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The purpose of the current study was to meta-analytically examine the relationships of organizational justice and organizational constraints with three performance criteria: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). A meta-analysis of 106 studies (n = 35699) revealed that task performance and OCB were positively related to all forms of organizational justice, but only task performance was negatively related to organizational constraints. On the other hand, CWB was negatively related to all forms of organizational justice and positively related to organizational constraints. Furthermore, different dimensions of organizational justice had differential relationships with performance criteria. Procedural and interactional justice had a weaker positive association with task performance compared to OCB. Procedural justice had a stronger positive relationship with OCB-O than OCB-I. With regard to the differential relationship between organizational constraints and performance, organizational constraints had a stronger negative relationship with task performance than OCB. Another significant finding was that negative emotions fully mediated the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB. The relationship between organizational justice with self-rated versus other-rated OCB was not significantly stronger for self-rated versus other rated OCB. Lastly, an unexpected finding was that organizational constraints had a stronger relationship with self-rated CWB than other-rated CWB. The study’s implications for research and practice are discussed, and directions for future research are provided.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

A prime concern for organizations is the understanding of variables that can affect job performance. One area of research has focused on examining the relationship between individual differences and performance. Barrick and Mount (1991) conducted a meta-analysis that examined the relationship between the five factor model of personality and job performance. They found that personality differentially predicted performance for different jobs. More specifically, they found that extraversion predicted performance for occupations involving social interaction (i.e., managers and sales). In addition, their study revealed that conscientiousness consistently predicted job performance criteria across different occupations. Results from a meta-analysis conducted by Judge and Bono (2001) show that core self-evaluation traits (self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability) were strong predictors of job performance. Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) is another criterion of performance that has been examined in relation to individual differences. Results from meta-analyses reveal that trait anger, negative affectivity, and sex are significant predictors of CWB (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hershcovis et al., 2007). Organization citizenship behavior (OCB) is a third criterion of performance that has been examined in relation to individual differences. Studies have found that conscientiousness is a stronger predictor of OCB than task performance (Borman et al., 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Another area of research has investigated the impact of workplace stressors on performance. With regards to the relationship between occupational stressors and performance, past meta-analytic research has primarily focused on examining the negative relationship between role stressors and in-role performance (e.g., Gilboa et al., 2008). Recently, research has begun to investigate the effects of role stressors on extra role behaviors such as OCB (Eatough et
al., 2011). Although previous meta-analytic research has made important contributions to understanding the relationship between role stressors and in-role and extra role performance, the impact of other stressors such as organizational constraints and organizational injustice on performance are less well understood. In order to convince organizations to take measures to reduce organizational constraints and organizational injustice, there must be clear evidence that these stressors not only hinder in-role and extra-role performance, but also increase the frequency of CWB. Therefore, it is important to gather meta-analytic evidence to verify the nomological network of occupational stress so that researchers can develop interventions to reduce stressors which in turn will improve organizational effectiveness.

The purpose of this research is four-fold: (1) to extend previous research by meta-analytically examining the relationship of organizational constraints with task performance, OCB, and CWB, (2) to investigate the relationship of organizational justice with task performance, OCB, and CWBs, (3) to examine negative emotions as a mediator the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB, (4) and to examine source of OCB/CWB data as a methodological moderator. This meta-analysis does include dispositional antecedents of performance because many meta-analyses have already examined relations between individual differences and performance (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Judge & Bono, 2001). Below, I provide an overview of organizational constraints and organizational justice and their relationships with task performance, counterproductive work behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Task Performance, OCBs, and CWBs**

Job performance is one of the most studied work-related criteria among researchers and practitioners. Traditionally, the construct of job performance captured task related behaviors.
Task performance refers to behaviors that benefit an organization’s technical core and are part of an employee’s job duties (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). For instance, task performance dimensions for a firefighter position may include rescue operations, salvage operations, and applying ventilation procedures. More recently, there have been efforts to catalog the performance criterion beyond task performance to include OCB and CWB.

The construct of organizational citizenship behavior was developed by Organ and colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983). One of the primary distinctions between task performance and OCB is that task performance is considered more a function of cognitive ability and prior experience while OCB is more of a function of motivation than ability (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Organ (1988) originally conceptualized OCB as individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person’s employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable (p. 4).

According to the definition given above, there are certain criteria that must be met in order for behaviors to be considered as OCBs. In addition to being discretionary (i.e., not formally recognized as part of an individual’s job responsibilities), the behaviors must also not be directly or formally rewarded or recognized by the organization (Organ, 1988). Lastly, these behaviors must contribute to the effective functioning of the organization. Furthermore, OCB consists of five dimensions: altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship (Organ, 1988). Altruism refers to voluntary behaviors that are intentionally
directed at helping a coworker (e.g., assisting a coworker with a heavy workload, teaching a coworker how to use equipment). Civic virtue involves taking part in the political process of the organization by attending meetings, expressing one’s opinions, and keeping up to date on organizational issues. Conscientiousness refers to behavior that goes above and beyond what is expected in terms of punctuality, attendance, conserving resources, and housekeeping. Courtesy involves taking the initiative to prevent the creation of problems for others and engaging in discussion with employees before committing to actions that will impact them. Lastly, sportsmanship refers to tolerating the unavoidable inconveniences of work without complaining. However, the appropriateness of Organ’s five dimension conceptualization of OCB has been under contention. For instance, Williams and Anderson (1991) developed a two-dimensional conceptualization of OCB, in which OCB is viewed as actions directed toward individuals (OCB-I) or directed toward the organization (OCB-O). Williams and Anderson (1991) based their two-dimension conceptualization of OCB on Organ’s five dimension taxonomy. OCB-I is comprised of courtesy and altruism whereas OCB-O is comprised of civic virtue, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship. The conceptual distinction between OCB-I and OCB-O is relevant to the current study because occupational stressors such as organizational justice may be differentially related to the two dimensions of OCB.

Viewed through the lens of social exchange theory, OCBs are beneficial acts that employees perform for their organization in exchange for benefits (Korsgaard et al., 2010). The norm of reciprocity underlies these social exchanges. Although these behaviors are discretionary, Podsakoff et al. (2009) found that managers placed equal weight on task performance and OCBs when conducting an overall performance assessment of employees. There are several reasons why managers incorporate OCBs in their performance evaluations of employees and reward
distribution decisions (Allen & Rush, 1998; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Hui, 1993). For instance, managers may realize that certain OCBs (e.g., civic virtue and sportsmanship) facilitate their own jobs. In response, managers are likely to reciprocate (Blau, 1964) by giving higher performance evaluations and rewards to employees who engage in OCBs. In light of the fact that OCB is associated with managerial performance ratings and decisions concerning the allocation of rewards, Organ modified his definition of OCB: “performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place” (Organ, 1997, p. 95). The main advantage of this revised definition of OCB is that it acknowledges the distinction between OCB and task performance while avoiding the pitfalls of conceptualizing OCB as discretionary behavior that isn’t formally recognized or rewarded by organizations.

One of the key assumptions of Organ’s (1988) original definition of OCB is that these behaviors improve organizational effectiveness. However, this assumption was untested for many years. Karambayya (1990) was the first to examine the relationship between OCB and group or organizational effectiveness. She discovered a correlation between OCB and high-performing work units. Unfortunately, these results are inconclusive because she measured unit performance subjectively. Studies later on addressed the limitations of Karambayya’ (1990) research by objectively assessing unit performance (e.g., Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1997; Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Ahearne, 1996). Overall, these studies found evidence that OCB is positively related to organizational success. Podsakoff et al. (2000) explains that OCBs can contribute to organizational effectiveness by:

(a) enhancing coworker and managerial productivity; (b) freeing up resources so they can be used for more productive purposes; (c) reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions; (d) helping to coordinate activities both within and across
work groups; (e) strengthening the organization’s ability to attract and retain the best employees; (f) increasing the stability of the organization’s performance; and (g) enabling the organization to adapt more effectively to environmental changes (p. 31, 34).

Although research shows that OCB leads to group and organizational effectiveness, the direction of causality is unclear. Without longitudinal or experimental research, it is impossible to determine whether OCB leads to organizational effectiveness or organizational effectiveness leads to greater perceptions of OCB. Nevertheless, OCBs should be a prime concern to organizations because these behaviors have been shown to contribute to organizational success. In order to foster OCB, we must first understand the antecedents of OCB.

