Journal of Culture, Society and Development
ISSN 2422-8400 An International Peer-reviewed Journal
Vol.12, 2015

Psychological Characteristics as Determinant of Counterproductive Work Behavior

Dr. Rishi Pal, Head & Professor,
AIBAS, Amity University, Haryana.

Abstract
This research has explored the relationship between counterproductive work behavior and psychological characteristics of self-efficacy and self-impression. Workers working in the manufacturing industries at Gurgaon and Maneser, Haryana were specified as population for the study. A sample of 240 workers was taken for the study from the stipulated population and tested for the tendency of counterproductive work behavior and psychological dimensions of self-efficacy and self-impression. Tested subjects were classified on the basis of High and low degree of self-efficacy and self-impression. Formulated groups of subjects having high and low self-efficacy and self-impression were compared for their tendency of counterproductive work behavior. Comparison reveals that the subjects of the group having high self-efficacy were negatively but significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior, whereas, the subjects of group with low self-efficacy were positively and significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior. Further comparison discovers that the group of subjects with high self-impression was negatively and significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior and the group of subjects having low self-impression was positively and significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior.
Keywords: Self-Efficacy and Self-Impression on Counterproductive Work Behavior

Self-Efficacy
Self-efficacy may be understood as the individual's belief in his abilities, competences and capabilities to attain an objective or a desired result. According to Albert Bandura, self-efficacy is "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations." In other words, self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her ability to succeed in a particular situation. Bandura described these beliefs as determinants of how people think, behave, and feel.
People with a high degree of self-efficacy are more likely to challenge themselves with difficult tasks and be intrinsically motivated. They will put forth a high degree of effort in order to meet their commitments, and attribute failure to things which are in their control, rather than blaming external factors. Self-efficacious individuals also recover quickly from setbacks, and ultimately are likely to achieve their personal goals. But individuals with low self-efficacy, on the other hand, believe they cannot be successful and thus are less likely to make a concerted, extended effort and may consider challenging tasks as threats that are to be avoided. Thus, individuals with poor self-efficacy have low aspirations which may result in disappointing performances becoming part of a self-fulfilling feedback cycle (Howard Margolis and Patrick McCabe, 2003).

"Self-efficacy refers to people's judgments about their capability to perform particular tasks. Task-related self-efficacy increases the effort and persistence towards challenging tasks; therefore, increasing the likelihood that they will be completed" (Barling & Beattie, 1983).
Judgments of self-efficacy are generally measured along three basic scales: magnitude, strength, and generality. Self-efficacy magnitude measures the difficulty level (e.g. easy, moderate, and hard) an individual feels is required to perform a certain task (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). Self-efficacy strength refers to the amount of conviction an individual has about performing successfully at diverse levels of difficulty (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). Generality of self-efficacy refers to the "degree to which the expectation is generalized across situations (Lunenburg, 2011).

Self-Impression
Self-Impression sheds light on a number of significant but under-theorized issues; the meanings of 'autobiographical', the generic implications of literary autobiography, and the intriguing relation between autobiography and fiction in the period.
The self is the one who is conscious, the one experiencing, the one sensing, the one feeling, the one imagining, the one conceiving and thinking, the one liking or desiring, wishing or hoping, the one taking action, etc.… or the one abstaining from such functions.

Counterproductive Work Behaviour
Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) may be defined as any intentional or unintentional behaviour of employees that can have possible harmful consequences on the functioning, resources and goals of the organization and its employees. Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) may include the acts such as theft,

favoritism, informing organization as sick when employee is not sick, involvement in illegal acts & frauds, sexual harassment, bullying, emotional abuse, revenge, retaliation, mobbing, aggression, violence, drug and alcohol use at work place, willfully staying away from organizational work, forcing others not to work and inappropriate use of organizational resources and infrastructure. Counterproductive behaviours may range in severity from minor offences such as stealing stationary to serious offences like involving in frauds of millions from organization. CWB may be executed at interpersonal level or at organizational level. Counterproductive behaviours at the interpersonal level are behaviours that affect the employees within the organisation and include acts such as favouritism, gossip, and harassment. At organizational level CWB are behaviours directed towards organization, these may include behaviours such as absenteeism and misuse of the employer's assets.

