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ABSTRACT
The connection between the perceptions of Workplace deviance among subordinates and its relation to their Organization Citizenship Behavior has been discussed in this research. As expected, relation between procedural justice and hypothesized causal descriptions of Organizational citizenship duties and the association among workplace deviance and discretionary behavior of subordinates, which was more pronounced in those who described it "OCB" as extended behavior. The study's consequences for theoretical approaches are examined, along with its shortcomings and potential paths for future investigation.
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INTRODUCTION
Some current studies in the literature indicate that “Some managers may operate in styles that come under the despotic category “ (Ashforth, 1994), harassing (Hoel, 1999), sabotaging (Duffy, 2002) and harmful, according to recent additions to the leadership studies ((Keashly, 1994). The phrase we will employ, workplace deviance, describes how teammates perceive how much their supervisors consistently engage in aggressive interaction that is visual and oral but not human contact (Tepper, 2001). Using derogatory names, having explosive outbursts (such as shouting or shrieking at others for disagreeing), intimidating others by threatening to fire them, withholding crucial data, hostile body language, the avoidance, or embarrassing or making fun of someone in public are all behaviors that fit this definition.

Background and Aim
The behavioral responses of subordinates to workplace deviance remain a constant question. “Employees may respond to excessive profanity with even more offensive behavior, according to theoretical remedies.” ((Andersson & Pearson, 1999). “If these types of behavioral grooves are possible, it is reasonable to expect that subordinates of abusive bosses will respond their boss's aggression in some way.” (Duffy, 2002). “Indeed, there is substantial theoretical and empirical support for the idea that people who feel challenged (for example, as the target of abusive behavior) or who perceive a loss of control strive to maintain their sense of independence.”e.g. (Brehm & Wright & Brehm). As a result, one goal of the present study was finding out how does the
victimized subordinates face and handle the situation and come back to normal, does it help in changing the behavior of employees in accordance with Organizational Benefit and for the good of the Organization which is referred to in the literature as Organizational Citizenship Behavior. (Organ, 1988) Refers to discrete actions that promote organizational effectiveness in aggregate. Assisting peers with job issues rather than complaining about minor issues, trying to behave respectfully to workmates, and speaking optimistically about the institution to outsiders are examples of OCBs. The absence of OCBs is not subject to penalties, which is a crucial element of the OCB concept. As a result, threatening to withhold OCBs should be a reasonable way for mistreated subordinates to react to workplace bullying. Despite having a low base rate, workplace bullying nevertheless has a big impact. A limited but rising amount of empirical data indicates that mistreated subordinates compared to their non-abused colleagues, report more emotional distress, career and life discontent, a desire to leave their occupations, and role stress. (Ashforth, 1994)((Keashly, 1994) (Duffy, 2002), and their perceptions of unfairness are what causes them to react in such a way to workplace deviance (Tepper, 2002). Therefore, workplace deviance is an originator of injustice which has negative effects on both managers and individuals (Bias & Tripp, 1998). We were also curious about the circumstances that would cause a subordinate to act in this manner, as well as why mistreated employees would refuse OCBs. There is a major emphasis on finding out the connection between workplace bullying and Organizational citizenship behavior of the employees. For achieving this a blend of Theory and literature contexts have been used for finding out the role of misbehavior of supervisors and finding out the prospective mediators in the variables. In the following paragraphs, a conceptual study has been done and it attempts to throw light on when the team members plan not to display the Organizational commitment behavior in reaction to workplace deviance and is an answer to the reason behind forfeiting the Organizational citizenship behavior. The following research stream implies that subordinates respond positively to compassionate leader behavior by accomplishing a discretionary behavior towards the Organization and withdraw it at the time of Team Leader’s bad behavior with them. As previously stated, disheartened Team Members frequently face demotivation as well as a decreased perception of internal locus of control” (Ashforth, 1997). According to reactance theory, disappointed individuals behave accordingly to restore their sense of control e.g. (Brehm & Wright & Brehm). Exercise is one potential strategy to regain control and independence or prudence in one's actions (Brehm W. &.). As a result, reacting to workplace deviance, a person can opt to engage in or abstain from participating in certain behaviors over which one has control.