Previous meta-analytic research has explored the antecedents and consequences of OCB. For instance, Organ and Ryan’s (1995) meta-analytic results reveal that job attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, perceived fairness, organizational commitment, leader supportiveness) are fairly strong predictors of OCB. In addition, job satisfaction was differentially related to OCB and task performance such that the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB was stronger than the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Hoffman et al.’s (2007) meta-analytic results also support the conclusion that OCB is more strongly associated with job attitudes than task performance. Through confirmatory factor analysis, they found support for a single factor model of OCB that is distinct from in-role performance. In terms of OCB related outcomes, Podsakoff et al. (2009) discovered that OCBs were positively associated with individual level outcomes such as managerial evaluations of employee performance and reward allocation decisions. Moreover, they found that OCBs were negatively related to withdrawal behaviors (e.g., turnover intentions, actual turnover, and absenteeism). At the unit level, they found that OCBs were positively associated with organizational effectiveness and customer satisfaction.
This paper extends the literature on OCB by meta-analytically investigating constraints and organizational justice as antecedents of OCB. In addition, this paper is a significant contribution to the literature because it examines the differential relationship of organizational constraints and organizational justice with OCB and task performance. Lastly, this paper explores the differential relationship of justice with OCB-I and OCB-O.

In contrast to OCB, CWB are behaviors that intentionally harm an organization or its employees (e.g., sabotage, theft, violence, interpersonal conflict), or run counter to organizational goals (e.g., withholding effort, wasting time/materials, daydreaming). These behaviors have been also referred to as deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), aggression (Douglas & Martinko, 2001), revenge (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997), and retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Because CWB is volitional and is characterized by harmful intentions, accidents and non-volitional behavior are not considered CWB. For instance, an employee absence attributed to illness would not be considered as CWB, whereas in employee absence due to a desire to spite one’s supervisor would be classified as CWB. Moreover, an employee’s poor performance would only be considered as CWB if the employee purposefully performs poorly to harm the organization.

Hollinger and Clark (1983) were the first to present a typology of CWB. Their typology consisted of two behavioral dimensions: production deviance and property deviance. Production deviance is defined as actions that violate standards for the minimal quality and quantity of work to be finished. Examples include surfing the Internet during work hours and taking unnecessary breaks. Property deviance refers to organizationally harmful acts such as theft and sabotaging equipment. The main drawback of their CWB taxonomy was that it was not comprehensive
enough to capture all deviant behaviors into the two dimensions. For example, their
categorization did not include deviant behaviors directed toward individuals.

Robinson and Bennett (1995) expanded Hollinger and Clark’s (1983) typology by
proposing four quadrants of counterproductive/deviant behavior: property deviance, production
deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression. Political deviance refers to participating in
social interactions that put other employees at a political disadvantage. Examples include being
rude to coworkers and showing favoritism. Personal aggression is serious and interpersonally
harmful behavior in which an individual exhibits aggression or hostility towards others.
Examples include engaging in verbal abuse. Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) categorization was a
significant advancement in the field because their taxonomy made a distinction between
behaviors directed toward other people (CWB-I) and behaviors directed toward the organization
(CWB-O). Based on their typology, CWB-I is composed of political deviance and personal
aggression, whereas CWB-O consists of property and production deviance. Bennett and
Robinson (2000) found empirical support for their model, demonstrating through factor analysis
that there were two separate scales within the construct of CWB.

The most recent typology of CWB was proposed by Spector et al. (2006). Spector et al.
argued that the CWB items were differentially related to different antecedents. Therefore, the
behaviors comprising CWB are too diverse to fall under a single construct. Thus, Spector et al.
constructed a scale that also distinguished between two dimensions of CWB: CWB-O and CWB-
I. Furthermore, the researchers divided CWB into five sub-dimensions: sabotage (destruction or
vandalism of company property), abuse (malicious verbal or nonverbal behaviors directed at
others), theft (stealing company or personal property), withdrawal (working fewer hours and
required), and production deviance (intentionally performing poorly or slowly). CWB-I mostly
consists of items related to the abuse subscale, whereas CWB-O consists of items from the other four subscales. The conceptual distinction between CWB-I and CWB-O is relevant to the current study because occupational stressors such as organizational justice may be differentially related to the two dimensions of CWB. This paper will investigate the relationship between workplace stressors and the two dimensions of CWB (CWB-I and CWB-O) instead of examining the relationship between stressors and the five sub-dimensions of CWB because factor analysis of the five sub-dimensions of CWB support a two factor model of CWB (Spector et al., 2006).

CWB is widespread and can incur significant costs to organizations. One study found that 75% of employees have stolen company property at least once (McGurn, 1988). Other research has found that 68% of managers experienced verbal aggression from their subordinates who received negative performance evaluations (Neuman & Baron, 1998). Furthermore, it has been estimated that CWB can cost American businesses as much as $200 billion annually (Penney & Spector, 2002). In addition, CWB have been projected to cost businesses between 1% and 2% of annual sales, and may be responsible for the demise of 20% of failed businesses (Coffin, 2003). As shown by these statistics, CWB is widespread and can have detrimental effects on organizations. In order to counteract CWB, we must first understand the antecedents of CWB.

Previous meta-analytic research has explored the antecedents and consequences of CWB. For example, Hershcovis et al. (2007) meta-analytically investigated individual and situational predictors of aggression. They found that the strongest predictors of interpersonal aggression were trait anger and interpersonal conflict. On the other hand, interpersonal conflict, organizational constraints, and job dissatisfaction were strongest predictors of organizational aggression. Furthermore, the results showed that poor leadership and interpersonal injustice were stronger predictors of supervisor-targeted aggression than coworker-targeted aggression. In
another meta-analytic study, Bowling and Beehr (2006) explored the antecedents and consequences of workplace harassment. They found that role conflict, role ambiguity, work constraints, and role overload are positively related to workplace harassment. In terms of consequences, workplace harassment was positively related to strain, anxiety, frustration, negative emotions, physical symptoms, and depression. Berry, Carpenter, and Barratt’s (2012) meta-analysis investigated the issue of whether other-reports of CWB provide an incremental contribution over self-reports. They found that other-report of CWB provided little incremental variance beyond self-report CWB. In addition, self-report and other report of CWB were robustly correlated with each other and correlated with other variables in a similar pattern and magnitude. Lastly, Dalal’s (2005) meta-analysis showed that the negative relationship between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior was due to a methodological artifact. More specifically, his meta-analysis revealed that stronger negative correlations between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior were found for supervisor ratings than for self-ratings. Dalal (2005) argued that supervisor ratings may have resulted in inflated correlations because of halo effect and other biases. This paper extends the literature on CWB by meta-analytically examining constraints and organizational justice as predictors of CWB. Furthermore, this paper advances the literature by exploring the differential relationship of justice with CWB-I and CWB-O. Lastly, this paper examines the mediating effects of negative emotions on the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB.

**Organizational Justice**

The concept of organizational justice was developed by French (1964) to describe employees’ perceptions of fairness in organizations. The literature on justice has identified three
different forms of organizational justice. Adams (1965) coined the term distributive justice which refers to the perceived fairness in the allocation of outcomes. Distributive justice includes perceptions of fairness with regard to compensation, pay, promotions, job titles, and office assignments (Karriker & Williams, 2009). According to Adams (1965), individuals determine fairness by comparing their input to outcome ratio to the ratio of a referent other. Individuals who perceive themselves as under-rewarded or over-rewarded will be motivated to restore equity. The second form of justice is procedural justice which refers to the perceived fairness of the procedures used to determine the allocation of outcomes (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The concept of procedural justice emerged out of past research on dispute resolution procedures which demonstrated that disputants were reactive to the procedures by which outcomes were determined (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The third form is interactional justice. Bies and Moag (1986) originally conceived of interactional justice as regarding “concerns about the fairness of interpersonal communication”. From its inception, interactional justice has been plagued with a lack of construct clarity. Although some researchers consider interactional justice as a unidimensional construct, others view it as having two separate dimensions: interpersonal justice and informational justice (Bies, 1986; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Interpersonal justice is the extent to which employees are treated with sensitivity, dignity, and respect by their supervisors and colleagues. Informational justice refers to the extent to which organizational authorities provide adequate explanations about procedures and outcomes that affect employees.

In response to the construct clarity issue of interactional justice, Karriker and Williams (2003) used confirmatory factor analysis and found support for three justice dimensions: interpersonal, distributive, and a combined procedural/informational dimension. Moreover,
Karriker (2006) reported that the correlation between informational and procedural justice was close to one, suggesting that procedural informational justice represented a unitary construct. In another study, Roch and Shanock (2006) created a new interactional justice measure that was indistinguishable from interpersonal justice but was different from informational justice. Their results revealed that interactional justice and interpersonal justice are essentially the same construct while informational justice is different from interpersonal and interactional justice.

