

## **A PREDICTOR BECOME DYSFUNCTIONAL: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY AND OCB**

**F. H. Abdul Rauf**

Department of Management, South Eastern University, Sri Lanka

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is a topic that has been widely addressed in management research during the past decade, as many have suggested that OCB's have a crucial role in the success of an organization. Further understanding the nature of its relationship to individual and job context factors allow practitioners to facilitate such behaviors within their organizations. Although certain personality traits are more inclined to exhibit OCB, their capacity to do so is likely to depend on their level of workload. Therefore, to further extend the development of the nomological network associated with OCB, personality factors and the moderating role of workload to this relationship was examined. A stratified sample size of two hundred employees from diverse organizations have been selected. Results of the hierarchical regression analysis revealed that personality traits strongly related to OCBs and the workload negatively interacted to significantly predict OCBs. The results support theory that links personality factors and workload would demonstrates the interactive effect of workload and personality traits in predicting OCB, suggesting that these factors are likely important factors that could be examined in job design efforts to enhance OCB. The moderating role of the workload is demonstrated as a new contribution of this study. Implications of findings and areas for future research also discussed.*

**KEYWORDS:** Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Personality Traits, Workload, Moderation

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

From the perspective of organizations, while some desirable employee behaviors are prescribed through job descriptions, others are not. These latter behaviors encompass organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance, the focus of a job description, takes place (Organ, 1997). OCB has received much attention in the literature. Many empirical studies have found that organizations receive benefits from OCBs (Rauf, 2015). Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are behaviors that support the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. OCBs are found to be related to organizational efficiency, effectiveness, innovation, and adaptability within diverse organizations (Organ, 1988), and have, therefore, received much attention in the literature. Some studies examined the negative effect of OCB, and few examined how to minimize them (Rauf, 2013).

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization”(Organ, 1988, p.4.). Organ's (1988) original model, identified five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior that employees engage in at their discretion: *altruism*, behavior targeted to helping a specific other with an organizationally relevant problem; *conscientiousness*, behavior that goes well beyond minimum organizational role requirements related to aspects such as attendance,

obeying rules and regulations, taking breaks; *sportsmanship*, willingness to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without complaining; *courtesy*: behaviors aimed at preventing work related problems with others from occurring; *civic virtue*, behavior that indicates an employee's participation, involvement, and concerned about the company. Several researchers have investigated reasons why employees perform OCBs. Yet, much of this research describes OCB focusing on either situational causes or working relationships (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). Therefore, studies on explanations of OCB based on individual differences are few. Therefore, additional empirical research is needed to understand the impact of individual differences on OCB.

According to Podsakoff et al. (2000, p. 526) Organizational Citizenship Behavior has four major categories of antecedents, which are individual (or employee) characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics and leadership behaviors. The earliest research on OCB's antecedents focused on attitudes, disposition and leader supportiveness (eg: Bateman & Organ, 1983). Studies analyzing leadership, as well as task and organizational characteristics as possible antecedents of OCB followed later (Podsakoff et al. 2000, p.526) among individual characteristics one can find employee attitudes, including traits such as satisfaction, fairness, and commitment. Furthermore, there are dispositional variables, the personality factors.

Dispositional factors generally influence individual behavior. It is assessed by popular personality model- the *Five-Factor-Model*. The five factor model of personality traits is a concept that has been developed, interpreted and changed over the period of last decades. According to Costa and McCrae (1989), "Personality traits refer to enduring patterns of thought, emotion and behavior that are not likely to change over time and explain people's behavior across different situations". Norman confirmed this five factor model and named the personality factors as follows: "*Extraversion*", "*Emotional Stability*", "*Agreeableness*", "*Conscientiousness*" and "*Culture*". As these factors are commonly used, these are named "*Norman's big five*" or simply the "*Big Five*". For the assessment of linkages between OCB dimensions and personality factors the following five factors are used: "*Extraversion*", "*Emotional Stability*", "*Agreeableness*", "*Conscientiousness*" and "*Openness to Experience*" (Barrick & Mount, 1991, p.5).

