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This study addresses the debate in the literature regarding the dimensionality of the job performance construct. The sample comprised 647 public servants from a state-based law enforcement organisation. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses delineate a four-factor structure, consisting of in-role behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour directed towards (1) individuals or (2) the organisation, and a distinct latent variable deemed counter-productive work behaviour (CWB). The pattern of correlations among the four performance dimensions and between the performance dimensions and attitudes support the construct and discriminant validity of the four performance dimensions. Further, the findings propose that CWB is a core, not discretionary, dimension of performance.

There has been growing interest in investigating performance-related work behaviours in recent years, prompting researchers to differentiate between task and non-task performance (Sackett, Berry, Wiemann & Laczo 2006). Although a good deal of previous research has developed models of job performance (Borman & Brush 1993; Campbell, McHenry & Wise 1990; Hunt 1996) the focus of such work has nevertheless remained almost entirely on task performance. Furthermore, meta-analytic reviews of discretionary work behaviour (Organ & Ryan 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach 2000) have not been broad enough to include task performance and consequently have not addressed the dimensions of general performance that include both in-role and extra-role behaviours (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac & Woehr 2007).

The distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviour is, however, delineated by Borman and Motowidlo (1993) in the construct of contextual performance. Rather than focusing on the distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviour, researchers of contextual performance are interested in the extent to which the behaviours of employees are discretionary (Vey & Campbell 2004). The definition of task performance reflects in-role behaviour and refers to patterns of behaviour that are directly related to producing goods or services, or activities that indirectly support the organisation's core operations (Borman & Motowidlo 1993). Employees using technical skills and knowledge to accomplish tasks are demonstrating task performance. Contextual performance, on the other hand, encompasses behavioural patterns that contribute to organisational effectiveness through supporting the psychological and social context in which task performance occurs (Borman & Motowidlo 1993). Assisting co-workers, cooperating with supervisors or nominating improvements to organisational processes are all examples of contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo 1993).
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), or behaviour that benefits an organisation indirectly through the maintenance of the organisation’s social system (Organ 1997), has been a widely studied topic in organisational behaviour research since the term was first created by Organ and colleagues (Bateman & Organ 1983; Smith, Organ & Near 1983). Interest in work-related behaviour that goes beyond prescribed tasks and is not formally recognised by the organisational reward systems has grown due to a number of changes in the business environment, including less hierarchical management and greater employee autonomy (LePine, Erez & Johnson 2002). Against the background of a rapidly changing business environment, research has shown that the performance of discretionary work behaviours is an important aspect of organisational effectiveness (Podsakoff, Aherne & MacKenzie 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1994; Walz & Nichoff 2000). However, even with an increasing body of research demonstrating the importance of OCB to organisational effectiveness, there remains little consensus on the dimensions of the OCB construct (Podsakoff et al. 1997) or its differentiation from task performance (Vey & Campbell 2004).

Over the past two decades the OCB construct has undergone numerous re-conceptualisations (Hoffman et al. 2007). The construct was proposed to have two factors, namely altruism and generalised compliance, (Smith et al. 1983) but was further developed by Organ (1988) to encompass five factors including altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. The factor structure was later condensed by Podsakoff et al. (1997) to three factors (helping behaviour, civic virtue and sportsmanship) and subsequently expanded into a seven factor model including helping behaviour, sportsmanship, organisational loyalty, organisational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self development (Podsakoff et al. 2000). An alternative approach conceptualises OCB as a global construct that includes all positive organisationally related behaviours demonstrated by employees, whether they are in-role, extra-role or political behaviours (Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch 1994).

Despite divergence regarding the number of factors, most conceptualisations of OCB suggest that it has two major dimensions. These can be characterised as (1) altruism, or pro-social behaviours directed at specific individuals or groups within the organisation, and (2) generalised compliance, which consists of pro-social behaviours directed at the organisation (Rioux & Penner 2001).

