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Abstract
In response to the need of study fulfilling the interplay between stressors and job outcomes, the present study has been carried out. We also examined the moderating role of Islamic Work ethics in the proposed relationship. Based on the purposive sampling technique, a sample of 287 employees working in Public sector organizations were selected. Results of the study supported the proposed hypotheses, indicating that the challenge stressors have positive and hindrance stressors have negative relation with organizational citizenship behavior. We also found that the Islamic Work Ethics moderates the said relationship in such a way that higher level of Islamic Work Ethics strengthen the relationship between challenge stressors and organization citizenship behavior and weaken the relationship between hindrance stressors and organization citizenship behavior.
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1. Introduction
Work related stress is related to fast paced global market and economic competiveness (Sauter, Murphy & Hurrell, 1990). The medical expenses and low productivity due to job related stress cost organizations millions of dollars around the world (Brun & Lamarche, 2006; Cynkar, 2007; Ryan & Watson, 2004). Job stress occurs when employees experience job stressors (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Stress is linked with impair job performance and cast negative impact on employee work attitude and behaviour (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007). However, not all stressors lead to ill health and low work outcomes. Evidences are accumulating the most common negative relationship
between job stressor and work outcome but little attention is given to its positive effects (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Wallace, Edwards, Arnold, Frazier, & Finch, 2009). The debate on positive and negative outcomes of job stressors has led researchers into categorizing job stressors into challenge and hindrance stressors (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000). The assumption of positive impact of challenge stressors and negative impact of hindrance stressors on attitude and work outcomes appeared to be justified by extant literature (Podsakoff et al., 2007; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005) but its impact on organisational citizenship behaviours has received little attention (Ramalu, Sintok & Rashid, 2016).

Organizational citizenship is important for effective organizational performance (Podsakoff, Ahearne & MacKenzie, 1997). As stated by Bolino and Turnley (2005, p. 740) that “the ideal worker is an employee who not only demonstrates high levels of task performance, but also engages in high levels of contextual performance or OCB as well.” Few evidence on factors of work related stress are studied linked to OCB but unfortunately, the body of literature on these relationships yielded inconsistent findings (see Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Motowidlo Packard & Manning, 1986). Therefore, inquiry on this relation seems to be important to found out how job stressor impact employee organizational citizenship behaviour.

On other hand, in understanding the underling concept of OCB, dispositional factors have become one of the focal area of research because these factors are individual to employee (Scholl, 2008) such as work values, personality traits (Neuman & Kickul, 1998; Konovsky & Organ, 1996), work attitude (Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, & Scholl, 2008), highly influenced organizational outcomes (see Elorza, Harris, Aritzeta & Balluerka, 2016; Wagner & Rush, 2000). Among these variables Islamic work ethics have received greater attention from researchers (see Alhyasat, 2012; Abbasi & Rana 2012), previously, greater attention were given to protestant work ethics, proposed by Blood (1969) especially in western countries (Mirels & Garrett, 1971). Islamic work ethics emerged a separated field of research in Muslim countries (Ali 1992; Yousef 2000). As Islamic work ethics are grounded on teaching of Holy Quran and Hazrat Muhammad (S.A.W.W) (Yousef 2000a). Business community are emphasizing on ethics and ethical behavior due to witnessing several scandals linked to insufficient or lack of ethical standards in organizations community (Hodgetts & Luthans, 2000; Rokhman, 2010). The assumption of decreasing negative impact of job stress on work outcomes are also empirically justified (Ajmal & Irfan 2014).

Taken as a whole, Islamic work ethics is relevant to evaluate work stressors effect on OCB because this trait is characterized by cooperation, goal orientation, work-related resourcefulness, help, devotion and hard work, against stressors. Regarding the relevance of Islamic work ethics with OCB, several meta-analyses revealed that Islamic work ethics is strongly related to innovation (Kumar & Che Rose, 2010), organizational commitment (Yousef, 2000), work involvement (Khan, Abbas, Gul & Raja, 2015), job satisfaction (Mohamed, Karim & Hussein, 2010), positive work behavior (Abbasi & Rana, 2012, Murtaza, Abbas, Raja, Roques, Khalid & Mushtaq, 2014). Therefore, it is likely that those employees who follow Islamic work ethics will perform extra role behaviors than those who report low on Islamic work ethics. Therefore we assume that Islamic work ethics will moderate the association between job stressors and OCB.
2. Stressors and Work Outcome