Organizational justice merits research and organizational attention because of its impact on organizational outcomes. For example, research shows that perceptions of procedural and distributive justice can lead to higher OCB, commitment, job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and task performance among organizational members (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Other organizational benefits include lower counterproductive work behaviors and turnover (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). On the other hand, perceptions of organizational injustice can lead to undesirable outcomes. From an occupational stress perspective, injustice should be a prime concern to organizations and its members because injustice can lead to psychological, physical, and behavioral strain. For example, research has shown that organizational injustice is related to increased withdrawal behavior, counterproductive work behavior, stress, physical symptoms, and decreased work performance and OCB (Greenberg, 2006; Hulin, 1991; Pfeffer & Langton, 1993). With regard to the relationship between injustice and CWB, Greenberg (1990) found that employee theft rates in manufacturing plants increased significantly when came was pay was temporarily reduced without an adequate explanation for the pay reduction (i.e., procedural injustice). However, when the reason for the pay cuts was explained to employees in an honest and thorough manner, theft rate was reduced. These findings are in line with the literature on justice, revealing that adequate
explanations for a pay cut reduces feelings of procedural injustice. Thus, theft served as a means for employees to get even with the organization and to restore justice. The main takeaway from Greenberg’s (1990) study is that employees who perceive that they are treated unfairly by the organization may engage in CWB directed toward their organization.

Given the detrimental outcomes associated with injustice, researchers need to gain an improved understanding of this phenomenon in order to combat it. The next step in furthering our understanding justice-performance relationship is by using the theoretical framework of the agent system model justice (Bies & Moag, 1986) to meta-analytically to examine the differential relationships of Organizational Justice with Task Performance, OCB, and CWB.

*Relationship of Organizational Justice with Task Performance, OCB, and CWB*

On the basis of social exchange principles (Blau, 1964), the agent system model of justice proposes that people tend to respond toward the perceived source of just or unjust treatment (Bies & Moag, 1986; Jones, 2009). According to this model, individuals tend to retaliate against the perceived source of injustice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Jones, 2009). In light of the fact that employees develop social exchange relationships with both their supervisors and their organizations, employees may respond to perceived injustice by engaging in counterproductive work behavior directed at their supervisor (CWB-I) or counterproductive work behavior directed at their organization (CWB-O), depending upon whether their supervisor or their organization is perceived as the source of unfairness. The agent–system model assumes that the supervisor (agent) is the most likely perpetrator of interactional injustice and the organization (system) is the most likely source of procedural injustice (Bies & Moag, 1986). Consequently, employees will tend to engage in CWB-I in response to interactional injustice and to engage in CWB-O in response to procedural injustice. There is empirical support for this assertion. Jones (2009) found
that interactional justice explained the most unique variance in CWB-I, and procedural justice explained the most unique variance in CWB-O. In addition, other research shows that employees who experienced interactional injustice from their supervisors engaged in supervisor directed deviance (Dupre et al., 2006).

The agent system model provides a theoretical basis for examining how organizational justice can foster OCBs. According to the model, individuals feel obliged to reciprocate the source of fair treatment (Bies & Moag, 1986; Masterson et al., 2000). For instance, employees who perceive that they are treated fairly by their supervisors may reciprocate by engaging in OCBs that benefit their supervisor (OCB-I) (Jones, 2009). Likewise, employees who perceive that they are treated fairly by the organization may reciprocate by engaging in OCBs that benefit the organization (OCB-O). Based on the agent system model justice, employees will tend to engage in OCB-I in response to interactional justice and to engage in OCB-O in response to procedural justice. In addition, individuals may respond to all forms of organizational injustice by withdrawing OCBs. However, organizational injustice should only be weakly to moderately relate to an employee’s task performance because of the mandatory nature of task performance (Jex et al., 2006). Thus, the positive relationship between all forms of organizational justice and task performance should be weaker than the negative relationship between organizational justice and OCB. On the basis of this discussion, I propose the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1a*: There will be a positive relationship between all forms of organizational justice with task performance and OCB.

*Hypothesis 1b*: The positive relationship between all forms of organizational justice and task performance will be weaker than the positive relationship between organizational justice and OCB.
Hypothesis 2a: The positive relationship between procedural justice and OCB-O will be stronger than the positive relationship between procedural justice and OCB-I.

Hypothesis 2b: The positive relationship between interactional justice and OCB-I will be stronger than the positive relationship between interactional justice and OCB-O.

Hypothesis 3a: There will be a negative relationship between all forms of organizational justice and CWB.

Hypothesis 3b: The negative relationship between procedural justice and CWB-O will be stronger than the negative relationship between procedural justice and CWB-I.

Hypothesis 3c: The negative relationship between interactional justice and CWB-I will be stronger than the negative relationship between interactional justice and CWB-O.

Organizational Constraints

Another occupational stressor that can affect task performance, OCB, and CWB is organizational constraints. Organizational constraints are frustrating work conditions beyond the control of employees that prevent them from completing their work related tasks. Peters and O’Connor (1988) identified eleven sources of organizational constraints: budgetary support, materials and supplies, job related information, required services and help from others, task preparation, required support, time availability, scheduling of activities, job-relevant authority, work environment, and transportation. Performance may be hindered as a result of the inadequacy, unavailability, or poor quality of a source of constraint (Jex, 2002).

Organizational constraints can be further categorized into two forms: job context and interpersonal (Liu, 2003). Job context constraints include the following: inadequate training, conflicting job demands, insufficient equipment or supplies, organizational rules and procedures, and lack of information regarding how to complete tasks. On the other hand, interpersonal
constraints consist of interpersonal issues with one’s supervisor and coworkers. Moreover, interpersonal constraints include receiving inadequate help from coworkers and being interrupted by others in the workplace.

From an occupational stress perspective, organizations should be concerned about organizational constraints because constraints can result in psychological, physical, and behavioral strain. For example, studies have found that organizational constraints can lead to psychological strains such as negative emotions, stress, job dissatisfaction, anxiety, depression, frustration, and intentions to quit (Chen & Spector, 1991; Fox et al., 2001; Penney and Spector, 2005; Spector et al., 1988; Spector et al., 2006). In addition, research has shown that constraints can result in physical strains such as physical symptoms and increased doctor visits (Spector et al., 1988). Behavioral strains include turnover, absenteeism, CWB, and reductions in OCB and task performance (Spector et al., 1988). The current study attempts to advance research in this domain by meta-analytically investigating the differential relationship of organizational constraints with task performance and OCB.

Relationship of Organizational Constraints with Task Performance, OCBs, and CWBs

Both empirical and meta-analytic research has consistently shown a weak to moderate, negative association between organizational constraints and task performance (Klein & Kim, 1998; Gibloa et al., 2008). According to Peters and O’Connor (1988), the weak association between constraints and performance are due to the work setting contexts. Kane (1997) identified four potential causes in the work environment that may account for the weak relationship between constraints and performance: (1) work standards were too lenient for constraints to occur; (2) poor performance was tolerated despite having high formal standards; (3) the organization’s culture influenced raters to informally adjust for organizational constraints when
evaluating performance; and (4) organizational resources were abundant and/or there was a low magnitude of constraints. A final explanation for why prior studies found a weak relationship between constraints and performance is that a majority of research used a relatively narrow definition of organizational constraints. Most prior research only focused on time, information, and resource constraints (Kane, 1997; Peters, O'Connor, & Eulberg, 1985).

The voluntary nature of OCBs increases the likelihood that they will be more strongly affected by employees’ attitudes and motivation than by employees’ ability (Jex, Cunningham, De La Rosa, & Broadfoot, 2006). As a result, an employee may be less likely to engage in voluntary altruistic behaviors when confronted with stress. This assertion is in line with the conservation of resources model (Hobfoll, 1989). According to the model, individuals desire to acquire and protect their resources. Stress threatens an individual's resources. Therefore, individuals may respond to stressors such as organizational constraints by withdrawing voluntary behaviors (i.e., OCBs) in order to conserve resources to devote to core job tasks. An employee’s increased allocation of resources to core job performance may reduce the amount of resources available for engaging in discretionary behaviors such as OCB. There is empirical support for this assertion. For example, Jex et al. (2003) found that organizational constraints were negatively related with altruism, a dimension of OCB. In contrast, stressors should not have a substantial effect on an employee’s task performance because task performance is mandatory (Jex et al., 2006).

Research in personality and individual differences further support the notion that organizational factors (i.e., constraints) can reduce the likelihood that an individual will perform discretionary behavior (i.e., OCBs). The first line of research shows that organizational strength affects the relationship between personality and behavior (Adler, 1996). In strong situations,
individuals have limited discretion over job-related tasks. Organizational constraints can be considered as a strong situation because they hinder employees from completing their work-related tasks, forcing employees to use more energy towards completing their core job tasks. Moreover, there is very little opportunity for individual differences in a person’s personality or motivation to guide his or her behavior in these situations. Thus, an individual’s motivation or personality traits such as extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness are inaccurate predictors of performance in strong situations. When confronted with organizational constraints, employees must devote a great deal of energy to task performance, leaving little energy left to engage in discretionary behaviors such as OCB. For example, if an employee is faced with a last-minute deadline (i.e., time constraint), he will likely devote most of his time and effort to completing the task at hand instead of helping a coworker solve a problem. On the other hand, in weak situations, individuals have more discretion over work-related task, and the relationship between personality and performance is stronger than in strong situations (Barrick & Mount, 1993; Weiss & Adler, 1984).