In a case study based research conducted by Chowdhury S and Thomas L (1999), the relationship between employees' self-efficacy of team membership, their satisfaction in regards to this membership and individual performance. The study demonstrated dependencies on the teams' performance. The subjects of the case study were junior and senior students enrolled in a business course that required team projects that were similar in nature to workplace projects.

Research by Axtell & Parker (2003) prove that increasing task control (autonomy) and training phases of increasing generalizability increase the transfer of self-efficacy to the workplace. The study also finds that job enlargement can lower self-efficacy if task control is not also increased.

Review of Literature

In a study by Roach et al. (2003), which examined the impact of self-efficacy on weight loss? The participants were randomly placed in either a control group or an intervention group. The sessions for both groups included information on nutrition, healthy eating habits and activities to promote self-efficacy. Results of this study supports the theory that self-efficacy has an impact on how individuals perceive themselves. Supported by education on how to increase self-efficacy, the intervention group was able to apply their new knowledge on reducing weight and improving eating habits. As a result of their self-efficacy increasing, their belief and motivation in attaining their goal increased as well (Roach et al., 2003).

Results of a study identify the associations among emotional intelligence, CWBs, and OCBs (Cheah Yeh Ying and Shirley Ken Tzu Ting, 2013) and results of another study showed that envy was a significant predictor of counterproductive work behaviors (abuse against others & withdrawal behavior). The relationship between envy and abusive behavior against other was more pronounced when perceptions of distributive justice were high. Similarly, the relationship between envy and withdrawal behavior was strong in case of high levels of procedural justice perceptions (Abdul Karim Khan, Jean Marie Peretti and Samina Quartulain, 2009).

The study conducted by Laurenz L. Meier and Paul E. Spector (2013) supported the possibility of a reciprocal relationship. Organizational constraints (but not experienced incivility) predicted subsequent CWB, and CWB predicted subsequent organizational constraints and experienced incivility. Because reciprocal effects point to a vicious cycle with detrimental effects of CWB to both actors and targets, the findings are not only of theoretical but also of practical importance.

One such study seeks to investigate the impact of job characteristics on counterproductive work behaviour (CWB). Three forms of CWB were identified: interpersonal CWB, production CWB, and property CWB. Job significant demonstrated a significant and negative relationship with production CWB. The relationship between job feedback, interpersonal CWB and property CWB was as postulated. In similar not, job identity demonstrated a significant and negative relationship with organizational CWB. However, job autonomy does not show any significant relationship. (Abdul Rahman Abdul Rahim, Alwi Shabudin and Aizzat Mohd Nasurdin, 2012)

In one of the study the impact of organizational climate on counterproductive behaviors was established. In organizational behavior studies, organizational climate is suggested as an important determinant or precursor of counterproductive behaviors. Based on the findings, significant and negative relationships have been observed between counterproductive behaviors and dimensions of organizational climate such as reward, warmth, support/commitment, organizational structure and organizational standards. Moreover, warmth relationship environment, support/commitment and organizational standards dimensions are found out to have effect on counterproductive behavior (Pelin Kanten and Funda Er Ulker 2013).

Results of another study indicated negative relationships between perceived organizational distributive justices, overall and ethical climates, and CWB. Importantly, the quality of perceived leader-member exchange and employee's occupational level were found to moderate the relationship between perceived distributional justice and organizational ethical climate and counterproductive work behavior (Lily Chernyak-Hai and Aharon Tziner, 2014).

Research Methodology

Objective of Study

The objective of present research was to explore the relationship between counterproductive work behavior and psychological traits of self-efficacy and self-impression.

Sample Design

Workers working in the manufacturing industries near Delhi and NCR were specified as population for the study. A sample of 240 workers was taken for the study from the specified population and tested for the tendency of counterproductive work behavior, self-efficacy and self-impression. Selected subjects were tested for their tendencies of counterproductive work behavior, self-efficacy and self-impression. Tested subjects were grouped on the basis of High and low degree of self-efficacy and self-impression. Formulated four groups of subjects classified on the basis of high and low self-efficacy and high & low self-impression were then compared for their tendency of counterproductive work behavior.

