

***Role of Schadenfreude and Attributional Styles in Organizational
Citizenship Behavior of Employees***



By

Naeem Ahmed

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

National Institute of Psychology

Center of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad – Pakistan

2017

***Role of Schadenfreude and Attributional Styles in Organizational
Citizenship Behavior of Employees***

By

Naeem Ahmed

***A Research Report submitted in the Partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the Degree of Masters of Science in Psychology***

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

National Institute of Psychology

Center of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad – Pakistan

2017

***Role of Schadenfreude and Attributional Styles in Organizational
Citizenship Behavior of Employees***

By

Naeem Ahmed

Approved by

(Ms. Aisha Zubair)

Supervisor

(Prof. Dr. Anila Kamal)

Director NIP

(External Examiner)

CERTIFICATE

Certify that M.Sc. Research Report on “Role of schadenfreude and attributional styles in organizational citizenship behavior in of employees” prepared by Naeem Ahmed has been approved for the submission to the National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

(Ms. Aisha Zubair)

Supervisor

Dedication

A small and humble Token of the gratitude

To

My parents (Abbu & Ammi)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful and the Most Beneficent. All the praises to Allah Almighty who has always bestowed me far better and more than what I deserved and strived for and for the blessing me with strength, perseverance and respect.

I feel immensely indebted to my supervisor Aisha Zubair for the unsurpassed guidance, courage, support and valuable feedback throughout the research period. Her patience, encouragement, motivation, continuous support in every worse situation, kind and humble attitude helped me out to complete this research work.

Thank you Ma'am for being so supportive.

I would like to oblige to my family members, their love support and adorable care for my whole life. I completed my research work only because of my parents. I was worthless without the support and love of my father and my mother.

I would like to say special thanks to my love of my life. The lady who always remained my back support in every situation I suffered from. Her unconditional love and support inspired me to meet challenges of life with full of rigor.

I am really grateful to my fellows and friends especially for their help in data collection and data entry. Special thanks to staff of computer lab, photo copier, library and admin staff for their support.

Naeem Ahmed

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF APPENDIXES	iv
Abstract	v
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Schadenfreude	1
Motives of Schadenfreude	2
Theories of Schadenfreude	8
Attributional Styles	9
Dimensions of Attributional Styles	10
Learning of Attributional Styles	12
Theories of Attributional Styles	15
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	18
Theories of OCB	21
Rationale of the study	26
Chapter II METHOD	27
Objectives.....	27
Hypotheses.....	27
Operational Definitions of Variables.....	28
Research Design.....	28
Sample	28
Instruments.....	30
Procedure.....	31
Chapter III RESULTS	32
Chapter IV DISCUSSI	38
REFERENCES	43
APPENDICES	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	<i>Descriptive Statistics of the Sample (N = 300)</i>	29
Table 2	<i>Reliability coefficient & Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (N=300).</i>	32
Table 3	<i>Correlation between Schadenfreude, Internal Attributional Styles External Attributional Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N=300).</i>	33
Table 4	<i>Group Differences along Gender on Study Variables (N=300).</i>	34
Table 5	<i>Group Difference the Type of Organization on Study Variables (N=300).</i>	35
Table 6	<i>Group Differences of Job Experience on Study Variables (N=300).</i>	36
Table 7	<i>Group Differences Across Education on Study Variables (N=300).</i>	37

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Annexure 1 Informed Consent

Annexure 2 Demographic Information Sheet

Annexure 3 Schadenfreude Scale

Annexure 4 Attributional Style Questionnaire

Annexure 5 Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale

Abstract

The present study aimed to explore the role of schadenfreude and attributional style in organizational citizenship behavior among employees of research organization and telecommunication companies. It was also attempted to explore the role of various demographics (gender, age, type or organization, and job experience) in relation to major constructs of the study. A convenient sample of ($N=300$) comprised of both male and female workers working in both type of organizations. Measures of Schadenfreude Scale (Batool, 2013), Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson et al., 1982) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990) were used to assess schadenfreude inclinations attributional styles and pro-social behavior in organization respectively. Results showed that schadenfreude was negatively associated with organizational citizenship behavior and internal attributional style and positively associated with external attributional style. Organizational citizenship behavior was negatively associated with the external attributional style and positively associated with internal attributional style. Male employees showed more inclination for schadenfreude and lesser organizational citizenship behavior as compare to the female employees. However non-significant findings were observed to gender on attributional styles. Old age employees have more inclination towards schadenfreude and lesser towards organizational citizenship behavior. Old age employees are more inclined towards external attribution styles and lesser towards the internal attributional styles as compare to the young and new employees. Private organization's employees are more inclined towards organizational citizenship behavior and lesser towards schadenfreude as compare to the employees of public organizations. However private organizations employees are more inclined towards the internal attribution style and lesser towards the external attributional styles as compare to the public organization's employees.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Working in any organization and giving desired outcomes is not simple process rather it is a complex process followed by variety of the factors. These factors may be organizational, personal, and job related. Here personal factors are going to be discussed and more focused related to our performance in an organization. From all those factors schadenfreude and external attributional styles are those factors which effect the own and also colleague's performance. On the other hand, organizational citizen ship behavior and internal attributional style are those factors which are considered very important and helpful and necessary in a group assignments and organization work. These variables are very common in Pakistan and in all over the world organizations. Mostly these types of variables are practiced in the research organizations and telecommunication companies.

Therefore the current study aims to explore the role of schadenfreude and attributional styles attributional styles and organizational citizenship behavior of organization. Detailed description of each of the variable is given below.

Schadenfreude

Schadenfreude is variously defined by many researchers as another person's misfortune can evoke feelings of anger or sympathy, but the same event can also evoke schadenfreude (Feather, 2006). According to appraisal theory, emotional responses are evoked through the individual's appraisal of an event (Roseman & Smith, 2001). Therefore, for someone's misfortune to evoke schadenfreude, this should be appraised as being beneficial for the schadenfroh person (Frijda, 2016). Three concerns on how another person's misfortune can be beneficial have received empirical support: deservingness of the unfortunate outcome, the opportunity to self-enhance from other people's unfortunate events, and prior envy felt towards the unfortunate other.

Another breeding ground for schadenfreude is politics, a blood sport in its own right, where partisan instincts often carry the day more often than bipartisan desires. Misfortunes befalling opposing party candidates, ranging from sexual scandals to verbal gaffes, enhance the fate of one's own candidate or party. In the context of a political campaign, particularly as election day nears, many newsworthy events may be considered via their implications for victory or defeat of one's own side. This may be true even though a misfortune befalling an opponent may also create negative, undeserved consequences for people in general. As with sports, the obvious direct gain for the self may seem minimal. If one strongly identifies with a political party, however, then all events should be interpreted through the lens of in-group gain, which, in the case of politics, might be considerable. (Hareli & Weiner, 2002).

It is worth emphasizing that there are clear advantages to superiority, as well as disadvantages of inferiority. Not only are valuable resources at stake based on relative standing (Smith, Combs, & Thiekle, 2008), but there are also self-related feelings in the mix as well (Brickman & Bulman, 2003; Morse & Gergen, 2001). Most contemporary psychological perspectives on the self make the common sense observation that people are motivated to feel good about themselves, and this motivation is a primary drive of human behavior (Baumeister, 2000; Brown & Dutton, 2004; Sedikides & Strube, 2000; Taylor & Brown, 2008; Tesser, Millar, & Moore, 2001). One prime way individuals are able to feel good about themselves is to conclude or discover that they are better than others on valued attributes (Wills, 2001). Misfortunes happening to others, especially competitors, are one potential road to this positive feeling.

Motives of Schadenfreude

The motives of schadenfreude are the reason that an individual feel pleasure or satisfaction over the loss or defeat of the others.

Deservingness. Another person's misfortune can be seen as beneficial if this misfortune is seen as deserved, which then indicates a form of justice being served

(Portmann, 2000). To judge an outcome as deserved or undeserved is related to the actions that lead to the outcome. A negative outcome is deserved if it was due to a negative prior action (Feather, 2006). For example, a person who does not put much effort into writing an application and comes unprepared for a job interview, is seen as deserving of the negative outcome, which is to not get the job (Feather, McKee & Bekker, 2011). In addition, personal responsibility of the outcome increases judgements of deservingness, which then leads to feelings of *schadenfreude* (Van Dijk, Ouwerkerk, Goslinga & Nieweg, 2005). A sense of deservingness may come into play in yet another way. When hypocrites hoist themselves with their own petards, the symmetry of the immoral action matching the hypocrite's original moral position probably makes the outcome seem especially fitting and just. In this sense, it may satisfy in a 'poetic' way. Those punished suffer because of their own poor choices, thus reinforcing the notion of a just world and karmic retribution (Lerner & Miller, 2008). In addition, they have been discovered doing the behavior that they, often pompously, forbid others from doing, making their embarrassment all the richer. Such symmetry and balance, associated with moralizing people especially (Monin, 2007), should be inherently pleasant (Feather, 2006; Heider, 2008).

The perceived deservingness of an outcome can also be influenced by the likeableness and moral character of the unfortunate person. Participants experienced more *schadenfreude* and rated the misfortune as more deserved when an unlikeable stimulus person suffered a misfortune, compared to when a likeable stimulus person experienced a misfortune (Hareli & Weiner, 2002). The moral character of a person affects the likableness of this person (Feather & Deverson, 2000). A study looked at the deservingness of punishment for an offence (child abuse or arson) committed by a person who was perceived as either having a strong or weak moral character (Feather & Atchison, 2017). The offenders who were judged to be more decent, reliable, worthy, and respectable (which together constitutes moral character) were judged to deserve the punishment less, and were less responsible for the offense. Moral people are seen as less likely to bring about a negative event that leads to a negative outcome (Feather, 2014).

However, people with weak moral characters such as hypocrites are more likely to act in a negative way (Powell & Smith, 2013).

An outcome that is seen as undeserved can also lead to feelings of schadenfreude. A person's undeserved positive outcome can lead to feelings of resentment, which then leads to feelings of schadenfreude when that person suffers a failure. Participants were asked to take the role of a low, average, or high performing student. They were then asked to judge a misfortune that befell a high achieving student who did not put much effort into his course work (Feather, 2008). Low performing participants felt the most resentment and schadenfreude towards the high achieving student. These results corroborate with the "tall poppy syndrome" seen in Australia (Feather, 2014) and (Bonde, 2009), which is the assertion that people who hold high-status positions should not think highly of themselves, and that people often wish to cut these high-status people down to size.