With regard to the relation between constraints and CWB, affective events theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) provides a theoretical explanation for how organizational constraints can lead to CWB through the experience of emotions. According to AET, affective workplace experiences can impact an employee’s affective reactions. Studies have shown that negative affective events at work may lead to negative emotional reactions such as anger or frustration. An employee’s emotional reaction to a negative affective event, in turn, may lead to the employee engaging in CWB. The employee may resort to CWB as a method of releasing his/her repressed negative emotions as a result of an organizational stressor such as organizational constraints. This also suggests that negative emotions may mediate the
relationship between organizational constraints and CWB. Thus, AET provides a theoretical framework for explicating the relationship between constraints and CWB, showing that CWB is partially attributed to an employee’s emotional reaction to organizational constraints.

Another stream of research by Fox and Spector (1999) reveals that aggression is a byproduct of frustration in the work environment. Frustration occurs when an individual’s goal is blocked. Frustration results in negative affective responses such as anger and fear, which in turn can lead to counterproductive workplace behaviors. In other words, their model proposes that affective reactions mediate the relationship between frustration in the work environment (i.e., organizational constraints) and CWB. Fox and Spector (1999) found empirical support for their model, showing that the relationship between organizational constraints and counterproductive work behavior was mediated by affective reactions to frustration. More recently, Fox and Spector (2005) expanded their model of work frustration aggression to include other counterproductive behaviors. Their model is known as the stressor emotion theory of counterproductive work behaviors. According to this model, any type of workplace stressor can lead to a negative appraisal of a situation. Negative appraisals, in turn, can result in the generation of negative emotions which lead to CWB. Empirical studies have found support for this model and reveal a positive association between organizational constraints and counterproductive work behavior (e.g., Penney & Spector, 2002; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Penney & Spector, 2005). Based on AET and Fox and Spector’s stressor emotion theory of counterproductive work behaviors, one may expect negative emotions to mediate the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB. Thus, I propose the following hypotheses:

_Hypothesis 4a:_ There will be a negative relationship between organizational constraints with task performance and OCB.
Hypothesis 4b: The negative relationship between organizational constraints and task performance will be weaker than the negative relationship between organizational constraints and OCB.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a positive relationship between organizational constraints and CWB.

Hypothesis 6: Negative emotions will partially mediate the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB.

On a related note, negative emotions may also mediate the relationship between organizational constraints and withholding of OCBs. In line with COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), negative emotions are an unpleasant state that drains individuals of their resources and may compel individuals to withdraw from discretionary activities such as OCBs in order to conserve resources. Thus, one may expect organizational constraints to lead to the experience of negative emotions which in turn, will result in the withholding of OCBs. However, due to an insufficient number of studies examining the relationship between negative emotions and OCBs, this mediation hypothesis cannot be tested.

Differential Relationship of Type of Constraint on Performance

Employees may respond differently to resource constraints versus interpersonal constraints. For instance, if a coworker fails to complete his work-related task for a team project, the rest of the team members would have to engage in OCB by helping their coworker complete the task. On the other hand, resource constraints may force individuals to devote their limited resources toward core job tasks, resulting in a reduction of resources available for OCB. Thus, individuals facing resource constraint may be less likely to engage in OCBs. This assertion is in line with Hobfoll’s COR theory (1989). On the other hand, resource and social constraints should
not have a differential relationship with task performance because there is no empirical or theoretical support for either type of constraint to have a stronger relationship with task performance than with the other type of constraint. In addition, there is no empirical or theoretical reason to expect a differential association between type of constraint and CWB.

Hypothesis 7: The negative relationship between resource constraints and OCB will be stronger than the negative relationship between social constraints and OCB.

Methodological Moderator of Occupational Stressors-OCB/CWB Relationships

A potential methodological moderator of the relationship between organizational constraints/organizational justice and OCB/CWB is the source of OCB/CWB data. Spector (2006) argues that it is difficult to accurately assess internal psychological states such as attitudes, intentions, or perceptions of environments with other methods than self-report. Thus, self-report methodology may be appropriate for assessing organizational constraints and justice because constraints and justice are an employee’s idiosyncratic perceptions of the work environment. However, self-report methodology is particularly vulnerable to common method bias because people’s judgments are often contaminated with response biases. For instance, people may respond in a socially desirable way. Social desirability refers to the fact that people may respond in a way that makes them appear desirable (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). People may respond to questions regarding CWB and OCB in a socially desirable way by underreporting the amount of CWB they engage in and over reporting the amount of OCB they engage in. As shown by this example, social desirability is problematic because it not only has the potential to distort the mean levels of responses, but also may inflate/deflate the relationship between two or more variables. In fact, studies have found large differences between self and observer ratings of OCB (Allen, Barnard, Rush, & Russell. 2000). In addition, when the
predictor and criterion are collected through the same source, common method variance may inflate or deflate the observed relationship between the variables (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, stronger relationships may be observed when OCB is collected through self-reports. In contrast, weaker relationships may be observed when CWB is collected through self-reports. The following hypotheses are essentially a replication of Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt’s (2012) meta-analysis which examined the incremental contribution of other-reports of CWB over self-reports.

_Hypothesis 8a:_ The relationships of organizational constraints and organizational justice with OCB will be stronger for self-rated versus other-rated OCB.

_Hypothesis 8b:_ The relationships of organizational constraints and organizational justice with CWB will be weaker for self-rated versus other-rated CWB.
CHAPTER II. METHOD

Literature Search

The literature search was conducted in the following steps. First, I performed an electronic search of PsychInfo, Proquest, and Google Scholar using the following pairs of keywords (combined stressor variable with performance variable in my search): organizational constraints (situational constraints), organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, fairness), OCB (organizational citizenship behavior, contextual behavior, extra role behavior, altruism, civic virtue, compliance, conscientiousness, courtesy, helping, individual initiative, individual support, interpersonal facilitation, loyalty, organizational support, sportsmanship), CWB (counterproductive work behavior, deviance, aggression, revenge, retaliation), and task performance. To address my mediation hypothesis, I performed an electronic search using the keywords organizational constraints (organizational constraints), negative emotions, and CWB (counterproductive work behavior, deviance, aggression, revenge, retaliation). Theses, dissertations, and conference presentations were also included in my literature search. Second, I compared my reference lists with the reference list of existing reviews of organizational constraints, organizational justice, OCB, CWB, and task performance.

Inclusion and Coding

Empirical studies had to meet the following criteria in order to be included in my meta-analysis. First, only empirical studies that examined relationships between organizational constraints and at least one performance criteria (e.g., task performance, CWB, or OCB) were included. In addition, only empirical studies that investigated relationships between organizational justice and at least one performance criteria (e.g., task performance, CWB, or
OCB) were included. Second, I collected correlation coefficients as effect sizes. With regard to studies that reported correlations between organizational constraints and multiple dimensions of OCB (OCB-I and OCB-O) or CWB (CWB-I and CWB-O), I took the average of the effect sizes in order to avoid inflation of the sample size (Cheung & Chan, 2008). Studies that did not report correlations among variables of interest were excluded. Furthermore, studies that did not provide sample size were excluded. Mean substitution of reliability coefficients were used in cases where studies did not report reliability coefficients for variables of interest.

Empirical studies with constructs similar to OCB (e.g., contextual performance) had to meet the following inclusion criteria. In line with Fassina, Jones, and Uggerslev’s (2008) procedure, constructs similar to OCB were only included if three quarters or more of the sample items of the construct overlapped with one or more of Organ’s (1998) factors of OCB. With regard to studies that only include Organ’s (1998) factors of OCB, I considered altruism and courtesy as pertaining to OCB-I (Williams and Anderson, 1991). Consistent with previous research, I considered civic virtue, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship as pertaining to OCB-O (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

Moreover, empirical studies with constructs similar to CWB (e.g., retaliation) had to meet the following inclusion criteria. Constructs similar to CWB were only included if three quarters or more of the sample items of the construct overlap with one or more of Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) four quadrants of CWB or with Spector et al.’s (2006) five sub-dimensions of CWB. Lastly, I coded the studies for rating source of OCB and CWB. A total of 106 studies fit the criteria for inclusion in this meta-analysis.
Meta-Analytic Procedure

I followed the procedures outlined by Hunter and Schmidt (2004) to conduct my meta-analysis. Hunter and Schmidt’s random effects model assumes that the underlying parameter has a distribution such that if one collects infinite samples for each study, the studies would generate different estimates. One of the main advantages of using this approach is its ability to correct for sources of error (i.e., sampling error and reliability). First, I computed a sample weighted mean correlation ($r$) for each specified relationship. I corrected for unreliability in both the predictor and criterion by following Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) procedures in creating artifact distributions. Next, I computed the percentage of variance accounted for by the sampling error to show the sampling error associated with sample sizes (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). The 95% confidence and credibility intervals were also calculated using Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) method. I used Lee and Preacher’s (2013) software to assess the differential relationships of target predictors (e.g., organizational constraints) and outcome (e.g., task performance versus OCB). Lastly, to determine whether negative emotions mediated the relationship between organizational constraints and OCB, I built a meta-analytic correlation matrix composed of all the corrected correlation coefficients between negative emotions, organizational constraints, and OCB. I performed path analyses on this correlation matrix to assess the fit of the proposed mediation model.
CHAPTER III. RESULTS