Table (6) Categorization Table

Variables	Criteria for Categorization		
		Criteria	N
Self-Efficacy	Higher degree	25≤Score≥40	160
	Lower degree	10≤Score≥25	80
Self-Impression	Higher degree	60≤Score≥100	145
	Lower degree	20≤Score≥60	95

Table (6) shows the categorization of the subjects on the basis of their personality traits of Self Efficacy and Self Impression.

Subjects scored between 25 and 40 were taken as subjects with high degree of Self Efficacy and subjects having score between 10 and 25 were categorized as subjects of low degree of Self Efficacy. Total 160 subjects were found with high degree of Self Efficacy and 80 were found in the category of low degree of Self Efficacy. Subjects scored between 60 and 100 were taken as subjects with high degree of Self Impression and subjects having score between 20 and 60 were categorized as subjects of low degree of Self Impression. Total 145 subjects were found with high degree of Self Impression and 95 were found in the category of low degree of Self-Impression. Subjects were further grouped on the basis of higher and lower tendencies of SE and SI as shown in Table (7). 70 subjects from each group were randomly selected for testing the relationship with Counterproductive Work Behaviour.

Method of Data Collection

Data was collected by using questionnaire method. The questionnaires were tested to identify whether the questionnaires were able to capture the required data as expected by the researchers. The tests were conducted mainly to find out whether our questionnaires were easily-understandable as well as whether there were any vague and confusing questions in the questionnaires. The stability of items included in all scales used in the research has been measured by using Cronbach's alpha technique. The reliability of various scales like Self-Impression, Self-Efficacy and Counterproductive Work Behaviour was found 0.867, 0.837 and 0.792 respectively. Table 1 shows values of cronbach alpha coefficient for all the scales with cronbach alpha values if item deleted.

Table (1) Reliability Coefficient (Cronbach's alphas)

Self Impression		
Items	**Cronbach alpha for dimensions**	**Cronbach alpha if item deleted**
item 1	**0.867**	**.804**
item 2		**.756**
item 3		**.822**
item 4		**.832**
item 5		**.851**
item 6		**.841**
item 7		**.866**
item 8		**.792**
item 9		**.891**
item 10		**.730**
Self Efficacy		
Items	**Cronbach alpha for dimensions**	**Cronbach alpha if item deleted**
item 1	**0.837**	**.832**

item 2		**.823**
item 3		**.751**
item 4		**.689**
item 5		**.789**
item 6		**.820**
item 7		**.835**
item 8		**.811**
item 9		**.792**
item 10		**.695**
item 11		**.766**
item 12		**.830**
item 13		**.832**
item 14		**.836**
item 15		**.769**
item 16		**.754**
item 17		**.764**
item 18		**.838**
item 19		**.789**
item 20		**.652**
Counterproductive Work Behaviour		
Items	**Cronbach alpha for dimensions**	**Cronbach alpha if item deleted**
item 1	**0.792**	**.782**
item 2		**.726**
item 3		**.622**
item 4		**.801**
item 5		**.765**
item 6		**.789**
item 7		**.699**
item 8		**.784**
item 9		**.736**
item 10		**.797**

The internal consistency of the items was assessed by computing the total reliability scale. The total reliability scale for the study was found 0.867, 0.837 and 0.792 for Self Impression, Self-Efficacy and Counterproductive Work Behaviour respectively.

Table (1) above shows the reliability scale for all dimensions and also, the reliability scale for each dimension calculated when each item is deleted from the dimension in order to see if the deleted item is genuine or not. In case cronbach's alpha for a dimension increases when an item is deleted it shows that item is not genuine in that dimension.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is used mostly for data reduction reasons and is performed by examining the pattern of correlations between the observed measures. Measures that are highly correlated, either positively or negatively are likely influenced by the same factors, while those that are relatively uncorrelated are likely influenced by different factors.