Deservingness clearly plays a major role in explaining many instances of schadenfreude. It has the added bonus for the observer of the misfortune of allowing the pleasure to seem unrelated to self-interest. Deserved misfortunes seem to satisfy people's preference for balance and symmetry. Deserved misfortunes may have a satisfying kind poetry to them. An exemplar of this general notion is when hypocrites suffer by committing the same immoral behaviors they have self-righteously accused other of committing.

Self-enhancement. Another way other's misfortunes can be beneficial for the schadenfreude person is by providing self-enhancement opportunities though downward social comparisons (Willis, 2008). In behavioral finance, self-enhancement is a common emotional bias. Also referred to as the self-enhancing bias, it is the tendency for individuals take all the credit for their successes while giving little or no credit to other individuals or external factors. People may emphasize their positive attributes while at the same time highlighting negatives associated with others. This can impact investors

negatively as they become overconfident about their own abilities; they will attribute past success to their own skill and reject the role of good luck in those outcomes.

Self-enhancement motivations increase when one's self-evaluation is threatened, or for people with lower self-esteem (Aspinwall & Taylor, 2007). Therefore, studies have looked at the relation between levels of self-esteem and self-evaluation thereat on levels of schadenfreude. One study investigated that the effect participants' self-esteem has on experiences of schadenfreude (Van Dijk, Van Koningsbruggen, Ouwerkerk & Wesseling, 2011). Low self-esteem participants experienced more schadenfreude when they read a story about a high achieving student who experienced a setback in his studies, compared to high self-esteem participants. Another study examined the combined effect of self-esteem and self-evaluation threat on experienced schadenfreude (Van Dijk, Ouwerkerk, Van Koningsbruggen, & Wesseling, 2012). Self-evaluation threat was manipulated by giving participants negative or positive feedback on a task. Participants then saw a video of a failed audition for a Dutch talent show, and responded to how much schadenfreude they felt. Participants with low self-esteem felt more schadenfreude after they had received negative feedback as compared to low self-esteem participants who received positive feedback. However, schadenfreude scores did not differ between high self-esteem participants who received negative or positive feedback (Van Dijk et al., 2012).

Envy. Another person's misfortune is beneficial to the envious schadenfrohn person because the misfortunate other is no longer in a higher position (Smith, Thielke & Powell, 2014). However, research on envy being an antecedent to schadenfreude has produced inconsistent results, where some studies has found a relationship between envy and schadenfreude (Takahashi et al., 2009; Van Dijk et al., 2005), another studies has not (Feather & Sherman, 2002; Hareli, & Weiner, 2002; Leach & Spears, 2008) found any relationship between envy and schadenfreude. The discrepancy in these studies is argued to be due to definitional challenges in regards to envy (Smith et al., 2014). Previous studies have not distinguished between two forms of envy, namely malicious and begin envy. A definition of these two forms of envy is given by Parrott and Smith

(2016) where “envy arises when a person lacks another’s superior quality, achievement, or possession and either desires it or wishes that the other lacks it” (p. 908). Therefore, malicious envy makes people want to pull down superior others, while benign envy makes people want to pull themselves up to the same level as the superior others (Van de Ven, Zeelenberg & Pieters, 2009). It is argued that studies failing to find a link between envy and schadenfreude have investigated benign, and not malicious, envy (Powell, Smith, & Schurtz, 2008). Not only do people feeling envy feel discontent and often inferior because of the desired advantage enjoyed by envied person but, typically, they also feel ill will toward the envied person. They would just as soon that no one has the advantage if they themselves are denied it (Smith & Kim, 2007). There are number of possible explanations for this hostility (Smith & Kim, 2007), but regardless of the particular causes of this hostility, it is a defining feature of envy. Furthermore, it is yet another reason for expecting a misfortune befalling an envied person to be pleasing. It is natural for negative, hostile feelings directed toward other people to coexist with a desire to have negative events happen to them (Heider, 1958), as Hareli and Weiner (2002) show.

A number of studies support claims that envy has a strong link with schadenfreude (Powell, Smith, & Schurtz, 2008). In one early study (Smith et al., 2006), we asked participants to watch a video interview of either an enviable (high GPA, notable wealth, and impressive achievements) or average student (average GPA, average financial situation, and unimpressive achievements) who described plans for applying to medical school. During a pause at the end of the interview, we assessed their affective reactions to the interview. At the end of the interview, an epilogue announced that the student had been arrested for stealing amphetamines from a research lab and therefore was compelled to delay his plans for medical school. Finally, we assessed their affective reactions a second time. As expected, participants reported that the misfortune befalling the enviable student was more pleasing than when it happened to the average student. Furthermore, the envy created by this manipulation (assessed during the pause in the interview and before the misfortune) mediated this effect. Finally, participants who reported higher scores on a measure of dispositional envy, completed before viewing the

interview, were more likely overall to find the misfortune pleasing. A second study (Brigham et al., 2007), using a similar methodology, replicated the effect for the envy manipulation. The study also showed that it occurred for both deserved and undeserved misfortunes. Thus, envious feelings were powerful enough to produce schadenfreude following a misfortune, even if the suffering person did not deserve the misfortune. Although these studies supported the importance of envy in explaining some instances of schadenfreude, the full empirical picture is mixed with some research adding further support (Van Dijk et al., 2005) and others failing to find support (Feather & Sherman, 2002; Hareli & Weiner, 2002). In a third study (Powell, 2009), we revisited the question of envy and schadenfreude. Participants read what they believed to be internet articles detailing interviews with fellow students. As in our earlier studies, the student's responses to interview questions were manipulated so that the student appeared either enviable or not. We also manipulated whether the student appeared likable or not, and we also manipulated whether the misfortune appeared deserved or not.

In-group inferiority. Leach et al. (2003) argued that schadenfreude is only evident when a third party or situation is the one that causes the misfortune, meaning that schadenfreude cannot occur if the pleasure is experienced when you are the cause of another person's misfortune. They suggest that schadenfreude should increase when an outer-group suffer misfortune in an area of high interest to the in-group members. They also delve into the idea that in-group inferiority will increase feelings of schadenfreude (Leach & Spears, 2009). (Mchikra et al., 2003) were successful in showing that when an individual felt more passionately about what formed the group (e.g. football) higher levels of schadenfreude were evoked when a third party suffered misfortune (e.g. lost a football match), and those who were less passionate, yet still were associated with the in-group had lesser feelings of schadenfreude. They were also able to demonstrate that schadenfreude was increased when feelings of in-group inferiority were experienced; however, this only affected those with lower interests (Leach et al., 2003). Chikara et al. (2011) also expressed that the threat to in-group inferiority and the increase in

schadenfreude to those with higher interests were not seen, as those who had higher interests were already experiencing higher levels of schadenfreude.

Personal gain (competition). Smith et al. (2009) argues that the emotion of schadenfreude can be a result of a personal gain. They liken this to competition, where when you or your team wins, you feel pleasure and this is ultimately in the suffering of the other team Chikara et al. (2011). This idea of competition is seen in other aspects of life, and more often in day to day situations. It is arguably under-appreciated as to how often schadenfreude appears in a competitive everyday situation (Smith, et al., 2009). For example, if you are up for a new job, there is most likely going to be more than one person up for the position, and if you are successful in the process, you will most likely feel joy. This feeling of schadenfreude is one that is less ugly compared to other feelings derived from other places such as envy. A competitive nature is somewhat highly regarded (as seen with our tendency to highlight sports, and sports people), and seen to be quite natural (Smith, et al., 2009).

Theories of Schadenfreude

Theories that have briefly explained the schadenfreude.

Social comparison theory. Schadenfreude has its roots in Social Comparison Theory (Festinger, 2017) which states that we evaluate our abilities and opinions by comparing our views with others, and that we want people in similar groups to like us, so will change our wants and beliefs to match theirs. Myers, (2014) also describes social comparison as evaluating our abilities and opinions by comparing ourselves to others. As schadenfreude is because a social comparison, where you are comparing yourself against the misfortune of someone else, you are forming an opinion or judging your own abilities on the others misfortune. This theory states that we feel bad when other people fair better than ourselves, an emotion that might have originally developed as a way to encourage progress as well as competition when we were still evolving. Many studies have shown

that people can become instantly less satisfied with their lot in life when they see other people who have more which may be one of the dangers of social networking.

It follows then that the reverse might also be true that you might feel better when someone around you suffers. Just as your lot in life seems less when someone gets more, it could also seem more when they get less and at the same time you might feel as though you're relative social status has risen. And in some cases we might actually stand to benefit directly from the misfortune of someone else. One study for instance looked at how the supporters of football teams would feel elation when their rivals did badly, but obviously in such scenarios they may also stand to gain as it clears the way in terms of competition. Many critique this theory for presuming that people always make rational decisions, and point out that this theoretical model fails to capture the power that emotions play in our daily lives and in our interactions with others. This theory also undercuts the power of social structures and forces, which unconsciously shape our perception of the world and our experiences within it, and play a strong role in shaping our interactions with others.

Attributional Styles

A person's attributional style, also known as their explanatory style, describes how they tend to, often unconsciously, explain various life events to them.

Attributions. When people make inferences about causes of their outcomes they make attributions (Harvey et al., 2014), which is considered to be subjective inferences and interpretations about what causes what Kelly (as cited in Hinderson 2016). Causal attributions are psychological concepts (Lee, Peterson, & Tiedens, 2003) that, among others, have been used in research about achievement motivation and clinical disorders (Corr & Gray, 1996). Information, the perceiver's belief and motivation affect attributions and these are called the antecedents of attributions. An individual's interest is also linked to the attribution process and a sense of competence, self-esteem and social

standing gets influenced by the attributions that individual make (Kelley & Michela, 2000).