Summary of Studies

Appendix A provides an overall summary of the studies included in this meta-analysis that examined the relationship between organizational justice and task performance. 47.37% \((k = 9)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 42.10% \((k = 8)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the private sector. 10.53% \((k = 2)\) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. With regards to the measures used in these studies, a diverse set of measures were used to assess justice perceptions and task performance. The most frequently used justice measure was Niehoff & Moorman’s (1993) scale \((k = 5)\). The most frequently used task performance measure was William and Anderson’s (1991) scale \((k = 6)\). On average, 55.4% of participants were female and 44.6% were male. 89.5% \((k = 17)\) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate (coefficient alpha) for procedural justice was 0.86. The mean reliability estimate for distributive justice was 0.92. The mean reliability estimate for interactional justice was 0.91. The mean reliability estimate for task performance was 0.87. Five studies did not report the reliability estimate for task performance. All studies reported reliability estimates for organizational justice variables.

Appendix B presents an overall summary of the studies that explored the relationship between organizational justice and OCB. 41.02% \((k = 16)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 46.15% \((k = 18)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the private sector. 17.94% \((k = 7)\) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. A variety of scales were used to measure justice perceptions and OCB. The most frequently used justice scale was Moorman’s (1991) scale \((k = 14)\). The most frequently used OCB scale was William and Anderson’s (1991) scale \((k = 7)\). On average, 50.3% of participants
were female and 49.7% were male. 70.73% of studies were published \((k = 29)\). The mean reliability estimate for procedural justice was 0.88. The mean reliability estimate for distributive justice was 0.90. The mean reliability estimate for interactional justice was 0.92. The mean reliability estimate for OCB was 0.83. One study did not report the reliability estimate for procedural justice. One study did not report the reliability estimate for distributive justice. All studies reported reliability estimates for interactional justice. One study did not report the reliability estimate for OCB.

Appendix C displays an overall summary of the studies that investigated the relationship between organizational justice and CWB. 32.14% \((k = 9)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 35.71% \((k = 10)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the private sector. 32.14% \((k = 9)\) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. A diverse set of measures were used to assess justice perceptions and task performance. The most frequently used justice measure was Moorman’s (1991) scale \((k = 13)\). The most frequently used CWB measure was Bennett and Robinson’s (2000) scale \((k = 8)\). On average, 57.4% of participants were female and 43.6% were male. 67.9% \((k = 19)\) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate for procedural justice was 0.90. The mean reliability estimate for distributive justice was 0.90. The mean reliability estimate for interactional justice was 0.91. The mean reliability estimate for CWB was 0.87. All studies reported reliability estimates for organizational justice variables. Two studies did not report the reliability estimate for CWB.

Appendix D presents an overall summary of the studies that examined the relationship between organizational constraints and task performance. 64.7% \((k = 11)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 35.29% \((k = 6)\) of the studies only recruited
participants from the private sector. 0% ($k = 0$) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. A variety of scales were used to measure organizational constraints and task performance. The most frequently used organizational constraints scale was Spector and Jex’s (1998) scale ($k = 2$). The most frequently used task performance scale was William and Anderson’s (1991) scale ($k = 2$). On average, 53.6% of participants were female and 46.4% were male. 76.5% ($k = 13$) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate for organizational constraints was 0.81. The mean reliability estimate for task performance was 0.83. Three studies did not report reliability estimates for organizational constraints. Six studies did not report the reliability estimate for task performance.

Appendix E displays an overall summary of the studies that explored the relationship between organizational constraints and OCB. 40% ($k = 4$) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 30% ($k = 3$) of the studies only recruited participants from the private sector. 30% ($k = 3$) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. Various measures were used to assess organizational constraints and task performance. The most frequently used organizational constraints measure was Spector and Jex’s (1998) scale ($k = 7$). The most frequently used OCB measure was Williams and Anderson’s (1991) scale ($k = 4$). On average, 52.9% of participants were female and 47.1% were male. 40% ($k = 4$) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate for organizational constraints was 0.87. The mean reliability estimate for task performance was 0.85. All studies reported reliability estimates for organizational constraints. One study did not report the reliability estimate for OCB.

Appendix F provides an overall summary of the studies that investigated the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB. 17.39% ($k = 4$) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 39.13% ($k = 9$) of the studies only recruited participants from
the private sector. 43.47% \((k = 10)\) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. A majority of studies used Spector and Jex’s (1998) organizational constraints measure \((k = 20)\). The most frequently used CWB measure was Spector et al.’s (2006) scale \((k = 9)\). On average, 60.9% of participants were female and 39.1% were male. 65.2% \((k = 15)\) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate for organizational constraints was 0.88. The mean reliability estimate for CWB was 0.91. All studies reported reliability estimates for organizational constraints and CWB.

Appendix G presents an overall summary of the studies that examined the relationship between organizational constraints and negative emotions. 16.67% \((k = 1)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 33.33% \((k = 2)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the private sector. 50% \((k = 3)\) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. All studies used Spector and Jex’s (1998) organizational constraints scale \((k = 6)\) and Van Katwyk et al.’s (2000) negative emotions measure. On average, 62.2% of participants were female and 38.8% were male. Lastly, 100% \((k = 6)\) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate for organizational constraints was 0.85. The mean reliability estimate for negative emotions was 0.90. All studies reported reliability estimates for organizational constraints and CWB.

Appendix H displays an overall summary of the studies that explored the relationship between negative emotions and CWB. 12.5% \((k = 1)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the public sector. 50% \((k = 4)\) of the studies only recruited participants from the private sector. 37.5% \((k = 3)\) of the studies recruited participants from both public and private sectors. A majority of studies used Van Katwyk et al.’s (2000) negative emotions measure \((k = 7)\). The most frequently used CWB measures were Spector et al.’s (2006) scale \((k = 2)\) and Fox, Spector,
and Miles’ scale ($k = 2$). On average, 63.3% of participants were female and 36.7% were male. 100% ($k = 8$) of studies were published. The mean reliability estimate for negative emotions was 0.90. The mean reliability estimate for CWB was 0.89. All studies reported reliability estimates for negative emotions and CWB.

Table 1 presents the number of effect sizes included in the meta-analysis ($k$), total number of subjects across studies ($N$), mean sample weighted correlations ($r$), estimate of corrected correlations ($\rho$), corrected standard deviation of corrected correlations ($SD\rho$), percentage of observed variance attributable to sampling error (%SE), 95% confidence interval around the mean sample-weighted correlation (95% CI), and 95% credibility interval around the corrected correlation (95% CV). The confidence intervals estimate the amount of sampling error in the sample-weighted mean by using the standard error of the sample-weighted mean. In contrast, the credibility interval uses the $SD\rho$ to detect the presence of potential moderators. More specifically, credibility intervals are used to examine whether moderator variables affect the variance in the corrected mean correlations (Arthur, Bennett, & Huffcutt, 2001).

Organizational Justice and Performance

Table 1 provides a summary of the meta-analytic estimates of the relationships between organizational justice and performance. Hypothesis 1a was fully supported. Task performance had a significant, positive correlation with distributive justice ($\rho = .14$), procedural justice ($\rho = .14$), and interactional justice ($\rho = .17$). Likewise, OCB had a significant, positive association with distributive justice ($\rho = .16$), procedural justice ($\rho = .20$), and interactional justice ($\rho = .22$).

Results of Z tests comparing the relative magnitudes of justice-performance relationships are displayed in Table 2. Hypothesis 1b was partially supported. Comparisons of corrected correlations revealed that distributive justice did not have a weaker positive association with task
performance than OCB ($Z = -0.84, ns$). In contrast, procedural justice had a weaker positive association with task performance than OCB ($Z = -3.56, p < .01$). Likewise, interactional justice had a weaker positive association with task performance than OCB ($Z = -2.16, p < .05$).

Although these significant findings represented very small differences in correlations, Eatough et al.’s (2011) meta-analysis which compared relationships of role stressors with OCB versus task performance also reported significant findings that had very small differences in correlations. Thus, these small differences in comparisons of effect sizes are typical of meta-analyses.

Results of $Z$ tests comparing the relative magnitudes of justice-OCB relationships are presented in Table 3. Comparisons of the corrected correlations between procedural justice and both dimensions of OCB revealed that procedural justice had a stronger positive relationship with OCB-O than OCB-I ($Z = 6.69, p < .01$). Thus, hypothesis 2a was supported. On the other hand, interactional justice did not have a stronger positive relationship with OCB-I than OCB-O ($Z = 0.43, ns$), providing no support for hypothesis 2b.