Many studies were conducted to investigate the relationship between personality characteristics and OCB. Although, there are studies which found positive relationship between personality traits and OCBs, none of the study examine the moderating effect of other variables in this relationship. Therefore, the present study examines both the relationship between personality traits and OCB, and the moderating effect of workload on the relationship between personality traits and OCBs. Therefore, objectives of this study are (a) to identify the relationship between personality factors and OCBs and (b) to find the moderating effect of workload on the relationship between personality factors and OCBs.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

In general, dimensions of personality influence employee performance. Many authors argued the influence of personality in individual behavior and achievement. Nikolaou (2003) stated that personality dimensions significantly influence individual achievement. Another study found personality has a significant impact on career success (Lau & Shaffer, 1999). Guthrie et al. (1998) were of the opinion that personality dimensions influence a person's success in managing his career. In general, the results of these studies indicated that personality with multiple dimensions

determines a person's success in career success, good performance, achievement and positive behavior. Positive personality traits such as love working together, innovative, open, organized, persistent in their work, and emotionally stable will determine a person's success both in work and learning.

More specifically, individual personality dimensions influence employee performance and behavior. In support of this argument, a number of evidence can be found from the literature. Although Caligiuri (2006) indicated that extraversion has negative relationship with performance, Barrick, et al. (2005) have emphasized extraversion as an important dispositional predictor of social behavior. Kumar and Bakhshi (2009) found that extraversion, significantly affect OCB. Study by Elanain (2007) conclude that all five factors of Big Five Factor Model predict employees OCB. A different study by Emmerik and Euwena (2007) found that the more open extraversion teachers will be more involve with OCB compare to introversion teachers. Barrack and Mount (1991) examining the influences of five personality traits on performance among various professional groups found a significant relationship between extraversion and performance. People who are high in extraversion are generally sociable, assertive, active, bold, energetic, and expressive (Goldberg, 1992). In contrast, those who are low in extraversion are timid, submissive, silent, and inhibited. Therefore, it make sense that those who are highly extraverted would engage in more flexible behaviors which may lead to engage in OCB.

**Hypothesis 1: Extraversion will be positively related to OCB.**

Many empirical studies showed that agreeableness is significantly related to performance (Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998; Barrack & Mount (1991). While Caligiuri (2006) found agreeableness had a negative relationship. Kumar and Bakhshi (2009) and Elanain (2007) also found that agreeableness significantly affect OCB. People who are high in agreeableness are generally friendly, good natured, cooperative, helpful, courteous, and flexible (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Witt, Burke, Barrick & Mount, 2002). In work contexts, agreeable employees show higher levels of interpersonal competence (Witt et al., 2002) and collaborate effectively when joint action is needed (Mount et al., 1998). Therefore, it is possible to hypothesize that persons high on agreeableness are likely to engage in OCB.

**Hypothesis 2: Agreeableness will be positively related to OCB.**

Kumar and Bakhshi (2009) and Elanain (2007) found that conscientiousness significantly affect OCB. Emmerik and Euwena (2007) found that teachers who obtain high scores on conscientiousness characterized as more careful and responsible, thus are more involved in the OCB. King et al. (2005) examined the relationship between personality and the helping behaviors in the workplace and found that strong conscientiousness have positive influence on helping behavior. A study by Caligiuri (2006) revealed that conscientiousness has a positive relationship with performance. People who are high in conscientiousness generally perform better at work than those who are low in conscientiousness (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Conscientious individuals can perform their part of the work with a minimum of oversight (Morgeson et al., 2005). Moreover, conscientious individuals are dependable, efficient, committed and hardworking. They are predisposed to take initiative in solving problems and are more methodical and thorough in their work (Witt et al., 2002). Therefore, it is possible to hypothesize that people who possess personality trait of conscientiousness would more likely to engage in OCB.