Attributional styles are also termed as explanatory style (Peterson, & Seligman, 2001). Seligman introduced attributional style as a personality characteristic and found that individuals vulnerable to depression and individuals not vulnerable to depression differed in their causal judgments regarding bad and good events in their lives (Furnham et al., 2004). People who habitually interpreted the causes of negative events as global, internal and stable, meaning the causes will affect everything they do, it is their own fault, and the causes will last forever, felt more hopelessness compared to people who interpreted causes of negative events with the opposite styles. The test of explanatory style and of learned helplessness was later extended to performance in the workplace where the explanatory style of sales agents and its relationship to performance was studied. The result showed that sales agents who sold more and survived at a significant higher rate were those who made attributions that were external, unstable and specific instead of making the opposite attributions; internal, stable and global (Seligman & Schulman, 2014).

Attributional style is a measure of an individual's cognitive style and this style is related to both work related behaviors and work related attitudes (Furnham et al., 2000). (Silvester, Patterson, & Ferguson, 2003) mention that attributional styles differ from a conventional personality trait since they hold a core component that is cognitive. "Thus, an individual's cognitions, derived from past experience and acquired knowledge, are viewed as being equally important determinants of an individual's behavior as the personality traits that they were born with"(p.129).

Dimensions of Attributions

The constructs where by individuals differs on attributional styles and can be distinguished.

Locus of causality. Locus of causality shows if the perceived cause of an event is either external or internal (Harvey et al., 2014) and these dimensions are related to self-reflective emotions such as personal esteem and pride (Weiner, 2005). The locus of causality refers to the extent to which individuals perceive outcomes as something due to the self or due to external circumstances (Brewin & Furnham, 2001; Henry, 2005). Internality therefore refers to causes within an individual and externality to causes in the environment or situation (Haugen, & Lund, 2004). When the perceived cause reflects a person's characteristics such as ability or effort that person makes an internal attribution and when it reflects a situational factor, an external attribution is made. If a person, for example, misses a deadline and blame supervisors or coworkers this person has made an external attribution. If a person explains the missed deadline due to one's own lack of ability, or lack of effort, an internal attribution is made (Harvey et al., 2014).

Stability. The dimension stability refers to the time perspective (Henry, 2005) whether a cause of an event is transient or persistent (Lee et al., 2003) and whether a cause changes over time (Martinko & Gardner, 2004). It is about the perceived permanence or variability of a causal factor (Harvey et al., 2014). Explanations of causes that are stable could be that new training never interests the employees, whereas explanations of causes that are less stable and transient could be that the training sessions the last couple of times have been bad (Smith et al., 2013).

Control. Dimension control refers to whether an individual can influence the cause of an event or not (Lee et al., 2003) in other words, if the individual can control or not control the causes of an event (Campbell, & Martinko, 2002). Factors that are mostly perceived to be uncontrollable are task difficulty and luck, while factors that are considered controllable are effort, and in a smaller extent, the factor ability (Harvey et al., 2014).

Learning of Attributional Styles

Attributional styles learned from different sources majorly we learn attribution from our parents as after constant failures or punishment individuals have a risk of becoming passive and remain in a state called learned helplessness, which might make individuals think that it is impossible to improve performance. There are, however, some strategies for minimizing organizationally induced helplessness. Attributional training focus on attributions for performance and refers to directing attributions that are unrealistic towards more realistic ones. Attributional training can be seen as a type of counseling for the employees (Martinko & Gardner, 2002) and changing an attributional style or trying to adopt or encourage another way of thinking concerning explanations for events is referred to as attributional retraining (Hall et al., 2004).

Scholars in the organizational sciences have underutilized the attribution theory (Harvey et al., 2014) and the role of attributional styles has been paid little attention in occupational settings (Furnham, Sadka & Brewin 2002; Furnham, Brewin & O’Kelly, 2004). During the last decades there have been very few empirical studies that have investigated the association between success in organizations and attributional styles (Smith, Caputi & Crittenden, 2013) and research about attributional processes has not focused on the impact of the organizational environment (Bitter & Gardner, 2005). Also, most of the articles that have been published about the attribution theory are in the psychology field and not in the organizational field and therefore, when it comes to the application of attribution theory to the organizational field, studies that have been published only represent the tip of the iceberg (Dasborough, Harvey & Martinko, 2011).

Partly as a consequence of early criticism, the attribution theory has not commonly been applied to organizational behavior (Martinko, Harvey, & Dasborough, 2011). These criticisms concern that attributional processes are cognitively demanding (Lord & Smith, 2006) and that leader’s behaviors are influenced by several factors and not just by their attributions, meaning that attributions play a smaller role (Mitchell, 2004). These criticisms, in the context of research about attributional styles, have

however been shown to be incorrect (Martinko et al., 2011). With this said, attributional styles in an organizational context seem to be a research area that needs more attention.

Research about attributions has illustrated, in numerous reviews that attributions matter in the working life (Harvey et al., 2014). Several organizational scholars argue that attributional processes are vital explanatory constructs when it comes to people's behaviors in organizations (Dasborough et al., 2011) and a variety of workplace behaviors can be explained through attributional processes (Martinko et al., 2011). Research has shown that an individual's aggression is influenced by how that individual attribute (Brees, Mackey & Martinko, 2013) and that attributional styles are associated to an individual's behaviors, expectancies and emotions (Martinko, Moss, Douglas & Borkowski, 2007). Attributions help people adapt their behaviors and people can take more powerful actions when the attributions are clearer (Martinez, Martinko & Ferris, 2012). Furnham et al. (2002) mention further that since expectations and perceptions in relation to some attributional styles lead to different work behaviors, which lead to success, it seems probable that this helps preserve the attributions.

Survival, as in how long a person stays in an organization and production can be predicted by the attributional style (Seligman & Schulman, 2006). Furthermore, it has also been shown that performance can be predicted by the attributional style (Corr & Gray, 2000). A person's motivation is also affected by that person's attributional style (Xenikou & Furnham, 2000) and therefore attributions play a central part in the motivation process (Martinko et al., 2011). Erroneous attributions to ability factors can cause people with low self-efficacy unnecessary loss of motivation and anxieties that might harm their performances (Silver, Mitchell & Gist, 2003). An individual's motivation, performance and achievement striving can also decrease if poor performance is attributed to an unchangeable lack of ability that is uncontrollable and stable, since this might trigger feelings of shame and hopelessness (Hall, Hladkyj, Perry & Ruthig, 2004). Corr and Gray (2004) mention further that in professions that are motivationally challenging, attributional styles are especially important. So by knowing that attributional

styles might be important for organizations and why it might be important this leads to the question if individuals' way of attributing can be shaped within an organizational context.

Attribution styles are stable, trait-like tendencies to make certain types of attributions that affect behaviors across situations" (Martinko et al., 2011, p.145). In other words, attributional style is seen as a personality characteristic (Martinko, Harvey, Sikora & Douglas, 2011). Despite this, people's organizational attributional style is said to vary over time, but over short periods of time, they are stable enough to be constructs that can be measured (Kent & Martinko, 2005). Attributional styles can also change and become rather unstable during long periods of time due to frequent failures, obstacles and changes at the workplace (Furnham et al., 2002).

Ashforth and Fugate. (2006) mention further that attributional style regarding achievement might be strongly associated to promotion possibilities. Furnham et al. (2002) also mention that the norms regarding behavior and the formal structure in an organization might moderate the association between attributional styles and employees' work behaviors. At the same time, Smith et al. (2013) mention that measures of attributional styles could be used for development of existing employees. With this said it seems like individuals' way of attributing can be shaped within an organizational context.

Ashforth and Fugate (2006) suggest that further research could focus on attributional styles development in work contexts, such as, in what way can leadership practices, reward systems, socializations processes and group dynamics help shape attributional styles within an organizational context. With this said, there seems to be a need for more knowledge concerning what can shape or develop attributional styles within a work setting. Since other authors have thought about leadership practices as something that might help shape individuals' way of attributing it would be interesting to investigate how the organizational factor, leadership style, is related to employees' attributional styles.

Theories of Attribution Styles

Theories related to the attributional styles are given below.

Attribution style theory. How do we attach meaning to other's behavior, or our own? This is called attribution theory Heider (as cited in Devil, 2017). For example, is someone angry because they are bad-tempered or because something bad happened.

Attribution theory deals with how the social perceiver uses information to arrive at causal explanations for events. They examine, what information is gathered, how it is combined to form a causal judgment” (Fiske & Taylor, 2001). Attribution theory is concerned with how and why ordinary people explain events as they do. Heider (as cited in Blaski, 2017) believed that people are naive psychologists trying to make sense of the social world. People tend to see cause and affect relationships, even where there is none! Heider didn't so much develop a theory himself as emphasize certain themes that others took up. There were two main ideas that he put forward that became influential.

Internal attribution. The process of assigning the cause of behavior to some internal characteristic, rather than to outside forces. When we explain the behavior of others we look for enduring internal attributions, such as personality traits. For example, we attribute the behavior of a person to their personality, motives or beliefs. When we use internal attribution we infer that a person is behaving in a certain way or than an event is due to factors related to the person. The factors in case such as traits, abilities, feelings and attitudes. (Fiske & Taylor, 2001)

The assumption here is that individual is directly blamed for the event or behavior. Another term internal attribution is dispositional attribution.

Suppose that you tried to explain your car situation to the tow truck driver using internal attributions. You might explain him that you knew better than to driver in the rain but did it away. You're driving way too fast for those conditions and it was your fault that the vehicle veered off the road.

External attribution. The process of assigning the cause of behavior to some situation or event outside a person's control rather than to some internal characteristic. Ashforth and Fugate (2006). When we try to explain our own behavior we tend to make external attributions, such as situational or environment features. When we use external attributions, we infer that a person is behaving in a certain way or that an event is due to the situation that they are in. There is the assumption that given the same situation, others would most likely respond in the exact same way. Because of its dependence on situational factors, external attribution is also called 'situational attribution.

Suppose that you tried to explain your car situation to the tow truck driver using external attributions. You would explain to him that the amount of water on the roads caused your tires to lose traction. You would likely blame the rain and the age of your tires as the reasons that you were stranded in the grass.

Jones and Davis correspondent inference theory. Jones and Davis (as cited in Dewil, 2017) thought that people pay particular attention to intentional behavior (as opposed to accidental or unthinking behavior).