Results of $Z$ tests comparing the relative magnitudes of justice-CWB relationships are presented in Table 4. Hypothesis 3a stated that there would be a negative relationship between all forms of organizational justice and CWB. Support was found for this hypothesis, revealing that CWB was negatively correlated with distributive justice ($\rho = -0.13$), procedural justice ($\rho = -0.17$), and interactional justice ($\rho = -0.21$). Comparisons of the corrected correlations between procedural justice and both dimensions of CWB revealed that procedural justice did not have a stronger positive relationship with CWB-O than CWB-I ($Z = 0.61, ns$). Thus, hypothesis 3b was not supported. In contrast, interactional justice had a stronger negative relationship with OCB-I than OCB-O ($Z = -3.61, p < .01$), providing support for hypothesis 3c.
Organizational Constraints and Performance

Table 1 presents a summary of the meta-analytic estimates of the relationships between organizational constraints and the different performance criteria. Hypothesis 4a was partially supported. Organizational constraints were significantly negatively correlated with task performance ($\rho = -.07$) but not with OCB ($\rho = .02$). Hypothesis 4b stated that the negative relationship between organizational constraints and task performance would be weaker than the negative relationship between organizational constraints and OCB. This hypothesis was not supported. Counter to hypothesis 4b, organizational constraints had a stronger negative relationship with task performance than OCB ($Z = -3.99, p < .01$). Results of Z tests comparing the relative magnitudes of constraints-performance relationships are presented in Table 5. Support was found for hypothesis 5 which predicted a positive relationship between organizational constraints with CWB ($\rho = .39$).

Hypothesis 7 predicted that the negative relationship between resource constraints and OCB would be stronger than the negative relationship between social constraints and OCB. Unfortunately, this hypothesis could not be evaluated because there were insufficient studies ($k = 1, n = 129$) examining resource and social constraints with OCB.

Mediating role of Negative Emotions

Hypothesis 6 predicted that negative emotions would partially mediate the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB. Table 6 displays the meta-analytic correlation matrix. Path coefficients revealed that organization constraints had significant, positive relationships with negative emotions ($\beta = .50, p < .001$) and CWB ($\beta = .31, p < .001$). Similarly, negative emotions had a significant, positive relationship with CWB ($\beta = .15, p < .001$). Thus, these findings support the hypothesized partial mediational model. Figure 1 depicts this saturated
model. An explanation for the direct path from organization constraints to CWB is that some forms of constraints may directly lead to CWB. For instance, in the event that an employee’s computer is malfunctioning, he will not be able to complete his work and consequently have no choice but to engage in CWB (i.e., wasting time).

Methodological Moderator

Table 7 presents the results of Z tests comparing the relative magnitudes of relationships between self-rated versus other-rated OCB. Hypothesis 8a was not supported. The relationship between a composite of organizational justice and OCB was not significantly stronger for self-rated versus other rated OCB ($Z = 1.06, ns$). Likewise, the relationship between all forms of justice and OCB was not significantly stronger for self-rated versus other rated OCB ($Z = -.08, ns; Z = .20, ns; Z = -.84, ns$). Due to the lack studies examining other-rated OCB in relation with organizational constraints ($k = 1, n = 178$), I was unable to determine whether the relationship of constraints and OCB was weaker for self-rated versus other-rated OCB.

Table 8 presents the results of Z tests comparing the relative magnitudes of relationships between self-rated versus other-rated CWB. Hypothesis 8b was not supported. Counter to my hypothesis, organizational constraints had a stronger relationship with self-rated CWB than other-rated CWB ($Z = -2.34, p < .05$). Moreover, the relationship between distributive justice and CWB was not significantly weaker for self-rated versus other rated CWB ($Z = -1.38, ns$). No support was found for the prediction that the relationship between procedural justice and CWB was significantly weaker for self-rated versus other-rated CWB ($Z = .47, ns$). Due to the lack studies examining other-rated CWB in relation with interactional justice ($k = 1, n = 147$), I was unable to assess whether the relationship of interactional justice and CWB was weaker for self-rated versus other-rated CWB. Lastly, the relationship between a composite of organizational
justice and CWB was not significantly weaker for self-rated versus other rated CWB ($Z = 1.06, \ ns$).

**Summary of Results**

To summarize the relationships between justice and performance, task performance and OCB were positively correlated with distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Both procedural and interactional justice had weaker positive relationships with task performance than OCB. Moreover, procedural justice had a stronger positive relationship with OCB-O than OCB-I. CWB was negatively related to distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. In addition, interactional justice had a stronger negative relationship with OCB-I than OCB-O.

With regards to findings that were not supported, distributive justice did not have a weaker positive association with task performance than OCB. Furthermore, interactional justice did not have a stronger positive relationship with OCB-I than OCB-O. Lastly, procedural justice did not have a stronger positive relationship with CWB-O than CWB-I.

To summarize the relationships between organizational constraints and performance, organizational constraints were negatively associated with task performance and positively associated with CWB. With regards to the mediator hypothesis, negative emotions fully mediated the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB. However, organizational constraints were not negatively related to OCB. Another unexpected finding was that organizational constraints had a stronger negative relationship with task performance than OCB. Lastly, the hypothesis that the negative relationship between resource constraints and OCB would be stronger than the negative relationship between social constraints and OCB could not be evaluated because there were insufficient studies.
None of the methodological moderator hypotheses were supported. The relationship between organizational justice and OCB was not stronger for self-rated versus other rated OCB. Contrary to my hypothesis, organizational constraints had a stronger relationship with self-rated CWB than other-rated CWB. Lastly, the relationship between organizational justice and CWB was not significantly weaker for self-rated versus other rated CWB.
CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION

Although there is extensive research on occupational stressors and performance (e.g., Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008; Eatough et al., 2011), there are gaps in the literature that need to be addressed. Specifically, very few studies have meta-analytically examined the relationship between organizational constraints and organizational injustice on performance. In addition, no published studies have meta-analytically compared the differential relationship of these occupational stressors with task performance, OCB, and CWB. The purpose of the present research was to address this gap in the occupational stress literature.

Findings revealed that all forms of organizational justice were positively related with task performance and OCB. An explanation for this finding is that justice promotes organizational effectiveness through the norm of reciprocity. In other words, when employees perceive that they are being treated fairly by their organization with regards to interpersonal communication and compensation, they are more likely to reciprocate by increasing their task performance and engaging in more OCBs. This finding is consistent with past research in the occupational stress literature which has meta-analytically examined the relationship of organizational justice with task performance and OCB (Colquitt et al., 2001). Colquitt et al. (2001) obtained a mean effect size of .30 for the relationship between procedural justice and task performance. My results reveal a mean effect size (corrected correlation) of .14 for the relationship between procedural justice and task performance. Thus, it appears that the mean effect size between procedural justice and task performance is weaker than previously reported. My meta-analysis included fourteen additional studies examining the relationship between procedural justice and performance that were not included in Colquitt et al.’s meta-analysis. In addition, Colquitt et al. (2001) obtained a mean effect size of .21 for the relationship between procedural justice and
OCB. My results reveal a mean effect size (corrected correlation) of .20 for the relationship between procedural justice and OCB. My meta-analysis included thirty additional studies examining the relationship between procedural justice and OCB that were not included in Colquitt et al.’s (2001) meta-analysis.

The second finding was that procedural justice had a stronger relationship with OCB than task performance. Moreover, interactional justice had a stronger positive association with OCB than with task performance. These findings are noteworthy because this study is the first to meta-analytically examine the differential relationship between organizational justice with task performance and OCB. An explanation for this finding is that organizational justice is weakly related to task performance because a certain level of task performance must be met in order for employees to keep their job (Jex et al., 2006). In contrast, OCB is more strongly related to procedural and interactional justice because of its discretionary nature. Employees who experience procedural or interactional injustice are more likely to withdraw OCBs in order to conserve resources needed for core job tasks. This conjecture is in line with the conservation of resources model (Hobfoll, 1989). However, the finding that distributive justice had a stronger positive association with task performance than OCB was unexpected. One explanation for this disparate finding is based on the fact that organizational rewards are partially contingent on task performance. Thus, employees who perceive that rewards are being fairly distributed will be more likely to exhibit higher levels of task performance than individuals who perceive that rewards are not being fairly distributed. On the other hand, employees who experience distributive injustice have no incentive to perform well.