**Hypothesis 3: Conscientiousness will be positively related to OCB.**

Barrick, et al. (2005) have described emotional stability as key dispositional determinant of social behavior. Although Caligiuri (2006) indicated that emotional stability had a negative relationship with OCB, Elanain (2007) found emotional stability significantly affects OCB. King et al. (2005), examined the relationship between personality and the helping behaviors in the workplace, and found high emotional stability is related helping behavior. People who are high in emotional stability are generally calm and even-tempered in the way they cope with daily life (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Those who are emotionally stable usually do not express much emotion. They tend to be less anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, worried and insecure. Therefore, it seems that employees who are emotionally stable more likely to engage in OCB.

**Hypothesis 4: Emotional stability will be positively related to OCB.**

While Kumar and Bakhshi (2009) found openness to experience indicated the negative effect, Elanain (2007) found a positive relationship between openness to experience and OCB. Emmerik and Euwena (2007) conducted a study to examine the relationship between personality and OCB, study found that the more open extraversion teachers who are more open to experience will be more involve with OCB compare to introversion teachers who are less open to experience. However, King et al. (2005), examined the relationship between personality and the helping behaviors in the workplace and found the relationship between helping behavior is not supported by openness to experience. A study conducted by Caligiuri (2006) indicated that openness to experience has a positive relationship with performance. The conceptual nature of openness to experience suggests a close relationship with other dispositional traits as creativity, inquisitiveness, unconventionality, autonomy, and change acceptance (Goldberg, 1992). "Open" individuals tend to seek out new and different experiences. On the other hand, "closed" individuals tend to be more traditional, conservative, and uncomfortable with complexities (Williams, 2004). Open individuals also differ from more closed individuals in social attitudes, and attitudes toward accepted values and assumptions. Importantly, open individuals display a preference for variety, they enjoy grasping new ideas, and they have an intrinsic interest in and appreciation for novelty. Therefore, it hypothesized that individuals with high on openness to experience are more likely to show OCB.

**Hypothesis 5: Openness to experience will be positively related to OCB.**

On the other hand, one major aspect of one's job that might influence the relationship between personality traits and OCB is workload. Even though individuals are high in various forms of personality traits by nature, heavy workload may prevent them from acting on this tendency. Workload, also referred to as the amount of work performed by an employee in a given period of time and are influential in affecting work outcomes (Griffeth & Hom, 2001), and research has indicated that such demands can have negative as well as positive effects on employee behavior (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000).

Some studies have suggested that, under some situations, employees cope with demanding circumstances by putting extra effort into their jobs and by identifying strategies to successfully meet the demands (Dweck, 1999). Whether an individual perceives a given behavior as discretionary may have implications for employee outcomes, such as workload. Morrison (1994) argues that behaviors that are considered in-role will be treated differently than those classified as extra-role. Because they are considered discretionary, extra-role behaviors may be viewed as optional, rather than as demands required of the position. Additionally, role pressures are

intensified when noncompliance with demands is perceived as having negative consequences (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). It seems that negative consequences are perceived as a more likely outcome of noncompliance with in-role behaviors, compared to behaviors deemed extra-role. Since workload is a function of “legitimate role requirements” (Herman & Gyllstrom, 1977, p. 320), occurring when demands and expectations exceed a given threshold (Rizzo et al., 1970), workload may be less likely to occur when behaviors are perceived as discretionary.

High workload has been found to predict employees’ engagement in numerous OCB dimensions (Anderson & Williams, 1996). OCBs are negatively related to workload (Barr, Spitzmuller & Stuebing, 2008). High workload interacts with altruism such that individuals who suffer from higher workload are less likely to help their co-workers (Anderson & Williams, 1996). As noted before, OCB is performance that in general is beyond an employee’s formally specified job duties. Reasonably, then, fulfilling extra-role while fulfilling in-role demands of the job would require additional resources on the part of employees, mainly in terms of their time and energy. Therefore, employees may find it difficult to exhibit OCB when they are already working hard to find the time and resources needed to satisfactorily accomplish their in-role responsibilities. Accordingly, workload should moderate the relationship between personality traits and OCBs.