This theory helps us understand the process of making an internal attribution. They say that we tend to do this when we see a correspondence between motive and behavior. For example, when observe a correspondence behaving someone in a friendly way and being a friendly person. Dispositional (internal) attributions provide us with information from which we can make predictions about a person's future behavior. The correspondent inference theory describes the conditions under which we make dispositional attributes to behavior we perceive as intentional. Davis used the term correspondent inference to refer to an occasion when an observer infers that a person's behavior matches or corresponds with their personality. It is an alternative term to dispositional attribution. So what leads us to make a correspondent inference? According to this theory we draw on five sources of information. Firstly choice if a behavior is freely chosen it is believed to be due to internal (dispositional) factors. Secondly, accidental vs. intentional behavior that is intentional is likely to be attributed to the

person's personality, and behavior which is accidental is likely to be attributed to situation or external causes. Thirdly, social desirability behaviors low in socially desirability (non-conforming) lead us to make (internal) dispositional inferences more than socially undesirable behaviors. For example, if you observe a person getting on a bus and sitting on the floor instead of one of the seats. This behavior has low social desirability (non-conforming) and is likely to correspond with the personality of the individual. Fourthly, hedonistic relevance if the other person's behavior appears to be directly intended to benefit or harm us. Fifth, personalism if the other person's behavior appears to be intended to have an impact on us, we assume that it is "personal", and not just a by-product of the situation we are both in.

Kelley's covariation model. Kelley's (as cited in Hall, 2015) covariation model is the best known attribution theory. Kelly developed a logical model for judging whether a particular action should be attributed to some characteristic (internal) of the person or the environment (external).

The term covariation simply means that a person has information from multiple observations, at different times and situations, and can perceive the covariation of an observed effect and its causes. It was stated that trying to discover the causes of behavior people act like scientists. More specifically they take into account three kinds of evidence. Kelley believed that there were three types of causal information which influenced our judgments. Low factors person (i.e. internal) attribution. High factors situational (i.e. external) attribution. Consensus the extent to which other people behaves in the same way in a similar situation. For example, Alison smokes a cigarette when she goes out for a meal with her friend. If her friend smokes, her behavior is high in consensus. If only Alison smokes it is low. Distinctiveness the extent to which the person behaves in the same way in similar situations. If Alison only smokes when she is out with friends, her behavior is high in distinctiveness. If she smokes at any time or place, distinctiveness is low. Consistency the extent to which the person behaves like this every

time the situation occurs. If Alison only smokes when she is out with friends, consistency is high. If she only smokes on one special occasion, consistency is low.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ (as cited in Alexa, 2016) defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as “contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that support task performance”. Over the past decade, the definition has sharpened to refer to specific forms of beneficial, extra role behavior, especially helping coworkers (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000) while empirical research has clarified the nature and antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Implicit to this research has been the premise that organizational citizenship behavior improves work group performance (Bateman and Organ, 2012). Even fewer have examined contingency factors in this relationship (Organ, 2000; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 2015), despite growing evidence of divergent relationships between organizational citizenship behavior and group performance outcomes (Bachrach, Powell, Collins, & Richey, 2006; Naumann & Bennett, 2002; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 2000). For example, research has reported relationships between organizational citizenship behavior and team performance ranging from in bank branches (Naumann & Bennett, 2002) in military units (Ehrhart, Bliese, and Thomas, 2006). These findings are consistent with laboratory results reported by (Bachrach et al., 2006), of no monotonic relationships between helping behavior and group performance. Inconsistent findings regarding relationships of organizational citizenship behavior and group performance may reflect contingency factors, such as task interdependence, which influence the degree to which group performance calls for coordinated interactions among members (Guzzo, & Shea, 2002). Contingency factors can shape the task context and may be fundamental to understanding the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and performance (Organ et al., 2006).

Organizational citizenship behaviors may detract from group performance in task-independent groups by diverting team members' time from their independent task work (Bergeron, 2007). In the present study, we sought to test hypotheses regarding conditions under which organizational citizenship behavior has its putative group-level performance benefits, building on recent ideas from resource-based theory applied to organizational citizenship behavior, and research speaking to conditions under which organizational citizenship behavior may detract from group-level performance. Advances in resource allocation theory have extended this framework beyond the individual allocation of attention in performing tasks Hockey (2007), to individual allocation of time, to task activities versus citizenship behavior (Bergeron, 2007). We extend this analysis to group performance, which earlier research has linked to organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000). We focus on a key factor in whether organizational citizenship behavior may foster or hinder group performance: task interdependence, defined as the extent to which successful group performance depends on inter-member coordination (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 2003; Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne, 2003). Task interdependence reflects interrelated roles, technology requirements, and work constraints (Van der Vegt & Van de Vliert, 2005).

Citizenship is "more important in jobs where people work in groups, need to coordinate their activities, or are interdependent with each other than in jobs where people work independently or as individual contributors" (Organ et al., 2006: 193). When group members rely on one another to complete their tasks, organizational citizenship behaviors become integrated into work processes Organ (as cited in Peter, 2006). Instead of detracting from task work, employees who perform organizational citizenship behaviors in task-interdependent groups may improve their groups' processes. When work requires ongoing coordination, organizational citizenship behaviors represent appropriate investments of resources likely to improve group performance. Independent tasks, by definition, do not require coordination. In brief, our team-level resource allocation framework suggests that devoting resources, such as time, to organizational citizenship behaviors boosts group performance when it aids inter member teamwork in

groups with interdependent tasks and detracts from group performance when it diverts resources from individual task work in groups with independent tasks. Organizational citizenship behavior has been shown to have a positive impact on employee performance and wellbeing, and this in turn has noticeable flow-on effects on the organization.

Empirical studies showed that attributional styles moderate between organizational citizenship behavior and job stress (Organ, as cited in Peter, 2006). There is empirical evidence for the widely-held belief that satisfied workers perform better, but this is correlational, not causal. However, certain types of performance primarily those related to citizenship behavior will be affected by job satisfaction. Think of workers who are cooperative with their superiors and colleagues, willing to make compromises and sacrifices and are 'easier to work with, workers who 'help out with the extra little things' without complaining (or even offering to do so without being asked) these behaviors are all encompassed within organizational citizenship behavior.

The effects on employee performance are threefold. Firstly, workers who engage in organizational citizenship behavior tend to receive better performance ratings by their managers (Podsakoff et al., 2009). This could be because employees who engage in organizational citizenship behavior are simply liked more and perceived more favorably (this has become known as the 'halo effect'), or it may be due to more work-related reasons such as the manager's belief that organizational citizenship behavior plays a significant role in the organization's overall success, or perception of organizational citizenship behavior as a form of employee commitment due to its voluntary nature (Organ et al., 2006). Regardless of the reason, the second effect is that a better performance rating is linked to gaining rewards (Podsakoff et al., 2009) such as pay increments, bonuses, promotions or work-related benefits. Thirdly, because these employees have better performance ratings and receive greater rewards, when the company is downsizing e.g. during an economic recession, these employees will have a lower chance of being made redundant (Organ et al., 2006).

How do these effects translate to organizational level outcomes? Organizational citizenship behavior is linked to lower rates of employee turnover and absenteeism, but on the organizational level increased productivity, efficiency and customer satisfaction, as well as reduced costs, have also been observed (Podsakoff et al., 2009). One study on organizational citizenship behavior in grocery stores or supermarkets reports that “organizational citizenship behavior explained approximately 20% of the variance in store profitability” (Ehrhart, 2004, p. 64).

Theories of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Theories that have explained the organizational citizenship behavior.

Regulatory focus theory. According to regulatory focus theory, a promotion focus lends itself to high achievement levels, while a prevention focus lends itself to high levels of duty and resources can be allocated toward attaining achievements (i.e. promotion focus) and or to accomplish job duties (i.e. prevention focus; Wallace & Chen, 2006). Therefore, it is likely that a promotion focus will lead to higher engagement of change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior as the successful engagement in organizational change will likely lead to more accomplishments and gains. However, it is unlikely that a prevention focus will positively lead to engagement in change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior, but rather will deter it, because implication on organizational change is not a prescribed job duty, and such engagement can be perceived as risky. Individuals with a prevention focus may prefer deploy resources toward their prescribed job duties, rather than engage in processes of organizational change. Furthermore, a proactive attitude toward organizational change will conflict with a prevention focus when the role of the incumbent in the organization is not directly related to organizational change. Therefore, we expect that a promotion focus will positively relate to change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior.

The relationship between prevention focus and change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior is expected to be negative, as none of the targets of change-oriented

organizational citizenship behavior are prescribed as a job duty. In sum, as regulatory focus concerns the enactment of behaviors in pursuit of a goal, we propose that an individual goal of maximizing achievement leads promotion-focused individuals to spend effort on change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior, in an attempt to be successful without regard to the commitment of errors. On the other hand, prevention-focused individuals, in their efforts to be vigilant and accurate in their task performance, focus on the duty and responsibility of the work tasks. This focus on avoiding errors of commission in task performance leaves little time and few resources available for extra-role behaviors.

Social exchange theory. Social exchange theory is a model for interpreting society as a series of interactions between people that are based on estimates of rewards and punishments. According to this view, our interactions are determined by the rewards or punishments that we expect to receive from others, which we evaluate using a cost-benefit analysis model whether consciously or subconsciously.

Central to the social exchange theory is the idea that an interaction that elicits approval from another person is more likely to be repeated than an interaction that elicits disapproval. We can thus predict whether a particular interaction will be repeated by calculating the degree of reward (approval) or punishment (disapproval) resulting from the interaction. If the reward for an interaction exceeds the punishment, then the interaction is likely to occur or continue.

While social exchange theory is found in economics and psychology, it was first developed by the sociologist George Homans (2000). Later, sociologists Peter and Emerson further developed the theory.

Social exchange theory, however, highlights some subtle complications that compromise relationships. For example, if individuals help someone else, they expect a favor in return that is comparable to the cost, effort, or inconvenience of this act. In contrast, if individuals receive assistance, they return a favor that is comparable to the

benefit or gain they enjoyed as consequence of this act--almost regardless of the cost or inconvenience (Zhang & Epley, 2009).

This principle can elicit resentment in relationships. If individuals offer support that was very inconvenient to them, but not especially beneficial to the other person, they will expect a major favor, but receive a trivial favor, in return. They will, thus, tend to experience a sense of resentment, which can compromise the stability and trust of their relationship with this person.