Another significant finding was that procedural justice had a stronger positive relationship with OCB-O than OCB-I. This research is the first to meta-analytically examine the
differential relationship between organizational justice with OCB-O and OCB-I. These results are consistent with the agent system model which states that individuals are obliged to reciprocate the source of fair treatment (Bies & Moag, 1986; Masterson et al., 2000). Thus, these results suggest that when individuals perceive that they are treated fairly by their organization, they will reciprocate by engaging in OCB-O. However, interactional justice did not have a stronger positive relationship with OCB-I than OCB-O. This result is not surprising considering the fact that interactional justice is comprised of two separate dimensions: interpersonal and informational justice. According to the agent system model of justice, individuals experiencing interpersonal justice have a tendency to reciprocate by engaging in OCB-I. On the other hand, individuals receiving informational justice are obliged to reciprocate by engaging in OCB-O. Thus, the non-significant finding can be explained by the fact that individuals may respond differently to interpersonal and informational justice.

Consistent with previous research, all forms of organizational justice were negatively related to CWB. This finding is in line with the norm of reciprocity and social exchange theory which state that individuals tend to reciprocate unfair treatment with retaliation (Blau, 1964). In line with the agent system model of justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Masterson et al., 2000), interactional justice had a stronger negative relationship with CWB-I than CWB-O. This is a noteworthy finding because no published study has examined the differential relationship between organizational justice with CWB-O and CWB-I. An explanation of this finding is that individuals tend to reciprocate the source of unfair treatment. These results are also consistent with past empirical studies which found that individuals tend to engage in CWB-I in response to interactional injustice (Jones, 2009). However, procedural justice did not have a stronger positive relationship with CWB-O than CWB-I. Although the agent system model assumes that the
source of procedural justice is most often the organization, there are exceptions to this rule. For instance, employees may perceive procedural justice as stemming from the individuals who developed the procedures for determining the allocation of outcomes. Thus, it is not surprising that procedural justice did not have a stronger relationship with CWB-O than CWB-I.

In line with past meta-analyses (e.g., Villanova & Roman, 1993), these meta-analytic results reveal a weak negative relationship between organizational constraints and task performance. Villanova and Roman (1993) obtained a mean effect size of -.14 for the relationship between organizational constraints and task performance. My results reveal a mean effect size (corrected correlation) of -.07 for the relationship between organizational constraints and task performance. Thus, it appears that the mean effect size between organizational constraints and task performance is even weaker than previously reported. My meta-analysis included seven additional studies examining the relationship between constraints and performance that were not included in Villanova and Roman’s (1993) meta-analysis. This weak association between constraints and performance can be explained by a number of factors such as lenient work standards, tolerance of poor performance, bountiful organizational resources, and measurement issues (e.g., using narrow definitions of constraints) (Kane, 1997). However, organizational constraints were not significantly negatively related to OCB. This is the first study to meta-analytically examine this relationship. This non-significant finding may be attributed to the presence of a moderating variable (i.e., type of constraint). As previously mentioned, employees experiencing resource constraints may respond by reducing OCB, whereas, individuals experiencing interpersonal constraints may respond by increasing OCB. Unfortunately, this conjecture cannot be meta-analytically examined due to fact that very few studies differentiate between categories of constraints. In summary, my non-significant finding
may be a result of a methodological artifact (i.e., failure of measures to differentiate between
different types of constraints). Contrary to my expectations, organizational constraints had a
stronger negative relationship with task performance than OCB. Taking the previous discussion
into perspective, this result is not surprising because the low correlation between constraints and
OCB is likely due to a methodological artifact.

Consistent with my prediction, there was a strong positive correlation between CWB and
organizational constraints. This result is consistent with previous meta-analytic studies that
investigated the relationship between CWB and constraints (Hershcovis et al., 2007). Hershcovis
et al. (2007) obtained a mean effect size of .31 for the relationship between CWB and
organizational constraints. My results reveal a mean effect size (corrected correlation) of .39 for
the relationship between organizational constraints and task performance. Thus, it is evident that
the mean effect size between CWB and constraints is stronger than previously reported. My
meta-analysis included sixteen additional studies examining the relationship between CWB and
constraints that were not Hershcovis et al.'s (2007) meta-analysis. This result is also in line with
AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) which states that affective workplace experiences such as
organizational constraints may lead to negative emotional reactions which, in turn, may lead to
CWB. This strong positive relationship between CWB and constraints suggest that individuals
have a high likelihood of responding to all types of constraints with CWB. In contrast to the
relationship between constraints and OCB, it is unlikely that constraint type moderates the
relationship between CWB and constraints.

In line with my hypothesis, negative emotions fully mediated the relationship between
organizational constraints and CWB. This finding is consistent with AET and Fox and Spector’s
stressor emotion theory of counterproductive work behaviors. This is the first study to meta-
analytically investigate the mediating role of negative emotions in the relationship between organizational constraints and CWB.

Contrary to my hypothesis, organizational justice did not have a stronger relationship with self-rated OCB than other-rated OCB. Furthermore, the relationship between procedural justice and OCB was not stronger for self-rated versus other-rated OCB. These findings are inconsistent with previous research which show large differences between self and observer ratings of OCB (Allen, Barnard, Rush, & Russell. 2000). A lack of power may explain these non-significant findings. Considering that researchers agree moderator tests often have very low statistical power (Aguinis, 1995; McClelland & Judd, 1993), a significant effect may have been hard to detect because of the small sample size associated with other-rated OCB.

Another unexpected finding was that organizational constraints had a stronger relationship with self-rated CWB than other-rated CWB. This finding is in line with Berry et al.’s (2012) conclusion that coworkers and supervisors tend to underreport employees’ CWB compared to the employees themselves. Because of the covert nature of CWB-O (e.g., sabotage and theft), these behaviors may be difficult for others to track. Only the perpetrator is aware of the amount of CWB-O he or she engages in. Thus, this finding suggests that CWB-O may be under reported by other-reports due to its covert nature. On the other hand, CWB-I is more likely to be reported than CWB-O due to its visibility. In addition, the relationship between organizational justice and CWB was not significantly stronger for other-rated CWB versus self-rated CWB. A significant moderator effect may have been difficult to detect because of the small sample size associated with other-rated CWB.
Practical Implications

The first major overall implication of the present study is that organizational justice can enhance in-role and extra-role performance. When individuals perceive that they are being treated fairly by their organization and its members, they reciprocate by devoting more effort to task performance, engaging in OCB, and refraining from CWB. On the other hand, when employees perceive that they are being treated unjustly by their organization and its members, they reciprocate by devoting less effort to task performance, withdrawing OCB, and engaging in CWB.

Because organizational justice has a significant impact on bottom-line organizational effectiveness, it is in the best interest of organizations to develop interventions to enhance perceptions of all forms of justice among its employees. For instance, an intervention to enhance perceptions of interactional justice may focus on training supervisors to develop high quality leader member exchange relationships with employees. On the basis of social exchange principles and the norm of reciprocity, high quality leader member exchange relationships are fostered by a reciprocal exchange of positive behaviors between supervisors and subordinates (Hofmann et al., 2003). Employees who are in higher quality leader member exchange relationships have higher perceptions of interactional justice about their supervisor. Procedural justice perceptions can be enhanced by providing individuals with voice in making decisions that affect them. For example, in the context of increasing procedural justice associated with performance appraisals, employees need to be informed about performance standards and receive timely performance feedback (Kaleem, Jabeen, & Twana, 2013). Employees should also be given the opportunity to give their input about their performance assessment and challenge it if
they perceive it to be unfair. Lastly, distributive justice perceptions can be fostered by setting up a compensation system that allocates salary, promotions, and rewards as fairly as possible.

The second major overarching implication of this study is that organizational constraints are negatively related to task performance and positively related to CWB. Because organizational constraints have a detrimental effect on bottom-line organizational effectiveness, organizations have a vested interest in developing interventions to remove constraints. First, organizations need to identify potential constraints that hinder employees from performing their job effectively. Once these constraints are identified, organizations can focus on removing them. Job context constraints can be reduced by providing employees with adequate training, sufficient equipment or supplies, clarifying organizational rules and procedures, and providing clear instructions for employees to complete tasks. Interpersonal constraints stemming from poor relationships between supervisors and subordinates can be reduced by training supervisors to develop leader member exchange relationships with subordinates.

The third implication is that organizational justice has differential relationships with different dimensions of OCB and CWB. In light of the finding that procedural justice is more strongly associated with OCB-O than OCB-I, organizations can foster OCB-O by developing interventions to increase perceptions of procedural justice. Taking into account that individuals tend to engage in CWB-I in response to interactional injustice, organizations can reduce CWB-I by increasing employee perceptions of interactional justice.

Limitations and Future Directions

While these results may have important implications for occupational stress research, these results must be interpreted in light of several study limitations. First, a majority of the
studies in the meta-analysis used all self-report measures. Consequently, some of the observed correlations may have been inflated by common-method variance.

Second, causality cannot be inferred because a majority of the studies were cross-sectional and non-experimental. In light of this limitation, future studies examining occupational stressors with performance should employ a longitudinal design to explicate the causal relationship between occupational stressors and performance. Employing experimental or quasi-experimental designs in future research in this area will further help researchers draw causal inferences.