Although some research has already been done in the area of OCB with workload, the results were inconsistent. For instance, while Organ and Ryan (1995) report a negative relationship, Bolino and Turnley (2005) report a positive relationship between workload and OCB. Again Erdogan and Liden (2006) in their study found that the high workload had large negative effects on OCB. However, they have not mentioned the distinction between in-role workload and extra-role workload, rather than merely stating that work overload includes both. Therefore, a question arises whether work overload emerges due to only in-role or both in-role and extra-role behavior. At the same time, many of those studies considered workload as an outcome of OCBs (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). Therefore, these inconsistencies’ and disagreement among the past resulted in questions in the literature suggests further study of the relationship between workload and OCB is warranted.

Therefore it can be expected that over workload will be negatively related to OCBs. Therefore, the relationship between personality and OCB is weak when the workload is high. Because the time and effort of the employees are spent to meet high work demand. Although the personality dimensions have tendencies to exhibit OCB they do not have time to exhibit OCBs because of the high workload. Employee tend not to reduce expected task performance, because it is likely to be risky, the employee will most likely decide to reduce OCBs. Therefore, the relationship between personality and OCB is moderated by workload. The relationship between personality and OCB would be positive when workload is low, but negative when workload is high. Based on the above discussion, the study expects that workload moderate the relationship between personality traits and OCBs.

Hypotheses 6: Workload will moderate the relationship between personality and OCB, such that relationship will be stronger at low levels of workload than at high levels of workload.

### **Methods and Analysis**

A stratified sample size of 200 will be drawn from diverse organizations in Sri Lankan context. Among them 112 were male and 88 were female. The average respondent was 37 years old and ages ranged from 25 to 64 years. Survey respondent have worked for the organization for an average of 7.5 years. Personality traits are measured with the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-



FFI), developed by Costa and McCrae (1992). The NEO-FFI is a well-recognized, extensively tested and widely used scale to measure the Big Five Personality dimensions (e.g. Mooradian & Olver, 1997; Renner, 2002). This inventory consists of sixty items (twelve items for each factor) and based on five-point Likert format (from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”). The Mean and Standard Deviation for personality was 4.107 and 1.235 respectively. Field testing was conducted of this measure to examine its applicability to the local context.

Employees provided self-reports of their workload at work using the Bolino and Turnkey’s (2005) modified workload scale. The scale contains seven items. Items were slightly modified to specify the work domain and to specify in role workload; for example, to complete your essential duties, is added and a sample item is “Do you have to work extra hard to finish a task”. The alpha coefficient for this variable for present study was .89. The Mean and Standard Deviation for workload is 4.826 and 1.086 respectively. Field testing was conducted of this measure before using to examine its applicability to the local context. Lee and Allen (2002) instrument was used to measure OCBs. The scale comprises 16 items with a 5-point Likert type response format, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Coefficient alpha for each factor was .96 (OCB). The Mean value and Standard Deviation for OCB were 5.205 and 0.720 respectively. “Help others who have heavy workloads” is a sample item to measure OCBs.

Data were screened by checking for normality, linearity, and multicollinearity. The scales used for were self-reported. Therefore, it is possible to have influence of common method bias on the results of these findings. Harman’s one factor test was conducted to investigate this possibility (Podsakoff et al. 2003). For this purpose, all items of the scales were entered into one single factor analysis. If a substantial amount of common method variance exists in the data, either a single factor will emerge or one general factor will account for the majority of the variance among the variables. If the percentage of variance accounted for first factor is more than 50%, it can be said that the common method variance is to be a serious threat to validity. The first factor accounted for only 32 percent of the variance, suggesting that a general factor did not account for the majority of the variance. These results indicate that common method variance is not likely to be a serious threat to validity.