In recognition of the importance of distinguishing task performance from discretionary actions in the measurement of citizenship behaviours, Williams and Anderson (1991) re-conceptualised the construct of OCB by demonstrating that traditional performance of in-role behaviour (IRB) could be separated from two types of extra-role behaviour, Williams and Anderson (1991) proposed that organisational citizenship behaviour that is aimed at the organisation (OCBO) is discrete from organisational citizenship behaviour directed toward individuals (OCBI). Based principally on Organ’s (1988) five factor classification, the dimensions of sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness were categorised as OCBO, whereas altruism and courtesy were characterised as OCBI. The scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) has been utilised by researchers seeking to differentiate in-role from extra-role behaviour (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble & Gardner 2007; Vigoda-Gadot 2007) and measure OCB directed at either individuals or the organisation (Choi 2008; Tan & Tan 2008; Vigoda-Gadot 2007) however distinctions between the OCBO, OCBI and IRB dimensions in these studies are not definitive.
Negative Aspects of OCB

Most research to date has focused on the positive aspects of OCB and its benefits in terms of organisational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al. 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1994; Walz & Niehoff 2000) however there is also a negative aspect to corporate citizenship. A number of studies have investigated dimensions of OCB that have negative consequences, either at the level of individuals (Vigoda-Gadot 2007), or organisations (Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling & Nault 2002; Sackett et al. 2006). The dimension of OCB that has negative outcomes for individuals due to the presence of coercion is known as compulsory citizenship behaviour (Vigoda-Gadot 2007) whereas discretionary behaviour that is part of the OCB spectrum, yet is detrimental to the organisation, has been categorised as counter-productive work behaviour (Kelloway et al. 2002; Sackett et al. 2006). There are two independent bodies of research relating to discretionary job behaviour, as these studies show. One focuses primarily on positive non-task performance, commonly referred to as OCB or contextual performance, and the other is concerned with negative non-task behaviour, generally labelled as counter-productive work behaviour (Sackett et al. 2006).

The current study aims to determine the dimensionality of performance by examining the relationship of the factor solution with attitudinal predictors including job satisfaction, affective commitment and intention to quit, using a sample drawn from the Australian public sector. In line with the evidence provided regarding variability in the factor structure of OCB, inconsistencies in delineating in-role and extra-role behaviours, and the existence of negative citizenship behaviour, the current study sought clarification of these issues using the Williams and Anderson (1991) OCB measure.

Method
Sample
The sample was comprised of public servants employed within a state-based law enforcement organisation. Data were collected using self-report surveys of employees in the organisation. Employees were encouraged to complete the questionnaires on a voluntary basis. The public servants were employed in a range of departments within the organisation including: human resources, education, business management, information technology, operations co-ordinations, corporate strategy, legal, media and communications, intelligence and forensic services. The sample included 662 employees, representing a return rate of 36% of total public servants. The sample of useable responses was reduced to 647 after removing responses with missing data and outliers (e.g. using Mahalanobis’ distances). Demographics of the sample show that the majority of employees (78%) were equally divided amongst three age groups (26% aged 20-29, 26% aged 30-39 and 26% aged 40-49), most were female (61%), most reported tertiary level education (62%) and 92% of respondents had been employed in the organisation for four years or less.