Third, the number of studies examining relationships of interactional justice with task performance, OCB, and CWB were relatively small compared with the number of studies exploring the relationships of procedural and distributive justice with performance criteria. Even fewer were the studies examining other-ratings of OCB and CWB in relation to organizational justice and constraints. Thus, caution is advised when interpreting some of these meta-analytic results that are based on only several studies. This also highlights the need for studies to include other-ratings of performance criteria.

Conclusions

Overall, this meta-analysis revealed that organizational constraints and injustice can negatively impact in-role and extra-role performance. Therefore, it is in the best interest of organizations to devise methods to remove constraints and enhance employees’ perceptions of justice. Hopefully research in the future will provide guidance to organizations on how to reduce constraints and injustice.
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APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND TASK PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>DJ (r)</th>
<th>PJ (r)</th>
<th>IJ (r)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Justice Measure</th>
<th>Task Performance Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartol et al. (2001)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Lind, Kanfer, and Earley (1990)</td>
<td>Bartol et al. (2001)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colquitt et al. (2012)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Colquitt (2001)</td>
<td>Colquitt et al. (2012)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanfer et al. (1987)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Kanfer et al. (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanfer et al. (1987)</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors &amp; Year</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sample Type</td>
<td>Study Authors &amp; Year</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sample Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapata-Phelan et al. (2009)</td>
<td>.06/08</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Zapata-Phelan et al. (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>DJ $(r)$</th>
<th>PJ $(r)$</th>
<th>IJ $(r)$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Justice Measure</th>
<th>OCB Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asgari et al. (2008)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Lind, Kanfer, and Earley (1990)</td>
<td>Bartol et al. (2001)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Confidence Interval</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrhart (2001)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.33 - .64</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Colquitt (2001)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karriker &amp; Williams (2009)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16 - .38</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Public &amp; Private</td>
<td>Colquitt (2001)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source Description</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorman, Niehoff, &amp; Organ (1993)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Private Moorman (1991)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadiri &amp; Tanova (2010)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>Private Niehoff &amp; Moorman (1993)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare &amp; Tremblay (2007)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Williams &amp; Anderson (1991)</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Yoon (2009)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Moorman (1991)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyun (1997)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Public and Private</td>
<td>Pyun (1997)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupp &amp; Cropanzano (2002)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Byrne (1999)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schappe (1998)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Konovsky &amp; Cropanzano (1991), Moorman (1991)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table showing various studies with effect sizes, standard errors, sample sizes, and publication status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>1-β</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Other Studies</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>1-β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tepper &amp; Taylor (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (2006)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Published Year</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Ngo, &amp; Wong (2006)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zellars, Tepper &amp; Duffy (2002)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Podsakoff et al. (1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>DJ ($r$)</th>
<th>PJ ($r$)</th>
<th>IJ ($r$)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Justice Measure</th>
<th>CWB Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect1</td>
<td>Effect2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Reference 1</td>
<td>Reference 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Setting 2</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krischer, Penney, &amp; Hunter (2010)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Public &amp; Private</td>
<td>Price &amp; Mueller (1986)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Allen (2002)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Niehoff &amp; Moorman (1993)</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menard et al. (2011)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Moorman (1991), Price &amp; Mueller (1986)</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Public &amp; Private</td>
<td>Colquitt (2001)</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skarlicki &amp; Folger (1997)</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>Moorman (1991), Skarlicki &amp; Folger (1997), Folger &amp; Konovsky (1989)</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spector et al. (2006)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>Moorman (1991)</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Private &amp; Public</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thau &amp; Mitchell (2010)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>Colquitt (2001)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanueva (2006)</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>Niehoff &amp; Moorman (1993)</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara (2006)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>Moorman (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara (2010)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>Moorman (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CONSTRAINTS AND TASK PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Task Performance $(r)$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Organizational Constraints Measure</th>
<th>Task Performance Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binnewies, Sonnetag, &amp; Mojza (2009)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Semmer (1984), Zapf (1993)</td>
<td>Roe et al.</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connor et al. (1984)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>O’Connor et al. (1984)</td>
<td>O’Connor et al. (1984)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reference 1</td>
<td>Reference 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters et al. (1982)</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Peters et al. (1980)</td>
<td>Peters et al. (1982)</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, O’Connor, &amp; Rudolf (1980)</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Peters et al. (1980)</td>
<td>Peters et al. (1980)</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel, Mento, &amp; Hendrix (1987)</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Steel &amp; Mento (1986)</td>
<td>Steel, Mento, &amp; Hendrix (1987)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>OCB ($r$)</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>Organizational Constraints Measure</td>
<td>OCB Measure</td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>Publication Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin et al. (2000)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Griffin et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Griffin et al. (2000)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CONSTRAINTS AND CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>CWB ($r$)</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Organizational Constraints Measure</th>
<th>CWB Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox et al. (2007)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Spector &amp; Jex (1998)</td>
<td>Fox et al. (2001)</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Reference 1</td>
<td>Reference 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CONSTRAINTS AND NEGATIVE EMOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Negative Emotions ($r$)</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Organizational Constraints Measure</th>
<th>Negative Emotions Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fox et al. (2007)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Spector &amp; Jex (1998)</td>
<td>VanKatwyk et al. (2000)</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H. SUMMARY OF STUDIES EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NEGATIVE EMOTIONS AND CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>CWB ($r$)</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>CWB Measure</th>
<th>Negative Emotions Measure</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fox et al. (2007)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fox, Spector, &amp; Miles (2001)</td>
<td>Van Katwyk et al. (2000)</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox et al. (2012)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Spector et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Van Katwyk et al. (2000)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles et al. (2002)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Public &amp; Private</td>
<td>Miles et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Van Katwyk et al. (2000)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spector et al. (2006)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Private &amp; Public</td>
<td>Spector et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Van Katwyk et al. (2000)</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Meta-Analytic Results for the Relationships of Organizational Justice and Constraints on Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>SD$r$</th>
<th>%SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>95% CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>68.89</td>
<td>.02, .29</td>
<td>.05, .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6875</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>57.29</td>
<td>-.01, .36</td>
<td>.04, .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>.18, .26</td>
<td>.19, .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>72.01</td>
<td>-.01, .32</td>
<td>.04, .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5719</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>54.98</td>
<td>-.14, -.35</td>
<td>-.27, -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2827</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>41.15</td>
<td>-.29, .10</td>
<td>-.25, .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2963</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>62.39</td>
<td>-.24, .09</td>
<td>-.17, .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4776</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>-.10, .42</td>
<td>-.07, .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10804</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>.00, .47</td>
<td>.01, .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3653</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>.07, .34</td>
<td>.22, .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3653</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>-.08, .35</td>
<td>.01, .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6328</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>-.46, .09</td>
<td>-.39, .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>-.29, -.13</td>
<td>-.22, -.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-.26, -.19</td>
<td>-.19, -.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>.14, .23</td>
<td>.17, .17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3915</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>57.49</td>
<td>.09, .42</td>
<td>.10, .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>.04, .39</td>
<td>.05, .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>.02, .41</td>
<td>.03, .36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>-.43, -.04</td>
<td>-.37, -.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-.25, -.14</td>
<td>-.18, -.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-.41, -.24</td>
<td>-.28, -.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10543</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8428</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3954</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3954</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior; CWB = counterproductive work behavior; $k =$ number of effect sizes; $N =$ total number of subjects across studies; $r =$ mean sample-weighted correlation; $\rho =$ estimate of corrected correlation; $SD_{\rho} =$ corrected standard deviation of corrected correlation; $%SE =$ percentage of observed variance attributable to sampling error; $95\% CI =$ 95% confidence interval around the mean sample-weighted correlation; $95\% CV =$ 95% credibility interval around the corrected correlation.
Table 2. Comparing Relationships of Organizational Justice with Task Performance versus OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>6875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>10804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.}
Table 3. Comparing Relationships of Organizational Justice with OCB-O versus OCB-I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \rho )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( Z )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>3653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( *p < .05, **p < .01. \)
Table 4. Comparing Relationships of Organizational Justice with CWB-O versus CWB-I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ρ</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .01.
Table 5. Comparing Relationships of Organizational Constraints with Task Performance versus OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Constraints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>10543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.}
Table 6. Meta-Analytic Correlations Between Organizational Constraints, Negative Emotions, and CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Constraints and Negative Emotions</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Constraints and CWB</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotions and CWB</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Comparing Relationships of Organizational Justice with Self-Rated Versus Other-Rated OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>14935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>6613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>7886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated OCB</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.**
Table 8. Comparing Relationships of Organizational Constraints and Justice with Self-Rated Versus Other-Rated CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ρ</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Constraints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated CWB</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>8428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated CWB</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated CWB</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>14557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated CWB</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated CWB</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>5719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated CWB</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated CWB</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>6328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Rated CWB</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01.*
Figure 1. Mediating Role of Negative Emotions on the Relationship Between Organizational Constraints and CWB