Furthermore, the correlations among factors varying at different level and not more than 0.90, show that the strong effect of common method bias is very unlikely. The correlation matrix of the variables was investigated and no multicollinearity was detected. Other than this, the examination of the correlation matrix showed no multicollinearity because of the absence of bivariate correlations above .90 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Finally, any data collected by self-report measures may have been influenced by a social desirability response bias. Although one cannot rule out a self-serving bias as a possible influence, researchers have suggested that social desirability is generally not a source of bias in measuring organizational perceptions (Moorman & Podsakoff, 1992). Another reason is OCBs are not reported to the supervisors or subordinates more often as they are discretionary behavior and they are only a personal choice of spontaneous behavior. Therefore, reporting on behaviors such as OCBs by the self-report system is more valid than the others or other method of data triangulation. However, an attempt was made to triangulate self-report data but couldn’t except in a few cases because of the reluctance of others to speak of other people’s work. The variables were centered to reduce multicollinearity (Aiken & West, 1991). Moderated Hierarchical regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) was used to test hypotheses.

Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation of participants’ answers to personality traits, workload and organizational citizenship scales were estimated and Pearson correlation

coefficients were calculated to find out the relationship between studied variables. Findings are presented in the Table 1. According to the Table 1, when participants' personality traits are considered the score means of extraversion and openness to experience ( $M=2.80$ ) were less than the score means of other personality traits. Therefore, this can be meant that participants' personality traits agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability are positive. This implies that the participants are agreeable with others, like to perform better at work and are very open with others. However, workload ( $M=3.80$ ) is at high level among participants. This implies that participants perceive that they are flooded with more workload in their workplace. The mean of organizational citizenship behavior was 3.02. This implies that the level of perceptions of organizational citizenship behavior among respondents are at moderate level.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of employee perception of Personality traits and organizational citizenship behavior.**

Scores	n	Lowest score	Highest Score	Mean	S
Extraversion	200	2.00	5.00	2.80	0.50
Agreeableness	200	1.00	4.00	3.10	0.40
Conscientiousness	200	1.00	4.00	3.20	0.48
Emotional stability	200	1.00	5.00	3.20	0.52
Openness to experience	200	2.00	5.00	2.80	0.54
Workload	200	3.00	5.00	3.80	0.82
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	200	1.00	4.00	3.02	0.40

According to the results of the correlation analysis presented in Table 2 the relationship between extraversion and OCB ( $r=.43$ ,  $p<.01$ ), the relationship between agreeableness and OCB ( $r=.47$ ,  $p<.01$ ), the relationship between conscientiousness and OCB ( $r=.51$ ,  $p<.01$ ) and the relationship between emotional stability and OCB ( $r=.55$ ,  $p<.01$ ) and the relationship between openness to experience and OCB ( $r=.46$ ,  $p<.01$ ) are positive. However, the relationship between workload and personality traits, and the relationship between workload and OCB are negative. Cronbach's alpha measure the reliability of the scale and for each of the variables it was greater than .70 which is acceptable as studied by Nunnally (1978).

According to the Table 2, a positive moderate significant relationship ( $r=0.43$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) is observed between extraversion and organizational citizenship behavior. Results of the study reveals when a positive increase is observed in the extraversion a positive increase can be observed in the organizational citizenship behavior. Further the findings also suggested that 18% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior is explained by the extraversion ( $r^2=0.18$ ). Generally, moderate level of relationships were found in this study.

**Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, Inter-Correlations and Reliabilities of Studied Variables**

	M	SD	E	A	C	ES	O	W	OCB
Extraversion	2.80	0.50	(.75)						
Agreeableness	3.10	0.40	.42**	(.80)					
Conscientiousness	3.20	0.48	.51**	.48**	(.72)				

Emotional stability	3.20	0.52	.38**	.39**	.41**	(.76)	
Openness to experience	2.80	0.54	.46**	.38**	.44**	.52**	(.74)
Workload	3.80	0.82	-.28*	-	-.29*	-	(.79)
				.30**		.32**	.32**
OCB	3.02	0.40	.43**	.47**	.51**	.55**	.46**
							.34**

Note. \*\* $p < .01$ . E = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; ES = Emotional stability; O = Openness to experience; W = Workload; OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior; M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation. Reliabilities are in parenthesis

The Table 2 also shows that there is a general moderate level, positive and significant relationship ( $r=0.47$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) is observed between agreeableness and organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, the findings reveals that when a positive agreeableness is observed an increase in organizational citizenship behavior also can be observed. This results also suggested that 22% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior is explained by agreeableness ( $r^2=0.22$ ). According to the results a positive and significant relationship ( $r=0.55$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) between emotional stability and organizational citizenship behavior is observed. Hence, it is possible to conclude that when emotional stability is increased an increase on organizational citizenship behavior also can be observed. It is also found that 30% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior is explained by emotional stability ( $r^2=0.30$ ). The results also provide evidence for a positive and significant relationship ( $r=0.46$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) between respondents' openness to experience and organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, it is possible to conclude that when openness to experience increases the perception of organizational citizenship behavior also increases. It is also found that 21% of the variance in organizational citizenship behavior is explained by openness to experience ( $r^2=0.21$ ). However, the relationship between workload and organizational citizenship behavior is negative ( $r=-0.34$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). This implies that 11% of the negative variance in OCB is explained by workload. As such when workload of employees increase the engagement in OCB decreases. Based on these results, it is possible to conclude that all the personality traits extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness to experience are positively associated with OCB. Therefore, H1, H2, H3, H4, and H5 are supported with these findings.

**Table 3. Results of moderated hierarchical regression for OCB**

Variables	Adjusted $R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta sR^2$
<i>Main effects</i>	.577	.483***		
Personality			.712***	.463
Workload			-.613***	.195
<i>Interaction effect</i>	.780	.262**		
Personality x Workload			-.074**	.003

Notes: Personality main variable is entered in step 1, Workload variable in step 2 & Interaction effect of both personality and workload in step 3;  $\Delta R^2$  - change of adjusted  $R^2$ ,  $\beta$ - beta coefficient,  $\Delta sR^2$  - squared partial correlation: \*  $p<0.1$ , \*\*  $p<0.05$ , \*\*\* $p<0.01$

To test the hypothesis 6, role of workload on the relationship between personality and OCB moderated hierarchical regression was carried out. For this purpose, personality is considered as a composite variable of all five traits. In the moderated hierarchical regression (see Table 3), Personality and workload entered in Step 1 explained 48% of the variance ( $\Delta F_{5,311}=59.986$ ),



$P < 0.001$ ). The cross product term of personality and workload entered in Step 2 explained an additional percent of variance in OCB ( $\Delta F_{6,997} = 247.02$ ).

Therefore, the hypothesis, personality as composite variable of all five traits were supported as personality and workload interacted to significantly influence OCB ( $\beta = -0.06$ ,  $t = -2.431$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ,  $sR^2 = 0.03$ ). The indicator  $sR^2$ , the squared semi-partial correlation, was used to ascertain the unique contribution of each variable to the criterion. It indicates the incremental change in  $R^2$  for a given variable beyond all other variables. Because the interaction was significant, follow up split group analysis was performed as recommended by Aiken and West (1991). Regression was done for OCB on personality at low (1 standard deviation below mean) and high (1 standard deviation above the mean) levels of workload. Personality was significantly interacted with workload to OCB at low level of workload ( $R^2 = 0.69$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\beta = 0.61$ ) but not at high level of workload ( $R^2 = 0.07$ ,  $P = 0.29$ ,  $\beta = 0.31$ ). Therefore, the hypotheses H6, workload will moderate the relationship between personality and OCB, such that relationship will be stronger at low levels of workload than at high levels of workload is supported with these results.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study the relationship between personality as an individual variable and the performance of organizational citizenship behavior was tested. The results, in general, support personality as a predictor of OCB. These results are consistent with Kumar and Bakhshi (2009) and Elanain (2007). Therefore, OCB may be a type of work performance which personality wish to exercise to demonstrate that interest.