Studies regarding stress has followed a tradition of distinguish good stressors from bad stressor (e.g., Selye, 1974). These stressors are distinguished based on certain merits at workplace (Jex, 1998), considering the mixed results generated by studies covering the employee behavioral response to job stressors (Jex & Yankel evich, 2008; Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009). Cavanaugh, et al., (2000) projected a two-dimensional work stressor framework (i.e., challenge– hindrance stressors) and established that the nature of stressors provide the direction between stressors and job outcomes. Factor analysis exposed that items related to stressors can be divided in two dimension. The first dimension was called challenge stressors and the sub items were workload, time pressure, and responsibility as these are considered path way to achieve goals and personal growth. While the second dimensioned was named as hindrance stressors, include ambiguity, role conflict, and organizational politics due to the reason of threatening to achieve goals.

Stressors such as high job demand, possibly will lead to exhaustion (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004) and burnout (Llorens, Bakker, Salanova, & Schaufeli, 2006), due to diminishing energy, that they raise in individuals. The exhaustion, and burnout deplete employee personal resources, therefore, they are less engaged in OCB decreases (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006).

Further studies on job and OCB have confirmed these results (see Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Researchers also identified stressful situation in which OCB is affected for instance if tasks are interdependent, employees feel a need to help each other thus to overcome job stressor result in high OCB but if employees are forced to help each other (Podsakoff et al. 2005). It might hinder their own performance, gives rise to negative emotion therefore, OCB decreases and may result in counter productive work behavior (Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, & Suazo, 2010; Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2011). Organizational stressors are not always harmful to work outcomes, but the nature of stressors (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007). Every individual in organizations appraise challenge and hindrance stressors rendering their views. Dealing with challenging job demands, employees consider that they will effectively cope with them, will obtain personal growth. These stressors naturally induce feelings of enthusiasm and assurance that result in vigorous problem-solving style of handling (Wallace, Edwards, Arnold, Frazier, & Finch, 2009). Contrariwise, when experiencing hindrances stressors individual’s initial reaction is that they might not be able to overcome these demands by efforts therefore, lead to less investment of efforts in fulfilling these demands. In such intense events employee performance decreases and turnover intention increases (Arshadi, & Damiri, 2013). Therefore, the unclear effect on stressful event on OCB might be due to the difference between job stressor.

A mounting body of research studies support the two-dimensional framework of challenge–hindrance stressors, thus, suggest that challenge stressors lead to required work attitudes or behaviors like affective organizational commitment (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan, & LePine, 2004), employee job satisfaction (Webster, Beehr, & Love,2011), and work self-efficacy (Webster, Beehr, & Christiansen, 2010), whereas hindrance stressors result in unwanted behaviors like turnover intention (Podsakoff et al., 2007; Webster, Beehr, & Love, 2011), low job satisfaction (Tufail, Shahzad, Gul & Khan, 2017) and withdrawal (Podsakoff et al., 2007). Though, OCB is vital for smooth running
of any organization, it is critical to understand the link between stressors and organizational related behaviors (Webster, Beehr & Christiansen, 2010). Thus, the following hypothesis has been developed:

**H1:** Challenge stressors have positive and Hindrance stressors have negative relation with OCB.

### 2.1 Moderating role of IWE

In business research Islamic work ethics was initially coined by Ali (1988) based on teaching of Holy Quran and Sunnah of Hazarat Musa (S.A.W) (see also Ali and Al-Owaihan 2008; Rice 1999; Yousef 2000). Holy Quran and Hazarat Muhammad (S.A.W) Sunnah are the main guidelines living live and are valid for all individual, it will remain valid for all time for people who follow Islam (Beekun & Badawi 2005).

Islamic principal are universal and applicable to all fields of life, they don’t change with passage of time and in no way they will depend on prevailing societal norms (Abbasi, Rehman, & Bibi, 2011). As per Islamic principal “it is the ethic that dominates economics and not the other way around” (Rice 1999, p. 346). Quran prohibit Muslims from negative, time wasting and unproductive activities, such activities are consider wasteful in Islam (Yousef 2000).

Islamic work ethics has focus on dedication, loyalty, hard work and commitment irrespective of work settings. In the same vein, it can be assumed that the individuals in organizations will exhibit high degree of OCB regardless of stressful situations. Previously, it has been discussed that the challenge stressors have positive and hindrance stressors have negative link with OCB. The direct relation between IWE and OCB is well established (Sulistyo, 2017; Khaled 2012; Tufail, Ahmad, Ramayah, Jan, & Shah, 2017).