In short, social exchanges are sometimes perceived as unjust by one or both parties. Benefactors, for example, might feel their assistance was not reciprocated sufficiently. Such perceived inequities can elicit conflict (Sulthana, 1987), emotional distress (Bakker, Schaufeli, Sixma, Bosveld, & van Dierendonck, 2000), or physical illness (Siegist, 2005).

Role identity theory. Tajfel's (as cited in Hall 2017) greatest contribution to psychology was social identity theory. Social identity is a person's sense of who they are based on their group membership. Tajfel (as cited in Van 2017) proposed that the groups (e.g. social class, family, football team etc.) which people belonged to were an important source of pride and self-esteem. Groups give us a sense of social identity: a sense of belonging to the social world. In order to increase our self-image we enhance the status of the group to which we belong, for example, England is the best country in all over the world! We can also increase our self-image by discriminating and holding prejudice views against the out group (the group we do not belong to). Therefore, we divided the world into them and us based through a process of social categorization (i.e. we put people into social groups). This is known as in-group (us) and out-group (them). Social identity theory states that the in-group will discriminate against the out-group to enhance their self-image.

The central hypothesis of social identity theory is that group members of an in-group will seek to find negative aspects of an out-group, thus enhancing their self-image.

Prejudiced views between cultures may result in racism; in its extreme forms, racism may result in genocide, such as occurred in Germany with the Jews, in Rwanda between the Hutus and Tutsis and, more recently, in the former Yugoslavia between the Bosnians and Serbs. Depending on the situation or the need of the group, roles can and do change. While most people understand the more visible roles, like that of a leader, there are a variety of other roles that are present that come to light depending on the situation at hand. At times, a group needs to have people fill all or some of these roles so the group can actually function.

For instance, there is a role called the shaper. This person pushes the group towards decision-making, and he or she likes to remove barriers and embrace challenges. A shaper is not always needed in a group, but if the group starts to struggle without making decisions or with making decisions, a shaper can help get them to an end result.

There is also a role called the resource investigator. These people are typically good communicators and are fairly strong at negotiating for resources. In this role, if the team has resources at its disposal but suddenly realizes they need additional or alternate resources, the resource investigator is the person that can help with that. If we take a moment to think about it, not every person has the skill set needed to accomplish this role. Even a leader, while potentially charismatic and visionary, may not have the negotiating skills needed to bring the additional resources to the team. Thus, as the needs of the group change, this role will become more and more vital.

Predictors of organizational citizenship behavior

Schadenfreude and attributional styles predict the organizational citizenship as schadenfreude is negatively associated with organizational citizenship behavior it predicts organizational citizenship behavior in a sense if individual possess more schadenfreude behavior that will be less in organizational citizenship behavior. Attributional style plays a moderator role between schadenfreude and organizational citizenship behavior, internal attributional style is positively linked with the

organizational citizenship behavior and external attributional is positively linked with schadenfreude and negatively with the organizational citizenship behavior. Less in organizational citizenship behavior can be a cause of the job stress and job withdrawal. More in organizational citizenship behavior can leads towards job satisfaction.

The assumption that organizational citizenship behaviors contribute to the effectiveness of work teams and organizations has only recently been tested empirically. Perhaps the first person to explore this issue was Karambayya (2000), who examined the relation between work unit performance and satisfaction and unit members' citizenship behaviorism a sample of eighteen intact work groups, comprised primarily of white-collar and Professional employees from twelve different organizations. In her study, she obtained performance ratings for the work units from key division and department heads, employee organizational citizenship behavior ratings from supervisors, and self-reports of satisfaction from employees. Consistent with her expectations, she found that employees in high performing work units were more satisfied and exhibited more citizenship behaviors than employees in low-performing work units. However, despite Karambayya's (2000) relatively encouraging findings, there are some limitations to her study. First, Karambayya's (2000) measures were subjective ratings provided by key informants in each of twelve different organizations, rather than quantitative indices of work unit or organizational success. Thus, although she observed a relation between organizational citizenship behaviors and subjective ratings of unit performance, the question of whether organizational citizenship behaviors influence objective unit performance remains unanswered. For example, the strength of the relation between citizenship behavior and performance may be influenced by the key informants' implicit theories (Berman & Kenny, 2000; Bruner & Tagiuri, 2004) of the relation between these two constructs. Second, because Karambayya had different raters evaluating performance in each of the twelve organizations in her sample, we do not know whether the measurement metric used by all of the raters was the same. Because it is likely that the organizations differed in their products, services, corporate cultures, and standards, it seems questionable that the same measurement metric would have been used by all raters. Third, as noted by

Bagozzi, Yi, and Phillips (2003), measurement error can sometimes be quite high in key informant reports. Finally, although Karambayya (2000) identified two groups of work units and labeled eleven of them as "high" and seven of them as "low" performing units, there is really no assurance that the two groups did not differ on other factors as well. Thus, although Kararnbayya's (2000) results were promising, they were far from conclusive.

Rationale of the present Study

For the improvement of the any organization, the behavior of the employees plays an important role. Every employee has its own unique behaviors and also poor behaviors. Furthermore, it also depends on the individual what he or she is going to offer for the organization either the good behaviors or the sick behaviors. Poor behaviors are very perilous for the organization and employees working in that organization. In my study my schadenfreude which is also a type of sick behavior and can be considered a threat for the progress the progress of the organization and the employees working in that organization. On the other hand attributional styles plays a mediator role in between schadenfreude and organizational citizenship behavior, schadenfreude is positively associated with the external attributional styles and organizational citizenship behavior is positively linked with the internal attributions. Organizational citizenship behavior is a unique behavior and has a very positive affect on the employees working in the organization.

Every organization motto is to improve the business and business can be improved by making the employees' behavior unique and helpful. These types of sick behaviors is mostly seen in the telecommunication and research organizations, because the most of the task of that organization are group work and in the group works coordination is must and such type of ill behaviors are threats for coordination.

This study aims to create awareness among employees how to behave in group work and also there is need to study the role of schadenfreude and attributional styles in organizational citizenship behavior in organization.

Chapter II**METHOD****Objectives**

1. To determine the relationship of schadenfreude and attributional styles in organizational citizenship behavior among employees.
2. To establish the role of varying demographics (gender, age, education, job experience, job designation) in relation to major construct of the study.

Hypotheses

1. Schadenfreude is positively linked with the external attributional style and negatively associated with internal attributional style.
2. Schadenfreude is negatively related with the organizational citizenship behavior.
3. External attributional style is negatively linked with organizational citizenship behavior and internal attributional style is positively related with organizational citizenship behavior.
4. Male employees are more inclined towards schadenfreude and lesser towards the organizational citizenship behavior as compare to the female employees. Male employees are more inclined towards the external attributional style and lesser towards internal attributional style as compare to the female employees.
5. Employees with more job experience are likely to experience more schadenfreude and lesser organizational citizenship behavior as compare to newer employees. Experienced employees are more externally attributed as compare to new employees and new employees are more internally attributed as compare to experienced employees.

Operational Definitions of Variables

In the present research, the variables taken are operationally defined as follow:

Schadenfreude. Schadenfreude directs the feelings and emotions of pleasure and satisfaction on others bad sufferings. In the current study, schadenfreude was assessed by the Schadenfreude Scale. High scores on the scale indicate high level of schadenfreude (Feather, 2006).

Attributional Style. Attributional styles can be defined as the individual's perception of causations that is his explanation why the events have taken place. Individual's beliefs about their success and failures (Martinko et al., 2007). Two subscales of the attributional style internal attributional style and external attributional style. In the current study attributional styles were evaluated by the Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson et al., 2002). High scores show more external attributions.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Organizational citizenship behaviors direct those behaviors which are more than the documented requirements of the job. It helps in maintaining the supportive and friendly behavior Organ (2006).

Research Design

The present study is a correlational cross sectional research. Survey method is used for data collection and analyses are quantitative in nature.

Sample

Purposive convenient sampling technique was used in the study for data collection. Data was collected from the employees working in the research organization and telecommunication companies working in the Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Total participants who participate with me were 300 from which 118 from research organizations and 182 from telecommunication companies. Participants were from both public and private organization, public ($n = 122$) and private ($n =$

178). Gender wise male ($n = 160$) and female ($n = 140$). Education level of the participants included from graduation ($n = 74$), masters ($n = 178$), M.Phil. ($n = 48$). The job designations were mostly managerial ($n = 66$), research ($n = 120$) and call center ($n = 114$). The job experience of these employees ranges from 1-10 years.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample (N = 300)

Demographics	f	%
Age (years)		
20-30	152	50.6
31-40	116	38.6
41-50	32	10.6
Gender		
Male	160	53.3
Female	140	46.6
Education		
Graduation	74	24.6
Masters	178	59.3
M.Phil.	48	16
Type of Organization		
Public	122	40.6
Private	178	59.3
Job Designation		
Managerial	66	22
Research	120	40
Call Centers	114	38
Job Experience		
1-5	202	67.3
6-10	98	32.6

In the table 1 demographic variables have been exhibited by their frequency and percentage. These variables include age, gender, education, organizational type, job designation and job experience.

Instruments

A brief description of the three scales used to measure the variables in the present study is given below.

Schadenfreude Scale. Schadenfreude scale was developed by Batool (2013). It consist on 25 items and is a five- point Likert scale in which 1= Never, 2= Rare, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often and 5= Always. All the items of the scale are positively worded. The minimum score on the scale is 25 and the highest score is 125. High scores on the scale show that individual is schadenfroh Alpha reliability the author obtained of the scale is .91. Batool (2013).

Attributional Style Questionnaire. Attributional Style was measured with attributional style questionnaire (Peterson et al., 1982). It poses 12 hypothetical situations. 6 situations are of good achievements and other 6 for bad. The response for the each question is internal and external. Higher ratings refer more external and lower rating refers more internal.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. In the current study organizational citizenship behavior scale developed by the Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) was used. The scale consists of 24 items. It is 5 point Likert scale ratings from 1(*strongly disagree*), 2 (*disagree*), 3(*neutral*), 4(*agree*), 5(*strongly agree*). Minimum score on the scale is 24 and maximum will be 120.