On the other hand, various modern and advanced management techniques which are centered with more collectivistic interests which need positive personality traits are now becoming very popular. Currently, there is a tendency for highlighting the importance of participatory management and team-based performance systems such as total quality management, employee involvement program, and quality circles, where employees can become involved in cooperative work and share their ideas. Furthermore, Karambayya (1991) revealed that OCBs contribute to the effective work performance of the work unit, therefore, focusing on personality characteristics may help the organization achieve the entire benefits of cooperation. The results of this study also suggest that by keeping up and looking after employees with more personality tendencies, organizations may enjoy the full benefits of OCB.

Workload, however, had a more complex relationship with OCB. With regard to workload, it acts as an impediment to OCB. The results also suggest that when the workload is high performance of OCB is low even when an individual is with high personality traits. The reason for this may be, that when individuals have more workload, they try to meet those work demands to their maximum but they do not get any time available to engage in OCB.

The present study addresses research questions that has received limited attention in this field and has contributed to the literature on OCB. It has significant theoretical implications as well. The study makes important contribution to the extant OCB literature. Findings and results of the present study suggest that personality traits influences OCBs. Evidence was also found for the impact of workload as a moderating variable on the relationship between personality and OCB. Further the findings reveal that even employees are with high in all aspects of personality traits, when they perceive their workload is high their OCBs are affected. Unlike previous studies that

assumed personality is related to OCB, this study mainly focused on the moderating effect of workload on the relationship between these two variables. Many previous studies found workload as consequences of OCB. The findings of the current study revealed a more specific interactive relationship of personality and workload towards OCB.

The current studies have a few limitations that direct areas for future research. Because this area of research has been largely neglected, there are many avenues available for future research. It was assumed that because the heterogeneity of organizations within sectors (e.g., manufacturing organizations) and between them (for profit vs. nonprofit organizations), even in a single country or culture, distinct patterns of OCB will emerge. The willingness to act spontaneous and cooperative behavior is assumed to be value-urged as it reflects the personal choice of the employees and voluntary. Therefore, it is expected to observe variability within and between groups (Bogler & Somech, 2005). Understanding these variations and attempting to explain these would contribute to a better understanding OCB.

Time management skills and workload self-efficacy may be particularly useful for employees struggling to balance multiple roles. Therefore, the relationship between OCB and workload may be moderated by time management skills, such that the relationship is weakened for individuals that are able to effectively manage their time. Future research should explore this possibility and consider other personal factors that may also impact the relationship between OCB and workload. Human resource practitioners should find ways to encourage OCBs without diminishing task performance; the conceptual and methodological issues should be addressed by future researchers for further understanding of this possibility. On the other hand, research in this area should not be limited to only positive consequences, as OCB may lead to other negative consequences as well, such as work–family conflict, job stress. Further, researchers should focus on steps that organizations can take to prevent the potential negative consequences of engaging in OCB, such as training employees on how to balance multiple demands and training supervisors to be aware of the types of behaviors they are encouraging their subordinates to conduct.

This study is highly relevant to the existing literature which is seems to be presently blind in terms of moderating effect on the relationship between personality traits and OCBs. The present study expand the knowledge in the relevant field. Similarly, the findings of the study will be useful and is a new knowledge contribution to the existing literature and highly useful for the organizations which like to increase its efficiency through OCBs with different traits of personality characteristics. Similarly, findings will pave the way for the management in paying attention in balancing workload of individual which may lead to a high level of their extra role performance.

## REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Anderson, S. E., & Williams, L. J. (1996). Interpersonal, job, and individual factors related to helping processes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 282-296.
- Barr, C. D., Spitzmuller, C., & Stuebing, K. K. (2008). Too stressed out to participate? Examining the relation between stressors and survey response behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13, 232–243.