In Pakistani context, IWE is relatively a new research area and very few studies encircle the moderating role of IWE with different job outcomes (see Batool, Gul, & Shahzad, 2013; Sadozai, Marri, Zaman, Youusufzai, & Nas, 2013; Khan, Abbas, Gul, & Raja, 2015; Tufail et al., 2017). Teaching of Islam encourage interpersonal relation and direct human to help each other during hard times, as directed by Hazrat Muhammad (S.A.W).

Work related objectives are known as ethical compulsions (Bouma, Haidar, Nyland, & Smith, 2003). Challenge stressors provide path to the personal growth and development (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). It means that when individuals follow the organizational ethics and consider their duty as obligation, will be developed in their respective fields and will display discretionary behavior. Further, it can be claimed that IWE, jointly with challenge stressors will strengthen the challenge stressors and OCB link, as IWE will offer dual strength to the individuals considering promotions and development. Moreover, IWE will moderate the relation between hindrance stressors and OCB in such a way that high the degree of IWE, when paired with hindrance stressors will weaken the relationship between hindrance and OCB. When an individual will consider the IWE in organizational life he/she will not be effected by the negative emotions and thus, will not consider the hindrance stressors restraining form exhibiting high degree of OCB. Based on the above discussion the following hypotheses have been developed:

**H2 a:** Islamic Work Ethics will moderate the positive relation between challenge stressors and OCB in such a way that the relationship will be stronger when the IWE is high.
H₂ b: Islamic Work Ethics will moderate the negative relation between hindrance stressors and OCB in such a way that the relationship will be weaker when the IWE is high.

3. Methodology
Data was collected from full time employees of different public sector organizations in major cities of Khyber Pakhtonkhwa through self-developed questionnaires. Data was collected at a single point. Purposive sampling techniques was adopted. Gathering data from a different organizations helped us to overcome maximum variances across various work settings. 400 questionnaires were distributed in different cadre employees working in Hospitals, Banks, NADRA, Passport Offices, and Universities. The surveys were distributed personally. Among the distributed questionnaires, 311 questionnaires were received. The questionnaires were scrutinized and excluding the missing data, 287 questionnaires were found fit for further analysis and yielded response rate of 71 percent. Of these useable responses, 21 percent respondents were from Hospitals, 21 percent from Banks, 18 percent from NADRA, 11 percent employees belonged to Passport Offices, and 29 percent were from Public sector Universities. Out of these respondents, 61% were male and the rest 39% respondents were female. 17% of the respondents were below 30 years, 41 % were at the range of 30 and 40 years. 35% were between the ages of 41 and 50, while the rest 7% were above 50 years. The mean age of the respondents were 34.2 (SD=7.81) years and the average job experience was 5.1 (SD=4.12) years.

3.1 Measures
Using a five point Likert scale, the variables of the current study were measured, where 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3 neither, 4 agree, and 5 represented strongly agree. Questionnaires regarding the variables of the current study were adopted from previous studies. The researcher measured the Challenge and hindrance stressors through 11 items scale developed by Cavanaugh et al, (2000). OCBs scale was adapted from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990) which was developed on five dimensions having 16 items and lastly, responses regarding IWE were recorded via 17 items instrument developed by Ali (1988).

3.2 Control variables
In the current study age and gender was taken as control variables. One way ANOVA when carried out, was also found significant. The previous studies also controlled the same for moderation analysis in Pakistani context (see Tufail et al., 2017; Khan et al., 2015; Usman, Shahzad, Roberts, & Zafar, 2015).

3.3 Common method bias
Researchers suggested the main element underlying common method variance is the use of single survey method (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). It greatly affect the results of behavioral studies, if not addressed thus, to overcome this issue Harman's one-factor test was conducted, to examined the data collected for this study (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Principal component factor result reveal that one factor contain 40.1 % of variance, which is less than commended value of 50% (Podsakoff et al., 2003), thus data for this study is free from common method bias.
4. Results
4.1 Model Measurements