Consent form. An informed consent form about detailed information about the voluntary nature of participants, right to quit at any time, anonymity, and confidentiality of data was provided. Willingness to participate and instructions to read carefully and fill out the scale genuinely was given. It was assured that the

information provided by the participants would be reserved off the record and will only be used for the purpose of research. (See appendix-I)

Demographic sheet. To explore various important demographic variables e.g. age, education, family system, working status, monthly income and marital duration, a detailed and comprehensive demographic sheet was devised. (See appendix-II)

Procedure

Data was collected by following proper channels. All the related organizations with my sample were requested to permit me for the data collection. For collection from the research organization all the directors of the research organizations were approached and CEOs of the telecommunication companies were approached. After the permission for the data collection all the participants was briefly oriented by me about the aims and objectives of the current study. After that all the participants were approached individually and requested to participate in the study. They were guaranteed that all the information would be kept confidential and would be only used for the research purpose only. They were informed that you have full right to withdraw from the questionnaire administration at any stage. Verbal instructions were given during questionnaire administration where needed. At last they were thanked with smile for their help support and participation.

Chapter III

RESULTS

In this chapter results of the study, the role of schadenfreude and attributional styles in organizational citizenship behavior in an organization are discussed. All the results are presented in the tabulated form because the study is based on the empirical data. The statistical analysis consists of descriptive and inferential statistics. In descriptive statistics it includes mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, range and Cronbach alpha. whereas in inferential statistics Pearson Product Moment Correlation, t-test, and ANOVA were included. All these analysis were conducted to analyze the hypothesis of the study.

Table 2

Reliability coefficient and Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (N=300)

Scales	No. of Items	α	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Range	
							Potential	Actual
SS	25	.81	65.05	18.49	.50	-.44	25-125	40-95
IAS	6	.79	8.00	1.21	.37	.14	6-12	8-10
EAS	6	.75	8.53	1.25	.32	.25	6-12	7-11
OCB	24	.84	82.53	17.34	-.85	.06	24-120	54-102

Note. SS= Schadenfreude Scale, IAS= Internal Attributional Styles Sub-scale, EAS= External Attributional styles Sub-scale, OCBS = Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale.

Table 2 illuminates descriptive, alpha-coefficient, skewness, and kurtosis of the Schadenfreude, Attributional Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The alpha reliability of all the scales and subscales are good that shows that all the scales are reliable. Means and standard deviation are also given in the above Table. The values of

skewness and kurtosis indicate that scores are normally distributed because the values are between -1 to +1 (George, & Mallory, 2010). Furthermore the range, potential and actual is also given; the potential directs the possible low scores and possible high scores on each scale, however actual range directs to the highest and lowest scores obtained by the participants in the current study.

Table 3

Correlation between Schadenfreude, Internal Attributional Styles, External Attributional Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (N=300).

Variables	SF	IAS	EAS	OCB
SF	-	-.27*	.32*	-.41*
IAS			-.61*	.37*
EAS				-.29*
OCB				-

*Note. SS= Schadenfreude Scale, IAS= Internal Attributional Styles Sub-scale, EAS= External Attributional styles Sub-scale, OCBS = Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale. *p<.001*

Table 3 shows the correlation between schadenfreude, internal attributional styles, external attributional styles and organizational citizenship behavior. Schadenfreude has significant negative relationship with internal attributional style and significant positive association with external attributional style. Internal attributional style has negative relationship with the external attributional style. The relationship between schadenfreude and organizational citizenship behavior is significant negative. Organizational citizenship behavior is positively related with internal attributional style and negatively associated with external attributional style.

Table 4*Group Differences along Gender on Study Variables (N=300)*

Variables	Male (n =160)		Female (n = 140)		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95%CI	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				LL	UL
SF	71.28	10.33	68.20	9.07	5.11	.00	.41	2.67	5.48
IAS	9.35	3.24	7.21	2.00	4.88	.00	.38	-1.21	-0.78
EAS	10.47	3.71	8.44	2.05	4.33	.00	.36	0.85	0.91
OCB	81.53	15.32	78.19	14.57	5.26	.00	.47	-1.49	-0.88

Note. SF = Schadenfreude, IAS = Internal Attributional Style, EAS = External Attributional Style, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Table 4 shows gender differences in relation to study variables. Results showed that male employees reflected more schadenfreude as compare to the female employees. Men express more internal attributional style as compare to the female employees, whereas female employees indicated more external attribution style. On the other hand, female employees showed more helping behavior in an organization as compared to the male employees

Table 5

Group Difference the Type of Organization on Study Variable (N=300).

Variables	Private (n = 178)		Public (n = 122)		t	p	95%CL		Cohen 's d
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
SF	62.57	18.30	68.67	18.25	2.84	.05	1.48	4.23	.34
IAS	7.79	1.13	8.27	1.27	3.46	.01	-0.98	-0.04	.37
EAS	8.46	1.24	8.63	1.27	1.20	.23	-1.11	0.91	.10
OCB	85.30	17.51	78.49	16.34	3.36	.01	0.57	2.36	.35

Note. SF = Schadenfreude, IAS = Internal Attributional Style, EAS = External Attributional Style, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Table 5 shows that employees of the public organizations are more inclined towards the schadenfreude and low in the organizational citizenship behavior and as compared to the employees of the private organizations. On the other hand, public organization employees reflected more internal attribution style as compare to the employees of the private organization. However, non-significant differences are found on external attributional style

Table 6

Group Differences of Job Experience on Study Variable (N=300).

Variables	Job exp:(1-5 years) (n = 202)		Job exp: (6-10 years) (n = 98)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CL		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			LL	UL	
	SF	66.89	10.41	61.26			9.66	5.49	
IAS	7.88	1.22	8.22	1.17	1.76	.11	-1.37	1.29	.14
EAS	8.51	1.32	8.57	1.13	1.19	.45	-0.12	0.75	.10
OCB	81.55	10.32	84.55	9.22	4.37	.01	-2.68	-0.18	.34

Note. SF = Schadenfreude, IAS = Internal Attributional Style, EAS = External Attributional Style, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Group I = 1-5 years, Group II = 6-10 years.

Table 6 shows that employees having less job experience reflected more schadenfreude as compare to the employees who have more job experiences. In relation to attributional styles there is non-significant difference on internal attributional style and external attributional style between the two groups. The employees who have more job experience are more inclined to express helping behavior as compare to the employees who less job experience.

Table 7

Group Differences Across Education on Study Variable (N=300).

Variables	Graduation (n = 74)		Masters (n = 178)		M.Phil. (n = 48)		F	P	i-j	D =i-j	95% CL	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD					LL	UL
	SF	62.30	9.71	59.48	10.36	67.10					9.42	8.17
IAS	7.01	2.22	9.30	1.55	11.63	2.02	5.62	.00	3>1,2 2>1	4.6,2.3 2.2	7.85	8.13
EAS	10.52	2.66	8.72	2.94	7.10	2.35	4.23	.01	1>2,3	1.8,3.4	8.39	8.62
OCB	77.77	9.63	79.65	10.45	81.80	9.18	6.71	.00	3>1,2 2>1	4.0,2.1, 1.8	80.5	84.5

Note. SF = Schadenfreude, IAS = Internal Attributional Style, EAS = External Attributional Style, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Table 7 shows that the employees who have lowest education are more inclined to express higher schadenfreude and external attributional style as compare to those who have higher education. On the other hand, those employees who have highest education reflected more internal attributional style and organizational citizenship behavior as compare to those employees who have lowest education.

Chapter IV

DISCUSSION

The objective of the present study was to study the role of schadenfreude and attributional styles in organizational citizenship behavior among the employees. For this purpose the employees of the research organizations and telecommunication companies were selected as a sample of the study. Sample was selected according to the convenience of the study variables in both types of organizations. The instruments were used in the study was Schadenfreude Scale (Batool, 2013), Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson et al., 1982) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Organ 1988). The reliability of the instruments is good and it shows that instruments are reliable and dependable measures of the related constructs.

Findings showed that schadenfreude is negatively associated with the organizational citizenship behavior among the employees of the research and telecommunication organization. Although the same relation have been obtained in the earlier studies as established by Organ et al. (2006). Social exchange theory (Festinger, 2017) also supports that in interpersonal relationships; people believe in the give and take respect. In the organization, employees have different type of nature and thoughts. Many of the employees are non-cooperative while, others are soft hearted. Those employees who do not cooperate are very serious threats for the other employees working in the organization because they create hurdles and hindrances in the work of other employees and those who are soft hearted are so cooperative and have higher organizational citizenship behavior.

Results also showed that schadenfreude is negatively associated with the internal attributional styles and positively linked with the external attributional styles or external locus of control. This relation is also supported by the social exchange theory. Ashforth and Fugate (2006) those employees who have high schadenfreude do not blame self for their own mistakes and failure but they always blames or external factors for their failure

and mistakes. On the other hand those who have less schadenfreude do not blame external factors for their own failure and mistakes. Earlier studies as (Wong & Weiner, 1981) have also supported this relation. In another study by (Mitchel & James, 2001) also found that schadenfreude is negatively associated with the internal attributional style and positively associated with the external attributional style.

Findings also showed that organizational citizenship behavior is negatively associated with the external attribution style and positively associated with internal attribution style. Prior studies also indicated that organizational citizenship behavior is positively associated with internal attributional style and negatively associated with external attributional style (Martinko et al., 2006). Those employees who mostly blame others for their failure and mistakes they can't be helpful for other colleagues. Ashforth and Fugate (2006) in this study the same results have been obtained that mostly employees for good achievements crushes the rights of the others and in that case schadenfreude employees are threats for the other employees.

Results showed that males are more schadenfroh and externally attributed as compare to females. Furthermore, females have more helping behavior so that they are more internally attributed. (Monin, 2007), these results also obtained in this study that by nature females are more sensitive as compare to the males so they have more helping behavior. Due to high emotionality they are more internally attributed. In the prior studies same results have been proved such as (Frijda, 2016). In the elementary schools most of the females works because they have soft nature as compare to the males. If we see in the hospitals mostly in the nursing staff most of the employees are female because they have low schadenfreude and high helping behavior because of the soft nature (Monin, 2007).

Findings showed that employees of the public organization are more schadenfroh and have less helping behavior as compare to the private organizations employees. Public organizations employees are more schadenfroh less helping because of the following reasons, structure of the organizations, management of the organizations, organizational politics, working environment and task orientation. These all factors can

affect the behavior of the employees. Public organizations are not well organized in these factors. The past study (Bergeron, 2007) have showed that private employees have more well managed work environment and also there is less organizational politics as compare to the public organizations.