Measures
Affective Organisational Commitment
This construct was measured using the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS) developed by Allen and Meyer (1990), containing eight items. Respondents were asked to rate each item on a five point scale, ranging from ‘Disagree strongly’ to ‘Agree strongly’, according to their degree of commitment to the organisation. After reverse-scoring negatively worded items, the eight items were summed to form an overall affective commitment score, with higher scores indicating higher levels of commitment.
Job Satisfaction
Job satisfaction was measured with a shortened version of the satisfaction scale from the Job Diagnostic Survey designed by Hackman and Oldham (1975). Respondents were required to rate three items on a seven point scale, ranging from ‘Extremely satisfied’ to ‘Extremely dissatisfied’. These three items were summed to constitute an overall job satisfaction score, with higher scores associated with higher levels of job satisfaction.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour
Organisational Citizenship Behaviours were measured using a 21-item scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). Both intra-role and extra-role behaviours were measured via three subscales: in-role behaviour (IRB); organisational citizenship behaviour aimed at the organisation (OCBO) and organisational citizenship behaviour directed toward individuals (OCBI). Each subscale contained seven items which were measured on a five point likert scale, ranging from ‘Disagree strongly’ to ‘Agree strongly’. Higher scores for each of the OCB subscales indicated higher levels of OCB.

Intention to Quit
Intention to Quit was measured by three items adapted from Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997). Each item was measured on a seven point likert scale ranging from ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’ with higher scores indicating a stronger intention to quit the organisation.

Demographic characteristics
A range of demographic questions was asked on the questionnaire. The information collected included data on age, sex, level of education, type and level of employment, and length of tenure.

Results
The primary objective of the research was to confirm that IRBs and OCBs are separate dimensions of performance, and that OCBI are distinct from OCBOs, in accordance with the model proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991). SPSS (version 15) was used to conduct an exploratory factor analysis on the performance items. A three-factor model with oblique rotation was employed to examine the factor pattern of IRB, OCBI and OCBO.

The pattern of factor loadings for these data indicated that the highest loadings did not occur on the appropriate factor for all items. All of the items contained in the OCBI scale did obtain the highest loading for that factor. However, items 8, 9, 13 and 14 loaded highest on the IRB factor rather than the OCBO factor where they were proposed to belong according to Williams and Anderson (1991). Most of the items relegated to the IRB factor (Williams & Anderson 1991) loaded on the correct factor, with the exception of items 20 and 21, which achieved their highest loadings on the OCBO factor. Item 19 attained inadequate loadings (below .2) on each of the three factors. It should be noted that all negatively oriented items loaded strongly on to one factor (OCBO) rather than two factors (OCBO and IRB). The first three factors had eigenvalues of 6.72, 2.15 and 1.81 and accounted for 50.82% of the variance in the self-report data. The factor correlations obtained with the oblique rotation were .48(IRB – OCBI), -.31 (IRB – OCBO) and -.21(OCBI – OCBO). The 21 items used to form the IRB, OCBI, and OCBO scales (Williams & Anderson 1991) had reliabilities of .43, .84 and .29 respectively. The inter-correlations among these variables were $r = .31, p < .01$, $r = .33, p < .01$ and $r = .19, p < .01$ respectively.
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Given the unexpected loadings of the three-factor model, additional analyses were undertaken. A four-factor model with oblique rotation was employed to further examine the factor pattern of IRB, OCBI and OCBO. Principal components results are shown in Table 1.

### Table 1.
Results of Four Factor Analysis of Performance Items – Oblique Rotation ($n = 647$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>OCBI</th>
<th>OCBO</th>
<th>IRB</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I help others who have been absent</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I help others who have heavy workloads</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I assist my supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I take time to listen to co-workers’ problems and worries</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I go out of my way to help new employees</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I take a personal interest in other employees</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I pass along information to co-workers</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My attendance at work is above the norm</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I give advance notice when unable to come to work</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I conserve and protect organisational property</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I adequately complete my assigned duties</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I fulfill the responsibilities specified in my job description</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I perform the tasks expected of me</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I meet the formal performance requirements of the job</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I engage in activities that will directly affect my performance evaluation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I take undeserved work breaks*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A great deal of my time is spent on personal phone/email communications*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I complain about insignificant things at work*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I neglect aspects of my job that I am obligated to perform*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I fail to perform essential duties*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue (Unrotated solution)                             | 2.15 | 1.31 | 6.72 | 1.81 |
| Percent variance explained                                   | 10.22| 6.23 | 31.99| 8.60 |
| Cumulative percent variance explained                       | 10.22| 16.45| 48.44| 57.04|

*Indicates negatively oriented items (10-12 from OCBO scale; 20-21 from IRB scale). Bold type indicates highest loadings on IRB, OCBI, OCBO and CWB scales.