To check the validity of contract used for this study, first convergent validity and then discriminant validity were checked. Convergent validity explained the degree to which the assessment tools produce a stability and consistency in the results, it can be indicated by high correlation values between similar concepts. AVE value higher than 0.5 and CR value higher than 0.7 indicate good convergent validity. In order to check convergent validity, factor loading were first calculated, all the factor loading exceeding the threshold of 0.4 (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) were retained, while items with low factor loading were removed as shown in the table 1. The Cronbach's alpha which show the degree to which the indicators of construct indicate the underlying construct, the coefficient of Cornbash’s alpa for all questionnaire were above 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978), the AVE which shows the amount of variance explained by the construct indicators was higher than the minimum required value 0.5 (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and their respective items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamic work ethics - Cronbach's alpha=0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laziness is a vice</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication to work is a virtue</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good work benefits both one’s self and others</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice and generosity in the work place are necessary conditions for society’s welfare</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One should carry work out to the best of one’s ability</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is not an end in itself but a means to foster personal growth and social relations</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life has no meaning without Work</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations should be emphasize and encourage</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work enables man to control nature</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative work is a source of happiness and accomplishment</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any person who works is more likely to get ahead in life</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work gives one the chance to be independent</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A successful person is the one who meets deadlines at Work</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One should constantly work hard to meet responsibilities</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value of work is delivered from the accompanying intention rather than its result.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge stressor - Cronbach's alpha=0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel stress with the number of projects and or assignments I have.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel stress with the amount of time I spend at work.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel stress with the volume of work that must be accomplished in the allotted time. 0.88

I feel stress with time pressures I experience. 0.62
I feel stress with the amount of responsibility I have. 0.81
I feel stress with the scope of responsibility my position entails. 0.78

**Hindrance Stressors - Cronbach's alpha=0.81**
I feel stress with the degree to which politics rather than performance affects organizational decisions. 0.81
I feel stress with the inability to clearly understand what is expected of me on the job. 0.86
I feel stress with the amount of red tape I need to go through to get my job done. 0.89
I feel stress with the lack of job security I have. 0.85
I feel stress with the degree to which my career seems "stalled." 0.83

**OCB - Cronbach's alpha=0.88**
This employee willingly give of his time to help others out who have work-related problems 0.84
This employee willing to take time out of his busy schedule to help with recruiting or training new employees 0.89
This employee usually “touch base” with other before initiating actions that might affect them. 0.85
This employee takes steps to try to prevent problems with others and/or other personnel in the organization. 0.81
This employee attend functions that are not required but help the organization’s image 0.82
This employee attend training/information sessions that he is encouraged to, but not required to attend 0.81
This employee attends and actively participates in organizational meetings. 0.71
This employee consumes a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. 0.69
This employee always find fault with what the organization is doing. 0.72
This employee tends to make “mountains out of molehills” or make problems worse that they are. 0.87
This employee usually focus on what is wrong with his situation rather than the positive side of it 0.89
This employee rarely takes long lunches or breaks 0.81
This employee does not take unnecessary time off work. 0.83
This employee does not take extra breaks. 0.86

The composite reliability of all construct were higher than there commended value of 0.7 indicate construct has adequate convergent validity. On other hand, Discriminant validity
depict the degree to which the construct indicators does not represent some other variables (Hair et al., 2013), it is shown by the low values of correlation of items of measurement with other variables, thus indicate that the correlation between dissimilar construct will be low (Campbell, 1960). Table 2 given below shows that the square root of average variance extract of each measure is higher than there correspondent variable correlation indicate adequate discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IWE</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>CS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamic work ethics</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB)</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance stressor (HS)</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td><strong>0.84</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge stressor (CS)</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td><strong>0.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted therefore to check the goodness of fit. All the Goodness of fit indicator were in acceptable ranges ($\chi^2 = 81.95$, $df = 43$, $\chi^2/df = 2.11$, RMSEA= .06, GFI= .93, AGFI = .89, IFI = .95, CFI = .91), therefore indicate a good fit.

4.2 Hypothesis Testing

Multiple regression analysis was carried out to find out the impact of challenge, hindrance stressor and Islamic work ethics on organizational citizenship behavior. For main effect all predictor variables were entered. Results show that challenge significantly predicted organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta =.13$, $p<0.01$), similarly, table 3 shows that hindrance stressor was negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta =0.24$, $p<0.01$) also Islamic work ethics has positive effect on OCB ($\beta =.24$, $p<0.01$), these results render support for proposed hypothesis.

