKinley, W. & Scherer, A. G. (2000). Some unanticipated consequences of organizational restructuring. *Academic Management Review*, 25(4), 735-752.
- Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 393-413.
- Neuman, J. & Baron, R. (2003). Social antecedents of Bullying: a social interactionist perspective. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C. (Eds): *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & McKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Podsakoff, P. M. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Randall, P. (1997). *Adult bullying: Perpetrators and victims*. New York: Brunner-Routledge
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 689-714.
- Seigne, E. (1998). Bullying at work in Ireland. *Bullying at Work, 1998 Research Update Conference: Proceedings*. (pp 133-146). Staffordshire University, Stafford
- Sloat, K. C. M. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Does your firm inspire employee to be good citizenship. *Professional Safety*, 3(1), 20-25
- Tepper, B. J. (2000) Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178-190.
- Uen, J. F., Peng, S.-P., Chen, S.-Y., & Chien, S. H. (2011). The impact of word of mouth on organizational attractiveness. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 16(3), 239-253.
- Vartia, M. (2002). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observer bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(1), 214-218
- Verdasca, A.T. (2015). Organizational changes, workplace bullying and organizational citizenship behavior, *International Journal on Working Conditions*, 9, 82-98
- Wang, Z. (2014). Perceived supervisor and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(1), 214-222
- Yaghoubi, M., Yarmohammadian, M.H., Raeisi, A.R., Javadi, M., Saghaiannejad, Isfahani, S. (2010), The Relationship between the Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Medical Records Staffs of Selected Hospitals of Isfahan. *Health information management*, 506-515.
- Zapf, D., & Gross, C. (2001). Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 497-522.
- Zellers, K.L, & Tepper, B.J. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1068-1076.
- Zulkarnain. (2013). The mediating effect of quality of work life on the relationship between career

development and psychological well-being.  
*International Journal of Research Studies in  
Psychology*, 2 (3), 67-80.