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis, *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-Monitoring as a moderator of the relationship between personality traits and performance, *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 745-767.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship, *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school; How does it relate to participation in decision making? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43 (5), 420-438.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 740-748.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied Multiple Regression/ Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Caligiuri, P. (2006). Developing global leaders. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 219-228.
- Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 65-74.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied Multiple Regression/ Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1989). *NEO-PI professional manual*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Ann Arbor, MI: Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Elanain, H.A. (2007). Relationship between Personality and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Does Personality Influence Employee Citizenship? *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(4), 31-43.
- Emmerik, V. I. J. H., & Euwema, M. C. (2007). The aftermath of organizational restructuring: Destruction of old and development of new social capital. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 833-849.
- Erdogan, B., & Liden, R. C. (2006). Collectivism as a moderator of responses to organizational justice: Implications for leader-member exchange and ingratiation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 1-17.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26-42.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Griffeth, R. W., & Hom, P. W. (2001). *Retaining valued employees*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Guthrie, J.P., Coate, C.J. & Schwoerer, C.E. (1998). Career management strategies: The role of personality. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13(5/6), 371-386.
- Herman, J. B., & Gyllstrom, K. K. (1977). Working men and women: Inter-and intra-role conflict. *Psychology of women quarterly*, 1(4), 319-333.

- Karambayya, R. (1991). *Work unit characteristics with implications for organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished manuscript, York University, North York, Ontario, Canada.
- King, E.B., J. M. George., & M. R. Hebl, (2005). Linking Personality to helping behavior at work: An interaction Perspective. *Journal of personality*, 73(3), 585-607.
- Kumar, K. & Bakhshi, A. (2009). Linking the 'Big Five' Personality Domains to Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *International Journal of Psychological studies*, 1(2), 73-81.
- Lau, V., & Shaffer, M. A. (1999). Career success: The effects of personality. *Career Development International*, 4: 225-230.
- 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.
- Mooradian, T. A., & Olver, J. M. (1997). I can't get no satisfaction': the impact of personality and emotion on post-purchase processes. *Psychology & Marketing*, 14, 379-393.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142.
- Moorman, R. H., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1992). A meta-analytic review and empirical test of the potential confounding effects of social desirability response sets in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 131-149.
- Mooradian, Todd A. & James M. Olver (1997). I can't get no satisfaction: The impact of personality and emotion on post purchase processes, *Psychology and Marketing*, 14 (4), 379-93.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1543-1567.
- Morgeson, F. P., Reider, M. H., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Selecting individuals in team settings: The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork knowledge, *Personnel Psychology*, 58 (3), 583-611.
- Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). The five factor model of personality and performance in jobs that involve interpersonal interaction, *Human Performance*, 11(2/3), 145-165.
- Nikolaou, S. (2003). Evaluation of Site Factors for Seismic Structural Design in the New York Metropolitan Area. *Proceedings, Metropolitan Section Structures Group Seminar*, ASCE, New York, 131-143.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior; its nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*, Sage publications.
- Organ, D. W. (1988), *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- Podsakoff, Philip M. MacKenzie, Scott B. Paine, Julie B. Bachrach, & Daniel G. (2000): Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *In: Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.

- Rauf, F. H. A. (2015). What Role Does Job Satisfaction Play on The Relationship Between Organizational Justice Perception And Organizational Citizenship Behavior? Empirical Evidence from Sri Lankan Employees, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(15), 149-162.
- Rauf, F. H. A. (2013). The Role Work Family Conflict Self Efficacy on The Negative Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *South East Asia Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law*, 3(1), 49-54.
- Renner, W. (2002). A psychometric analysis of the NEO five-factor inventory in an Austrian sample. *Review of Psychology*, 9, 25-31.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150–163.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Williams, S. D. (2004). Personality, attitude and leader influences on divergent thinking and creativity in organizations, *European journal of Innovation, Manage*, 77(3), 187-204.
- Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 164-169.