As shown in Table 1, all items loaded on the correct factors, as proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), with the exception of the negatively oriented items, which loaded together on a separate fourth factor (CWB). As also shown in Table 1, the first four factors had eigenvalues of 6.72, 2.15, 1.81 and 1.32 respectively and accounted for 57.05% of the variance in the self-report data. The factor correlations obtained with the oblique rotation were .39(IRB – OCBI), .27(IRB – OCBO), .30(OCBI – OCBO), -.23(IRB – NEG), -.12(CWB – OCBO) and -.18(CWB – OCBI). Due to the low loadings of item 19 across all factors, it was excluded from the analysis. The remaining 20 items were used to form the IRB, OCBI, and OCBO factors in line with the scales proposed by Williams and Anderson (1991), with the exception of items 10, 11, 12, 20 and 21, which produced the CWB factor. The reliabilities of the four subscales were .70, .84, .70 and .73 respectively. The inter-correlations among these variables were $r = .44, p < .01$(IRB – OCBI), $r = .55, p < .01$(IRB – OCBO), $r = .44, p < .01$(OCBI – OCBO), $r = -.36, p < .01$(IRB – CWB), $r = -.34, p < .01$(CWB – OCBO) and $r = -.28, p < .01$(CWB – OCBI).

### A Revised, Four Factor Model

The results show that the four factor model of the OCB scale was superior to the model containing three OCB factors and that CWB is markedly distinct from IRB, OCBI and OCBO. Item 10 ("I take undeserved work breaks"), item 11 ("A great deal of my time is spent on personal phone/email communications"), item 12 ("I complain about insignificant things at work"), item 20 ("I neglect aspects of my job that I am obligated to perform") and item 21 ("I fail to perform essential duties") were loading...
on the additional (fourth) variable. After examining the nature of the items, this construct was labeled “counter-productive work behavior” (CWB) to reflect the negatively-oriented behavior that was common across the five items. The convergent and divergent validity of the resulting factor structure were also assessed by examining the relationships among the performance variables, between performance and the attitudinal variables (affective organisational commitment, job satisfaction and intention to quit) and among the attitudinal variables. The correlations between all variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IRB</td>
<td>25.31</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OCBI</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCBO</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CWB</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. JOBSAT</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. COMMIT</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ITQ</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>12**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01 Note. IRB = In-Role Behaviours (items 15-18); OCBI = Organisational Citizenship Behaviours – Individuals (items 1-7); OCBO = Organisational Citizenship Behaviours – Organisations (items 8, 9, 13, 14); CWB = Counter-productive Work Behaviour (items 10, 11, 20, 21); JOBSAT = Job Satisfaction; COMMIT = Affective Organisational Commitment; ITQ = Intention to Quit. n = 647

The correlation matrix shows that when a fourth subscale containing counter-productive work behaviour items (CWB) was incorporated in the model, it correlated negatively with the other three OCB subscales; OCBI (r = -.28, p < .01), OCBO (r = -.34, p < .01) and IRB (r = -.36, p < .01). Among the attitudinal predictors, job satisfaction correlated positively with OCBI (r = .15, p < .01), OCBO (r = .17, p < .01), IRB (r = .18, p < .01) and negatively with CWB (r = -.17, p < .01). Affective commitment also correlated positively with OCBI (r = .16, p < .01), OCBO (r = .21, p < .01), IRB (r = .13, p < .01) and negatively with CWB (r = -.18, p < .01). Intention to quit was negatively correlated with OCBO (r = -.13, p < .01) and IRB (r = -.10, p < .01) whilst it was positively correlated with CWB (r = .12, p < .01). OCBI and ITQ were not significantly correlated.