Table 3: Main Effects And Moderation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization Citizenship Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic work ethics</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge stressor</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance stressor</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance X IWE</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge X IWE</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 287$. $^p < .10$, $^*p < .05$, $^{**} p < .01$

The remaining two hypotheses ($H_{2a}$ and $H_{2b}$) were tested through moderated regression analysis (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2013). For this gender and age were entered first, then in next step predator and moderating variable were entered while two product
terms (Hindrance stressor X IWE and Challenge Stressor X IWE) were entered in third step of analysis. Results show that interactive term was highly significant for challenge stressor indicated that Islamic work ethics moderates the relationship between challenge stressor and organizational citizenship behavior, confirming H2a. The slope test revealed that for high Islamic work ethics the positive slope was significant (β = .37, p < .005), similarly the negative slope was also significant (β = − .18, ns). Thus provides support for H2a.

![Figure 1: Interactive effects of challenge stressors and Islamic work ethics on organizational citizenship behaviour](image)

While H2b predicted that Islamic work ethics will moderate the negative relationship between hindrance stressor and OCB, such that the relationship will be weaker for employees who developed high Islamic work ethics. Step 3 in table 3 shows the negative relation between hindrance stressors and organizational citizenship behavior was significantly moderated by Islamic work ethics (β = − .18, p < .05). Figure 2 illustrates the graph for this interaction. Slope test revealed that the relationship between hindrance stressors and organizational citizenship behavior significant for high Islamic work ethics (β = − .15, p<.05) and insignificant for low Islamic work ethics (β = .24, n.s). These results were supported Hypothesis H2b, which predicted stronger negative relationship between hindrance stressors and organizational citizenship behavior for low Islamic work ethics.
5. Discussion

The results of this study exposed that challenge stressors have positive while hindrance stressors have negative relation with organizational citizenship behavior. According to COR theory, stressors require using resources. Consequently, according to the COR theory, to deal with stressors resources (e.g., effort, attention, coping strategies) are required. Hence, continual experience of stressors results in extra resource lessening instigating stress and adverse health related effects e.g. burnout (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). Previous studies direct that both challenge and hindrance stressors may cause superior strains (LePine et al., 2005) as both the challenging and hindering job demands need adaptive reactions from employees (LePine et al., 2005).

The mixed results on job stressor and OCB relationship is due to individual appraisal of job stressor as a hindrance or challenge. Challenge stressor correlates positively with OCB. It might be because initial response of employee to challenge stressor is adaptive, employee feel they can cope with these stressors, therefore feel relaxed and exhibit discretionary behaviors. The personal growth linked to challenge stressor motivate employee to put more effort to achieve organizational growth LePine et al., (2005). The motivation for growth and development will lead to higher degree OCB has also been confirmed. Earlier, the same was suggested by LePine et al., (2005). The link between hindrance stressors and OCB is inverse, thus, elaborates that low degree of OCB will be observed by employees having negative feelings or emotions at work place. Adverse
emotions strengthen the probability of withdrawal from discretionary behaviors (Bachrach & Jex, 2000; Weber et al, 2010) thus, results in negative relation with OCB.

IWE has positive impact on OCB (see Usman et al., 2015; Murtaza et al., 2016). IWE provides a complete system of life, thus, to follow the Islamic beliefs, any individual will show dedication to work and will demonstrate high degree of OCB, as Muslim workers are anticipated to apply their religious principles in organizations (Khan et al., 2015). The novel part of the current study was to explore the combined effect of stressors and IWE on OCB. Moderation analysis showed that IWE significantly moderates the impact of challenge stressors on OCB. In such way that challenge stressor is positively related to OCB for Employee having higher in Islamic work ethics. On contrary, the said relationship is negative for employee who reported low in Islamic work ethics. Therefore, based on the results of this results this study suggests that employee high on IWE exhibit more OCB when experience challenge stressor than employee low on IWE.

Finding regarding the moderating role of IWE in a link of hindrance stressors and OCB was also confirmed. Hindrance stressors are negatively correlated with employee behavior (Podsakkoff et al., 2009; Llorens, Bakker, Salanova, & Schaufeli, 2006; Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2012). However, hindrance stressors when combined with IWE revealed that the said relation is moderated. It might be because employee exhibit OCB as a mean to help their coworker, as per Islamic teachings. Consequently, it may be due to the Islamic perspective and highly acceptance of IWE that allowed them to engage in extra role behavior without considering the barriers.

Future research may replicate the same study in other Asian countries. Pakistan is a developing country, so more focus showed be given on contextual factors rather than using stressors as uni-dimensional. Another avenue for future research can be employees’ trust and organizational politics when paired with IWE, will eliminate the adverse effect of hindrance stressors on OCB.
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