Table (2) showing factor analysis for Self Efficacy

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.184	21.845	21.845	2.184	21.845	21.845	2.040	20.403	20.403
2	1.687	16.867	38.712	1.687	16.867	38.712	1.641	16.407	36.810
3	1.444	14.438	53.150	1.444	14.438	53.150	1.443	14.426	51.236
4	1.172	11.721	64.870	1.172	11.721	64.870	1.218	12.177	63.413
5	1.000	10.005	74.875	1.000	10.005	74.875	1.146	11.462	74.875
6	.764	7.640	82.515						
7	.689	6.895	89.410						
8	.444	4.441	93.851						
9	.420	4.201	98.053						
10	.195	1.947	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
VAR00001		.810			
VAR00002				.850	
VAR00003					.920
VAR00004			.770		
VAR00006		.594			
VAR00007	.907				
VAR00008	.485		.627		
VAR00009		.764			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table (3) showing factor analysis for Self Impression

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.849	14.247	14.247	2.849	14.247	14.247	2.170	10.852	10.852
2	2.358	11.790	26.037	2.358	11.790	26.037	1.983	9.914	20.767
3	1.972	9.861	35.898	1.972	9.861	35.898	1.858	9.289	30.055
4	1.797	8.983	44.881	1.797	8.983	44.881	1.813	9.063	39.119
5	1.481	7.403	52.284	1.481	7.403	52.284	1.680	8.400	47.518
6	1.373	6.865	59.149	1.373	6.865	59.149	1.583	7.914	55.433
7	1.126	5.629	64.778	1.126	5.629	64.778	1.496	7.481	62.913
8	1.089	5.446	70.224	1.089	5.446	70.224	1.462	7.310	70.224
9	.992	4.961	75.185						
10	.771	3.854	79.039						
11	.715	3.576	82.615						
12	.670	3.348	85.963						
13	.659	3.294	89.257						
14	.547	2.733	91.991						
15	.405	2.024	94.015						
16	.354	1.768	95.783						
17	.279	1.397	97.180						
18	.271	1.355	98.535						
19	.168	.841	99.376						
20	.125	.624	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
VAR00001								.523
VAR00004					.739			
VAR00005	.764							
VAR00006								.697
VAR00008					.647			
VAR00010							.711	
VAR00011						.529		
VAR00012	.556	.453						
VAR00013				.821				
VAR00014				.741				
VAR00015						.683		
VAR00016						.751		
VAR00017		.824						
VAR00018		.557					.517	
VAR00019			.836					
VAR00020			.608					

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 16 iterations.

Table (4) showing factor analysis for Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Total Variance Explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.744	17.444	17.444	1.744	17.444	17.444	1.641	16.407	16.407
2	1.565	15.654	33.098	1.565	15.654	33.098	1.394	13.939	30.346
3	1.298	12.981	46.080	1.298	12.981	46.080	1.330	13.298	43.644
4	1.212	12.121	58.200	1.212	12.121	58.200	1.306	13.064	56.708
5	1.131	11.313	69.513	1.131	11.313	69.513	1.281	12.805	69.513
6	.877	8.774	78.287						
7	.807	8.071	86.358						
8	.589	5.886	92.244						
9	.460	4.603	96.847						
10	.315	3.153	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrixa

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
VAR00001	.710				
VAR00002	.802				
VAR00004				.813	
VAR00005			.768		
VAR00006	.674				
VAR00007		.866			
VAR00010			.677		

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Factor loadings are the weights and correlations between each variable and the factor. The higher the load, the more important it is in defining the factor's dimensionality. A negative value indicates an inverse impact on the factor.

Table (2, 3 & 4) shows the factor loadings for each item in relation to the various factors. These values in the table show the weight and correlation each item has to a factor or component. All values below 0.45 are cut off from this table because they are not significant for analysis. From table 4, it can be realized that items from different dimensions are regrouped under the same factor and some items from one dimension are found to fall in more than factor.

Findings and Discussions

Findings of the research were obtained by using various descriptive and inferential statistical techniques

Table (5) Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
SE	240	1.90	3.20	2.5779	.02200	.34077	.093	.157	-.934	.313
SI	240	2.35	3.70	3.0494	.01866	.28904	-.155	.157	-.137	.313
CWB	240	2.20	3.80	3.0863	.02701	.41843	-.381	.157	-.687	.313
Valid N (list-wise)	240									

Table (5) exhibits the statistical values of mean score, range, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis calculated by using the data collected from 240 subjects (Workers working in the manufacturing industries) chosen randomly on availability basis from different manufacturing industries. Mean score values for Self Efficacy (SE), Self-Impression (SI) and Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) were found to be 2.5779 for SE, 3.0494 for SI and 3.0863 for CWB. Standard deviation calculated with respect to the mean scores of variables for the research like Self Efficacy, Self-Impression and Counterproductive Work Behaviour was 0.34077, 0.28904 and 0.41843 respectively. Standard deviation measures the dispersion of individual scores around mean score of all the scores. Higher value of standard deviation with respect to mean score point out a wide spread of scores among data and considered as inconsistent data whereas low value of standard deviation

shows the consistency of the data i.e. the scores of the subjects were scattered near to the mean score of the group.