Discussion
The psychometric properties of the organisational citizenship behaviour scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) were studied with particular focus on the dimensionality of the construct. The general aim of the research was to better understand the factor structure and specific components of the measure in response to the ongoing debate in the literature regarding these issues. The present study is significant for two reasons. First, this study did not replicate the results of previous research demonstrating a three factor structure for the organisational citizenship behaviour scale (Williams & Anderson 1991). Contrary to the expected conceptualisation of a three factor solution, the OCB scale appears to have a four-factor structure, comprising in-role behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour directed towards (1) individuals or (2) the organisation, and a fourth factor consisting of negatively oriented items. Second, the items contained in the fourth factor appear to capture a pattern of counter-productive work behaviour, indicating that this factor is a latent variable. Tests of convergent and divergent validity demonstrated that the counter-productive work behaviour factor correlated negatively with job satisfaction.
and organisational commitment, and positively with intention to quit, in contrast to correlations between these attitudinal predictors and the other three OCB subscales. An alternative four factor model of OCB that conceptualises counter-productive work behaviour as a distinct subscale was developed as a result of these findings.

Discretionary Work Performance
Much of the research in the area of OCB has focussed on its antecedents (Podsakoff et al. 2000) including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, organisational justice and perceived organisational fairness (Blakely, Andrews & Moorman 2005; Byrne 2005; Niehoff & Moorman 1993; Organ & Ryan 1995; Tepper & Taylor 2003). However, a number of studies have investigated the dimensionality of OCB, resulting in the inclusion of dimensions such as compulsory citizenship behaviour (Vigoda-Gadot 2007) and counter-productive work behaviour (Kelloway et al. 2002; Sackett et al. 2006). In parallel, extra-role behaviour has been addressed by contextual performance researchers, proposing that when and how a person engages in contextual performance is much more discretionary than when and how an employee undertakes task performance (Van Scotter, Motowidlo & Cross 2000). The current study provides support to the proposition that the context and type of discretionary work behaviour is important. Through conceptualising OCB as a dimension of overall job performance that can be either beneficial or detrimental to the effective functioning of organisations, this study challenges the widely held view that discretionary performance associated with organisational citizenship is essentially positive (Podsakoff et al. 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1994; Walz & Niehoff 2000).

OCB as a Dimension of Job Performance
Job performance is an indicator of organisational effectiveness that not only refers to the quality and quantity of work, but includes extra-role behaviour (O’Reilly & Chatman 1986) and organizational citizenship (Smith et al. 1983). Researchers of job performance accept that employees who work persistently, are helpful to others and use initiative to solve problems are more effective and successful than staff members who do not display these behaviours (Van Scotter et al. 2000). The feature that OCB and contextual performance share in common is that the primary focus is on positive behaviours that benefit organisational effectiveness, but do not reflect core work tasks (Sackett et al. 2006). Due to this premise, most research to date has focused on the positive aspects of OCB and its benefits in terms of organisational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al. 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie 1994; Walz & Niehoff 2000) however there is also a negative aspect to performance associated with corporate citizenship.

In contrast to focusing only on positive aspects of OCB, the current study developed the model of OCB to include the extra dimension of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), rendering it possible to identify a pattern of employee behaviours that chronically reduce organisational efficiency, such as failure to perform essential duties, taking undeserved work breaks, and excessive personal use of communication systems. A further consequence of employees engaging in counter-productive behaviours, such as constant complaining about trivial matters and neglecting to perform necessary obligations, is their potential to influence co-workers in an unconstructive manner that detracts from organisational effectiveness (Robinson & Bennett 1995). Failure to fulfil essential tasks can be perceived as anti-IRB, or going against the system, and coupled with complaining about the organisation on a regular basis, this pattern of behaviour has the potential to undermine morale, reduce organisational commitment and negatively influence the culture within the organisation.
The theoretical contribution of this study is the confirmation that the domains of work performance do indeed include task performance, positive extra role behaviour and negative discretionary behaviour. As indicated by the tests of convergent and discriminant validity, the negatively oriented items in the Williams and Anderson (1991) OCB scale, referring to behaviours including failure to perform essential duties, taking undeserved work breaks, and excessive personal use of communication systems, are clearly CWB. In contrast to IRB, OCBO and OCBI, which correlated positively with the primary antecedents of OCB, namely job satisfaction and affective commitment, CWB correlated negatively with these attitudinal predictors. On the other hand, intention to quit correlated positively with CWB, indicating that employees engaging in sub-role performance were more likely to consider leaving the organisation than employees who did not engage in CWB.