**Methods**

We framed dual hypothesis and they were tested using collection from 300 subordinates and team leaders. Two surveys were done - the former survey was administered on the subordinates and the latter one on the Supervisors. Participants completed the survey during scheduled meetings. Measures that were tested were:

- Workplace deviance, OCB Role Definition, Procedural Justice, Organization citizenship behavior.

**Antecedents of OCB**

In an effort to understand why early research found little link between employees' attitudes and job performance (Brayfield & Crockett & Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1955, 1985), Organ and his colleagues established the OCB idea. These findings were attributed by Organ (1977) to the
hypothesis that the extent to which individuals can adjust their performance is constrained by contextual factors such as technology and work management procedures. As discussed by Organ the attitudes of the employees are displayed in the extra activities and tasks on which they work and have more control over them. Empirical research which had given clues about the relation between positive Organizational Behavior in those employees who feel more comfortable while working has obviously supported these theories. (Bateman & Organ & Smith, 1983). The Academicians like (Hui, 1999) (al H. e., 1999) discovered that the employees with whom their bosses or supervisors shared time, data and personal support performed OCB extensively than their other colleagues. A positive correlation was also found between OCB of subordinates and Transformational leadership behaviors of their bosses like expressing a vision and role modelling, motivating employees taking them in confidence for high Performance. (Podsakoff, 1990) (Moorman, 1990) (Fetter, 1990) and Podsakoff, (MacKenzie, 1996) (Bommer, 1996). This body of research implies that workers exhibit positive Citizenship Behavior as an answer to helpful managerial behavior and abstain from participating when the latter is present. We continued this line of research by examining whether subordinates' OCB is related with abusive super-vision. As previously said, abused subordinates feel constantly frustrated and have a decreased sense of self - control (Ashforth, 1997). According to the reaction theory, furious people act out in order to regain control of their situation (e.g., Brehm & Brehm, 1981). As a result, in response to abusive monitoring, one may opt to engage in or refrain from engaging in specific activities. According to research, abused employees are prone to assume their employer as partially accountable for their boss’s actions (Tepper, 2002)

Hypothesis 1: Negative OCB effects are definitely correlated to workplace deviance.

**Moderating Effects of Subordinates’ OCB Role Definitions**

There has been a criticism about the difference between the required behavior i.e. the in-role behavior “formal limited role of the subordinates” and the extra role behavior (which exceeds one’s own job requirements). They say that these subsets of behavior are very confusing. (Graham, 1991); (Dyne, 1994), (Graham, 1994), (Morrison, 1994) made the case that changes in the Organizational job roles must not be unpredictable by referencing concepts of task creation, cognitive contract, and socioeconomic data processing. According to research, organizational roles are continually negotiated and renegotiated in common, and supervisory and their teammate roles in specific (Graen, 1976); workers’ perspectives of their own job demands may be differ from that of their Employers; and similar positions might very well describe one’s positions different manner (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Therefore, there seems to be some variation in individuals' interpretations of respective duties, especially with regard to behaviors that almost all observer would consider extra-role. Empirical data reveals that most of the Staff believe OCBs are a necessary component of their jobs, which is consistent with these concepts (Lam, Hui), 1999; Morrison, 1994; Pond, Nacoste, Mohr, & Rodriguez, 1997). (Tepper, 2002) , (Lockhart, 1999), (Hooblers, 2001) Which role to choose concept backs up the idea that, in an effort to soothe these concerns, workers' task descriptions with regard to Organizational commitment regulate the link between attitudes and Organizational citizenship behavior. The few who characterize Organizational citizenship behaviors as the internal behavior, according to the framework, may be willing to return favors by engaging in OCBs, but their inability to control in-role behavior prohibits employees from doing it again (Organ, 1977). Staff members who assume Organizational citizenship Behavior as external behavior, on the other hand, perceive very few situation - specific restrictions on one’s
OCB achievement and comprehend that threatening to withhold Behaviors is not penalized, enabling them to adjust their OCB in reaction to favorable coverage or unfavorable treatment (in reaction to unfavorable treatment). To corroborate this, Tepper, Lockhart, and Hoobler (2001) discovered that role definitions modulated the impacts of ethical climate on two types of OCB in one group and three types of OCB in another sample. The role distinction theory was supported in each instance where there was a significant interaction: When OCB was characterized as extra-role behavior as opposed to in-role activity, there was a higher correlation among justice and role perceptions. Same procedures would explain the connection amongst occupational stress and subordinates' OCB, as was predicted. As we previously mentioned, staff of abusive supervisors ought to feel a great deal of hatred and a desire for vengeance. Withdrawal of OCBs appears to be an effective way to respond to an abusive supervisor's behavior to the degree and understanding that OCBs are a professional commitment organizations and their members appreciate (Hypothesis 1). As opposed to mistreated employees who consider OCB as external behavior, those who view OCB as in-role behavior ought to be less inclined to resist OCB. The result of these justifications was conduct:

Hypothesis 2: The relationship among workplace deviance and subordinates' OCB will be moderated by the roles that subordinates describe, and as a result, the connection will be higher amongst colleagues according to whom OCB is an external activity as opposed to colleagues who understand OCB as an internal behavior.

**Procedural Justice**

According to Organ's explanation, employees engage in OCBs when they think their connection to the company is one of socialization (i.e., relationships that exist outside of formal contracts and in which the members' contributions are left unspecified) as opposed to economic exchange (i.e., relationships in which each party's contribution is contractually specified; Blau, 1964). Social interactions differ from commercial contracts in that they include hazy, informal agreements where each party's contributions are up for personal interpretation. Organ (1988) argued that organizational practices that foster positive attitudes result in a sense of responsibility to compensate the organization in a way appropriate to a social interaction process. Moreover, Organ was having an opinion that employees respond using OCB since they know that OCB does not come under a defined role or reward system so if they find a fair system of work consisting of for e.g. “feelings of trust, support, and good faith” then obviously they display a good degree of OCB. “Employees' OCBs are associated with attitudes and perceptions that are indicative of social exchange, such as job satisfaction” (Smith, 1983), “trust” (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994)organizational support ( (Moorman B. &., 1988)), and justice. This is consistent with (Organ, 1988) assertion that the conditions of social exchange should be the basis for OCB performance. (Moorman, 1990). So In this study, we concentrated on procedural justice, or how fair the business and its representatives appear to employees while making allocation decisions. Measures of procedural fairness have been incorporated into the majority of investigations of OCB precursors, and the data reveals a strong and trustworthy positive link between procedural justice and OCB.

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between procedural justice and OCB role definitions will operate as a mediator between the effects of workplace deviance and OCB role definitions.
Discussion
The findings of this study imply that (a) The staff members who are abused are not able to exhibit a considerable form of OCB in comparison to the employees whose bosses are better and not abusing them. The association between workplace deviance and subordinates’ OCB is mediated by procedural justice, but this mediation relationship is stronger when subordinates define OCB as extra-role activity as compared to when subordinates define OCB as in-role behavior. Podsakoff et al., 1990, 1996, for example), (b) subordinates’ perceptions of justice as a mediator of the effects of workplace deviance on subordinates' self-reported attitudes (Tepper, 2000), and (c) the moderating effects of supervisory practices on OCB. By integrating and extending the findings of these studies, our study contributes to the body of knowledge. (Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001). After examining the outcomes of the study the observations imply that (a) the staff members who have abusing Supervisors show a less amount of Organization Citizenship Behavior. This connection is mediated or neutralized by Procedural Justice This study has integrated the results of different studies and has contributed to the body of knowledge which looked at “(a) Direct connection between Supervisors Practices and Organization Citizenship Behavior “ (Hui, 1999); (Podsakoff, 1990),” (b) subordinates' perceptions of justice as a mediator of the impacts of workplace deviance on subordinates' self-reported attitudes” (Tepper, 2001) and “ (c) the moderating effects of supervisory practices on OCB. By combining and extending the findings of these studies, our study contributes to the body of knowledge.” (Tepper, 2001) (Hooblers, 2001) (Lockhart, 2001).