Results show that employees with less experience have more schadenfreude behavior and less organizational citizenship behavior. Experience has a very important role in the life, through experience we learn many skills (such as time management, dealings and working styles) and that skills set out our behaviors which we show in the environment. In the prior studies these results have been proved. In the prior study (Sieggest, 2005) had also showed that less experienced or new employees are not aware from the environment of the organization and they have not friendly relations with the other employees of the organization so for that reason they have less organizational citizenship behavior as compare to those who are experienced.

Findings show that the employees who have lowest education are more schadenfreude and external attributional style because of low mentality and lower thought they feel more jealous as compare to those who are highly educated. Ehrhart, (2004) showed that highly educated employees have more internal attributional style and organizational citizenship behavior as compare those who have lowest education.

Implications

Every organizations motto is to achieve goals and have good progress. No doubt skills are very necessary for achieving goals but there is very important role of the behavior of the management and employees of the organization and also working environment have very much important role. For that reason the current have many important implications for every organization.

First of all organizations should have free from organizational politics because organizational politics have very serious effects on the thoughts of the employees due to this many of the employees can leave the organization. It also can affect the

organizational environment and can create schadenfreude and external attributed behaviors and these can affect the progress of the employees. On the other hand pro social and internally attributed employees can't work in such environment and due this they will obviously leave the organization.

Secondly in the every organization all the employees should be treated equally and management should be careful about the relations of the employees with each other. Due to favoring some employees many others can be heart and it can create jealous thoughts from where schadenfreude like behaviors get birth and can cause to kill pro social behavior, it is also very perilous for the organization.

Limitations and suggestions

This study has some limitations and suggestions as well. The current study was based on quantitative approach therefore for more depth knowledge qualitative approach can also be used. Instruments used in this study were self-report measure and it can increase the chances of biasness in responding. Sample was too much limited from a limited territory so many of the organizations could not be mentioned in this study, however many of the organization could be mentioned in future research. As large would be the sample with varying experience, age and services can increase the generalizing potential of the results. Research findings can be very help full for the organization in making a good working environment in the organization.

In the future more researches variables can be added in the study such as organizational politics and social support. The present study is cross-sectional but for more depth longitudinal study can also be done.

Conclusion

The results of the current study showed that schadenfreude is positively associated with external attributional style. Both the schadenfreude and external attributional style are serious threats for the environment of the organization. These both behaviors can affect the progress and reputation of the organization of the organization

very badly. These factors can be increased in any organization due to organizational politics, favoritism and bad governance. Furthermore, results showed that internal attributional style is positively linked with organizational citizenship behavior. These two variables are positive for any of the organization and can make these type practices organization environment much better. Pro social behavior has a very much important role in the progress of the organization. Group analysis showed that experienced employees of the organization are much inclined in the schadenfreude and external attributional style as compare to the new employees and this is only due organizational politics. So for the better progress of the organization every organization should be free from the bad politics.

References

- An, S. K., Kang, J. I., Park, J. Y., Kim, K. R., Lee, S. Y., & Lee, E. (2010). Attribution bias in ultra-high risk for psychosis and first-episode schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia research, 118*(1), 54-61.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Fugate, M. (2006). Attributional style in work settings: Development of a measure. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 12*(3), 12-29.
- Bachrach, D. G., Powell, B. C., Bendoly, E., & Richey, R. G. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluations: Exploring the impact of task interdependence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 193-201.
- Baker, T. L., Hunt, T. G., & Andrews, M. C. (2006). Promoting ethical behavior and organizational citizenship behaviors: The influence of corporate ethical values. *Journal of Business Research, 59*(7), 849-857.
- Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost?. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1078-1095.
- Brambilla, M., & Riva, P. (2017). Predicting pleasure at others' misfortune: Morality trumps sociability and competence in driving deservingness and schadenfreude. *Motivation and Emotion, 41*(2), 243-253.
- Campbell, C. R., & Martinko, M. J. (1998). An integrative attributional perspective of empowerment and learned helplessness: A multimethod field study. *Journal of Management, 24*(2), 173-200.
- Chen, C. H. V., Tang, Y. Y., & Wang, S. J. (2009). Interdependence and organizational citizenship behavior: Exploring the mediating effect of group cohesion in multilevel analysis. *The Journal of Psychology, 143*(6), 625-640.
- Cheng, H., & Furnham, A. (2003). Attributional style and self-esteem as predictors of psychological well-being. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 16*(2), 121-130.
- Cikara, M., Botvinick, M. M., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Us versus them: Social identity shapes neural responses to intergroup competition and harm. *Psychological science, 22*(3), 306-313.
- Cikara, M., & Fiske, S. T. (2012). Stereotypes and Schadenfreude: Affective and physiological markers of pleasure at outgroup misfortunes. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*(1), 63-71.

- Cohen, A., & Abedallah, M. (2015). The mediating role of burnout on the relationship of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy with OCB and performance. *Management Research Review*, 38(1), 2-28.
- Colligan, R. C., Offord, K. P., Malinchoc, M., Schulman, P., & Seligman, M. E. (1994). CAVEing the MMPI for an optimism-pessimism scale: Seligman's attributional model and the assessment of explanatory style. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 50(1), 71-95.
- Corr, P. J., & Gray, J. A. (1996). Attributional style as a personality factor in insurance sales performance in the UK. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69(1), 83-87.
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader-member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 615-634.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel psychology*, 57(1), 61-94.
- Ehrhart, M. G., Bliese, P. D., & Thomas, J. L. (2006). Unit-level OCB and unit effectiveness: Examining the incremental effect of helping behavior. *Human Performance*, 19(2), 159-173.
- Feather, N. T. (2008). Effects of observer's own status on reactions to a high achiever's failure: Deservingness, resentment, schadenfreude, and sympathy. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 60(1), 31-43.
- Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. R. (2014). Deservingness, liking relations, schadenfreude, and other discrete emotions in the context of the outcomes of plagiarism. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 66(1), 18-27.
- Feather, N. T., & Sherman, R. (2002). Envy, resentment, schadenfreude, and sympathy: Reactions to deserved and undeserved achievement and subsequent failure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(7), 953-961.
- Feather, N. T., McKee, I. R., & Bekker, N. (2011). Deservingness and emotions: Testing a structural model that relates discrete emotions to the perceived deservingness of positive or negative outcomes. *Motivation and Emotion*, 35(1), 1-13.
- Folkes, V. S. (1988). Recent attribution research in consumer behavior: A review and new directions. *Journal of consumer research*, 14(4), 548-565.

- Furnham, A., Brewin, C. R., & O'Kelly, H. (1994). Cognitive style and attitudes to work. *Human relations, 47*(12), 1509-1521.
- Gilliam, F. G., Santos, J., Vahle, V., Carter, J., Brown, K., & Hecimovic, H. (2004). Depression in epilepsy: ignoring clinical expression of neuronal network dysfunction? *Epilepsia, 45*(2), 28-33.
- Grasmick, H. G., & McGill, A. (1994). Religion, attribution style, and punitiveness toward juvenile offenders. *Criminology, 32*(1), 23-46.
- Hall, N. C., Hladkyj, S., Perry, R. P., & Ruthig, J. C. (2004). The role of attributional retraining and elaborative learning in college students' academic development. *The Journal of social psychology, 144*(6), 591-612.
- Harvey, P., Madison, K., Martinko, M., Crook, T. R., & Crook, T. A. (2014). Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: The road traveled and the path ahead. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(2), 128-146.
- Harvey, P., Martinko, M. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2006). Promoting authentic behavior in organizations: An attributional perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 12*(3), 1-11.
- Haugen, R., & Lund, T. (1998). Attributional style and its relation to other personality dispositions. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(4), 537-549.
- Heinzelmann, P. J., Williams, C. M., Lugn, N. E., & Kvedar, J. C. (2005). Clinical outcomes associated with telemedicine/telehealth. *Telemedicine Journal & e-Health, 11*(3), 329-347.
- Hoogland, C. E., Schurtz, D. R., Cooper, C. M., Combs, D. J., Brown, E. G., & Smith, R. H. (2015). The joy of pain and the pain of joy: In-group identification predicts schadenfreude and gluckschmerz following rival groups' fortunes. *Motivation and Emotion, 39*(2), 260-281.
- Huang, C. C., You, C. S., & Tsai, M. T. (2012). A multidimensional analysis of ethical climate, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Nursing Ethics, 19*(4), 513-529.
- Karambayya, R. (1990, August). contextual predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *In Academy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 1990, No. 1, pp. 221-225)*. Academy of Management.

- Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2008). "A vengefulness of the impotent": the pain of in-group inferiority and schadenfreude toward successful out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1383.
- Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2009). Dejection at in-group defeat and schadenfreude toward second-and third-party out-groups. *Emotion*, 9(5), 659.
- Leach, C. W., Spears, R., Branscombe, N. R., & Doosje, B. (2003). Malicious pleasure: schadenfreude at the suffering of another group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5), 932.
- Lee, F., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Who's being served? "Self-serving" attributions in social hierarchies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 84(2), 254-287.
- Lee, F., Peterson, C., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2004). Mea culpa: Predicting stock prices from organizational attributions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1636-1649.
- Leon, M. R., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2015). Coworker responses to observed mistreatment: Understanding schadenfreude in the response to supervisor abuse. *In Mistreatment in Organizations* (pp. 167-192). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Lepak, D. P., Jiang, K., Han, K., Castellano, W. G., & Hu, J. (2012). Strategic HRM moving forward: what can we learn from micro perspectives?. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 27, 231-259.
- Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). challenge-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: do challenge-oriented behaviors really have an impact on the organization's bottom line?. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(3), 559-592.
- Martinko, M. J., & Gardner, W. L. (1987). The leader/member attribution process. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 235-249.
- Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behavior: A causal reasoning perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 36-50.
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., & Dasborough, M. T. (2011). Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: A case of unrealized potential. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1), 144-149.

- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Brees, J. R., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(S1).
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Sikora, D., & Douglas, S. C. (2011). Perceptions of abusive supervision: The role of subordinates' attribution styles. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(4), 751-764.
- Martinko, M. J., Moss, S. E., Douglas, S. C., & Borkowski, N. (2007). Anticipating the inevitable: When leader and member attribution styles clash. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 104*(2), 158-174.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.
- Mezulis, A. H., Abramson, L. Y., Hyde, J. S., & Hankin, B. L. (2004). Is there a universal positivity bias in attributions? A meta-analytic review of individual, developmental, and cultural differences in the self-serving attributional bias. *Psychological bulletin, 130*(5), 711.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School effectiveness and school improvement, 17*(2), 145-177.
- Nielsen, T. M., Hrivnak, G. A., & Shaw, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance: A meta-analysis of group-level research. *Small Group Research, 40*(5), 555-577.
- Norvapalo, K. (2014). The quality and development of the leader-follower relationship and psychological capital: a longitudinal case study in a higher education context. *Jyväskylä Studies in Business and Economics; 1457-1986; 144*.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of management, 20*(2), 465-478.
- Peterson, C., Semmel, A., Von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. I., & Seligman, M. E. (1982). The attributional style questionnaire. *Cognitive therapy and research, 6*(3), 287-299.

- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human performance, 10*(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of applied psychology, 82*(2), 262-269.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of management, 26*(3), 513-563.
- Powell, C. A., & Smith, R. H. (2013). Schadenfreude caused by the exposure of hypocrisy in others. *Self and Identity, 12*(4), 413-431.
- Ruthig, J. C., Perry, R. P., Hall, N. C., & Hladkyj, S. (2004). Optimism and attributional retraining: Longitudinal effects on academic achievement, test anxiety, and voluntary course withdrawal in college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*(4), 709-730.
- Sánchez, S., Simonsen, C., & Thuesen, M. (2012). Korrektur. *Psyke & Logos, 33*, 27-49.
- Seligman, M. E., & Schulman, P. (1986). Explanatory style as a predictor of productivity and quitting among life insurance sales agents. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 50*(4), 832.
- Seligman, M. E., Kaslow, N. J., Alloy, L. B., Peterson, C., Tanenbaum, R. L., & Abramson, L. Y. (1984). Attributional style and depressive symptoms among children. *Journal of abnormal psychology, 93*(2), 235.
- Silvester, J., Patterson, F., & Ferguson, E. (2003). Comparing two attributional models of job performance in retail sales: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(1), 115-132.
- Skinner, N., Feather, N. T., Freeman, T., & Roche, A. (2007). Stigma and Discrimination in Health Care Provision to Drug Users: The Role of Values, Affect, and Deservingness Judgments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(1), 163-186.

- Smith, P., Caputi, P., & Crittenden, N. (2013). Measuring optimism in organizations: development of a workplace explanatory style questionnaire. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 14*(2), 415-432.
- Smith, R. H., Powell, C. A., Combs, D. J., & Schurtz, D. R. (2009). Exploring the when and why of schadenfreude. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*(4), 530-546.
- Smith, R. H., Thielke, S. M., & Powell, C. A. (2014). Empirical challenges to understanding the role of envy in schadenfreude. *Schadenfreude: Understanding pleasure at the misfortune of others*, 91-109.
- Sparrowe, R. T., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2001). Social networks and the performance of individuals and groups. *Academy of management journal, 44*(2), 316-325.
- Sujan, H. (1986). Smarter versus harder: An exploratory attributional analysis of salespeople's motivation. *Journal of Marketing Research, 41*-49.
- Takahashi, H., Kato, M., Matsuura, M., Mobbs, D., Suhara, T., & Okubo, Y. (2009). When your gain is my pain and your pain is my gain: neural correlates of envy and schadenfreude. *Science, 323*(5916), 937-939.
- Taylor, S. S. (2014). Silly social science scales: Embracing the particular. *Organizational Aesthetics, 3*(1), 4-6.
- Van de Ven, N., Zeelenberg, M., & Pieters, R. (2009). Leveling up and down: the experiences of benign and malicious envy. *Emotion, 9*(3), 419.
- Van der Vegt, G. S., & Van de Vliert, E. (2005). Effects of perceived skill dissimilarity and task interdependence on helping in work teams. *Journal of management, 31*(1), 73-89.
- Van Dijk, W. W., Goslinga, S., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (2008). Impact of responsibility for a misfortune on schadenfreude and sympathy: Further evidence. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 148*(5), 631-636.
- Van Dijk, W. W., Ouwerkerk, J. W., Goslinga, S., & Nieweg, M. (2005). Deservingness and schadenfreude.

- Van Dijk, W. W., Ouwerkerk, J. W., Goslinga, S., Nieweg, M., & Gallucci, M. (2006). When people fall from grace: reconsidering the role of envy in Schadenfreude. *Emotion, 6*(1), 156.
- Van Dijk, W. W., Ouwerkerk, J. W., van Koningsbruggen, G. M., & Wesseling, Y. M. (2012). "So you wanna be a pop star?": Schadenfreude following another's misfortune on TV. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 34*(2), 168-174.
- Van Dijk, W. W., Ouwerkerk, J. W., Wesseling, Y. M., & van Koningsbruggen, G. M. (2011). Towards understanding pleasure at the misfortunes of others: The impact of self-evaluation threat on schadenfreude. *Cognition and Emotion, 25*(2), 360-368.
- Van Dijk, W. W., van Koningsbruggen, G. M., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Wesseling, Y. M. (2011). Self-esteem, self-affirmation, and schadenfreude. *Emotion, 11*(6), 1445.
- Wallace, C., & Chen, G. (2006). A multilevel integration of personality, climate, self-regulation, and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(3), 529-557.
- Weiner, B. (1986). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. In An attributional theory of motivation and emotion (pp. 159-190). Springer US.
- Welbourne, J. L., Eggerth, D., Hartley, T. A., Andrew, M. E., & Sanchez, F. (2007). Coping strategies in the workplace: Relationships with attributional style and job satisfaction. *Journal of vocational behavior, 70*(2), 312-325.
- Willner, P., & Smith, M. (2008). Attribution theory applied to helping behaviour towards people with intellectual disabilities who challenge. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 21*(2), 150-155.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Blair, V., Peterson, C., & Zazanis, M. (1995). Collective efficacy. In Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment (pp. 305-328). Springer US.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979). Attribution of success and failure revisited, or: The motivational bias is alive and well in attribution theory. *Journal of personality, 47*(2), 245-287.

Annexure I

Informed Consent

I, Naeem Ahmed, M.Sc. research student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad. I am conducting a research which aims to study the perceptions of employees working in research organizations and telecommunication companies.

I humbly request for your support and participation in my research project. I assure you that any personal information provided will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purpose. You have full right to withdraw at any stage of questionnaire administration. Please provide your consent through endorsing the signature in the prescribe space.

Your participation will be highly appreciated.

Thank you

Naeem Ahmed

akoondhar558@gmail.com

Signature

Demographic Information Sheet

Age (years) _____

Gender:

Male	Female
------	--------

Education:

Graduation	Masters	M.Phil.	Ph.D.
------------	---------	---------	-------

Organizational Title: _____

Type of Organization:

Public

Private

Job Designation: _____

Overall Job Experience: _____

Job Duration in Current Organization: _____

Annexure III

Scale 1

Read the following statements and rate how much you feel satisfied, relaxation and confidential. Select any one of the option given in front of the statements.

How much you feel satisfied in the following situations.

No	Statements	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always
1	When your enemies get into the trouble.					
2	On seeing your competitors weak.					
3	On the defeat of your direct competitors.					
4	On getting trouble to those who once misbehaved you.					
5	On the loss of those who are stronger than you.					
6	On the loss of those with whom you feel jealous.					
7	When you compare someone once loss or defeat with you.					
8	On seeing someone in trouble to whom you hate.					
9	On seeing loss of those who are stronger than you.					
10	On the problems of those					

	whom you dislike.					
11	If your strong enemy or competitor loses strong hold.					
12	On seeing in trouble that you get angry.					
13	On seeing in trouble to whom you feel threaten.					
14	Finding those weak to whom you feel fearful.					
15	On the insult of your opponent.					
16	When you find something bad with those to whom you shared bitter past experiences.					
17	On seeing those in trouble to whom you can't take revenge.					
18	Those who get into the trouble because of themselves.					
19	On seeing punished those who did injustice with you.					
20	On seeing insulting those who were hypocrites.					
21	On seeing your opponents					

	in trouble.					
22	On the misfortune who betrayed you.					
23	On the loss of yours friends enemies.					
24	On getting hurt to whom you had any fight or contradiction.					
25	On the loss of those whose loss is yours gain.					

Annexure iv

Scale 2

Read the following statements and imagine hypothetical events and respond the situation according to your hypothetical imagination.

No.	Statements	Most important cause	Internal	External
1.	You became very rich.			
2.	You apply for a position that you want very badly and you get it.			
3.	You get a raise.			
4.	You meet a friend who compliments you on your appearance.			
5.	You do a project that is highly praised.			
6.	Your spouse (boyfriend or girlfriend) has been treating you more lovely.			
7.	You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully for some time.			
8.	You give an important talk in front of a group and the audience reacts negatively.			
9.	You can't get all the work done that others expect of you.			
10.	A friend comes to you with a problem and you don't try to help.			
11.	You meet a friend who acts hostilely towards you.			
12.	You go out on a date and it goes badly.			

Annexure v

Scale 3

Read the following statement carefully and answer them by encircling the number, which describes your behavior at job in the best way.

Nos	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I help others who have heavy workloads.					
2.	I am the one who always need to be pushed to do things.					
3.	I believe in giving an honest day's work for an honest days pay.					
4.	I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.					
5.	I try to avoid creating problems for coworkers.					
6.	I keep abreast of changes in the organization.					
7.	I tend to exaggerate petty matters.					
8.	I consider the impact of my actions on coworkers.					
9.	I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.					
10.	I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me.					
11.	I attend functions that that are not required, but help the company					

	image.					
12.	I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos and so on.					
13.	I help others who have been absent.					
14.	I don't abuse the rights of others.					
15.	I willingly help others who have work related problems.					
16.	I always focus on what's wrong, rather than the positive side.					
17.	I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.					
18.	I have a better attendance than others.					
19.	I always find fault with what the organization is doing.					
20.	I am conscious about how my behavior affects other people's job.					
21.	I don't take extra breaks.					
22.	I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching.					
23.	I help to familiarize people even though it is not required.					
24.	I am one of the honest employees of the organization.					