**OCB and Counterproductive Work Behaviour**

The findings of this study confirm the link between OCB and CWB that has been documented by other researchers (Kelloway et al. 2002; Sackett et al. 2006). Counterproductive behaviour has been defined in the literature as deliberate actions by individuals to breach fundamental organisational policies, rules and procedures, thereby causing harm to the organisation and its members (Robinson & Bennet 1995). It has been acknowledged that CWB varies in severity, and can involve both acts of commission and omission, such as deliberately not passing on information to co-workers, gossiping about organisational leaders, or committing acts of psychological or physical aggression (Robinson & Bennett 1995).

In research to date, CWB and OCB have been regarded as separate constructs. However, there are adequate reasons to question whether the constructs are empirically distinct due to the degree of item and construct overlap (Kelloway et al. 2002). For example, item overlap occurs in some measures of OCB and CWB. Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) counter-productive work behaviour scale includes a production deviance component which is categorised as relatively minor deviant behaviour that is harmful to the organisation. The items included in this dimension reflect sub-role behaviour such as taking excessive work breaks, intentionally working slowly and wasting resources (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). These behaviours overlap with substantially with items in the Williams and Anderson (1991) OCB scale, such as “I take undeserved work breaks”, “A great deal of my time is spent on personal phone and email communications” and “I neglect aspects of my job that I am obligated to perform” which also denote sub role performance that goes against organisational norms.

The results of this study support the general results of previous research that has acknowledged competing viewpoints as to whether OCB and CWB are best viewed as behaviours located on a single continuum or as distinct constructs. That is, self-reported CWB and OCB are negatively correlated and do reflect separate albeit related constructs (Kelloway et al. 2002; Sackett et al. 2006). This conclusion is supported by the findings of the current study.

**Limitations**

This study used self reports to collect data from participants on measures of OCB and the attitudinal predictors of job satisfaction, affective organisational commitment and intention to quit. This method of data collection was necessary as the study aimed to measure self-perceptions of discretionary work performance and work attitudes. The concern that common method variance could occur due to the use of self report data is however minimised in this study due to the pattern of differential relationships between the attitudinal predictors, OCB, and CWB, where common method variance could be anticipated to cause similarity among the relationships.
**Implications**

In line with the conclusions of previous research linking OCB and CWB, the findings of the current study support the contention that it is appropriate for researchers to continue to conceptualise self-reported CWB and OCB as distinct constructs (Kelloway et al. 2002; Sackett et al. 2006). Given the significant contribution of discretionary work behaviour to organisational effectiveness, it is important for organisations to be aware of the negative aspects of OCB and the detrimental impact that these behaviours can have on organisational functioning. Considering that the use of organisational surveys measuring discretionary employee behaviours is extensive, it is important that these behaviours are not simply considered as opposite poles of the same continuum, namely role performance in the organisation (Giacalone & Greenberg 1997). Through incorporating the dimension of CWB into the OCB scale, behaviour that goes against the system, violates organisational norms, and reflects sub-role performance can be measured. Future research is recommended to investigate the differences in antecedents and consequences of both constructs in order to increase the awareness and understanding of the full spectrum of positive and negative work performance.
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