Theory, Research, and Practice Implications
Organization scholars have recently shown great interest in workplace deviance and related behaviors. This research suggests that workplace deviance has a number of deleterious consequences for organizations and their members. Abused subordinates are more likely to withhold OCBs compared with their non abused counterparts. This enables the abused subordinate to achieve Tripp, and Kramer (1997) referred to as a low-intensity type of revenge. More generally, our research provides support for justice-based views as to how workplace deviance affects subordinates’ behavioral responses. Apparently, the perceived injustices evoked by workplace deviance explain subordinates’ behavioral responses. Hence, our work adds to a growing number of studies that implicate subordinates’ justice perceptions in explaining responses to leadership practices (e.g., Mossholder et al., 1998; Niehoff & Moor- man, 1993; Pillai et al., 1999; Tepper et al., 1998). Current findings on workplace deviance and related practices have piqued the interest of many organizational experts. According to this research, workplace deviance has a lot of negative effects on organizations and its constituents. Subordinates who have experienced abuse are more prone than non abused peers to refuse to accept OCBs. This permits the victimized employee to exactly behave in a kind of repercussion or retaliation” Tripp and Kramer (1997) More generally, our data supports ideas on how workplace deviance impacts subordinates' behavioral responses that are grounded in fairness. It’s evident that the reaction of Employee which is visible which is the outcome of perceptual injustice supported by strict Supervision. Therefore, our research adds to the growing body of research linking subordinates' perceptions of justice to their repercussions to their boss’s behaviors (e.g., Mossholder et al., 1998; Niehoff & Moore, 1993)

Moreover it’s interesting to find through research that some ill-treated Team mates may still engage in OCBs because they think doing so is necessary for their position. These workers can
believe that, despite their supervisor's actions, they are acting in a normative

Limitations and Ideas for Further Study
First limitation is that this study of OCB and its relation with perceived supervisory abuse has been done at a particular point of time. More research needs to be carried out to examine whether workplace deviance causes a low grade OCB or it acts as a consequent feature of OCB. It can further be discussed that may be the supervisors are more harsh towards the subordinates who withhold OCB and thus this step may ensure a contribution to favorable morale and work-unit effectiveness. So it could be understood to suggest that the team members or who displayed an Organization Citizenship Behavior at lower degree was an outcome of the harsh behavior of the bosses and these did not withhold their devoted behavior. Using research designs that incorporate measurements of workplace deviance and subordinates' OCB at various points in time, it will be feasible to identify whether workplace deviance is a cause, a result, or a cause and consequence of OCB. Our understanding of the connection between workplace deviance and subordinates' behavior is a second weakness. The fact that it was not possible to investigate how the suffering subordinate would have explained their bosses' behavior and actions is the final research drawback. A useful supervision can be interpreted in a variety of ways because it is a subjective evaluation. A person's explanation for an actor's behavior, according to attribution theory, impacts their emotional and behavioral responses to that behavior (Weiner, 1995). For example, it might be expected that subordinates who attribute workplace deviance to internal causes (such as the supervisor being a bad or incompetent person) will feel more injustice and withhold OCBs than those who attribute it to external causes (e.g., he or she had a bad day or is responding to organizationally imposed constraints). We did not look into a relevant topic known as counterfactual reasoning in the literature (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). For instance, it may be argued that when abuse victims don't see how their organization could have known about or stopped the abuse, they don't hold it responsible (and do not withhold OCBs). Looking into these aspects can help researchers and practitioners better understand how subordinates feel and respond to workplace deviance.

Results
The findings suggest that the subordinates displayed greater frequency of OCB when their supervisors were less abusive, when they defined OCB as in role behavior and when they held more favorable justice perceptions.
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