Table (7) Table showing Inferential Statistics:

Variables	N	Karl Pearson Correlation (r)	Coefficient of determination (r^2)	Adjusted r^2
Higher Self Efficacy and Counterproductive Work Behaviour	70	-0.785	0.616	0.610
Lower Self Efficacy and Counterproductive Work Behaviour	70	0.587	0.344	0.334
Higher Self Impression and Counterproductive Work Behaviour	70	-0.826	0.682	0.677
Lower Self Impression and Counterproductive Work Behaviour	70	0.521	0.271	0.260

In Table (5) formulated groups of subjects having high self-efficacy and low self-efficacy as well as with high self-impression and low self-impression were compared for their tendency of counterproductive work behavior. Correlation value was found to be -0.785 among the group of higher self-efficacy whereas it was 0.587 among the group of lower self-efficacy. Coefficient of determination explains the dependability of dependent variable on independent variable. Subjects of the group having high self-impression were found negatively related (r = 0.826) with counterproductive Work Behaviour whereas correlation value was 0.521 in case of subjects of the group of low self-impression.

Comparison reveals that the subjects of the group having high self-efficacy were negatively but significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior, whereas, the subjects of group with low self-efficacy were positively related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior. Further comparison discovers that the subjects of the group with high self-impression were negatively and significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior and the subjects of group having low self-impression were positively and significantly related with their tendency of counterproductive work behavior.

References

1. Abdul Karim Khan, Jean Marie Peretti and Samina Quartulain (2009), Envy And Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Is More Fairness Always Preferred?
2. Abdul Rahman Abdul Rahim, Alwi Shabudin and Aizzat Mohd Nasurdin (2012), Effects of Job Characteristics on Counterproductive Work Behavior among Production Employees: Malaysian Experience, *International Journal of Business and Development Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Pg.123-45.
3. Axtell, C. & Parker, S. (2003). Promoting role breadth self-efficacy through involvement, work redesign and training, *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, 1, Sage Publications.
4. Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*,4. New York: Academic Press, pp. 71-81.
5. Barling, J. & Beattie, R. (1983), Self-efficacy beliefs and sales performance, *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, Vol. 5, 41-51.
6. Cheah Yeh Ying and Shirley Ken Tzu Ting (2013), The Effects of Emotional Intelligence on Counterproductive Work Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.1, No.1.
7. Chowdhury, S., & Lanis, T. (1999), *Importance of self-efficacy of working in team environment in determining individual satisfaction and performance: Does it depend on the team performance?* [PDF Document] Retrieved from Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
8. Howard Margolis, Patrick McCabe, (2006), Improving Self-Efficacy and Motivation: What to Do, What to Say, *Intervention in School and Clinic*, vol 41, issue 4, pg. 218-227.
9. http://www.hrzone.com/hr-glossary/counterproductive-work-behaviours-definition
10. Laurenz L. Meier and Paul E. Spector (2013), Reciprocal Effects of Work Stressors and Counterproductive Work Behavior: A Five-Wave Longitudinal Study, *Journal of Applied Psychology*

11. Lily Chernyak-Hai and Aharon Tziner, 2014, Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange, *Journal of Work and Organizacional Psychology*, Vol. 30 Num.01.
12. Lunenburg, F. (2011). Self-efficacy in the workplace: implications for motivation and performance. *International Journal of Management, Business, And Administration*, *14*(1).
13. Max Saunders (2010), *Self-Impression - Life-Writing*, Auto-biografiction, and the Forms of Modern Literature, Oxford University Press.
14. Pelin Kanten and Funda Er Ulker (2013), The Effect of Organizational Climate on Counterproductive Behaviors: An Empirical Study on the Employees of Manufacturing Enterprises, The Macrotheme Review *A multidisciplinary journal of global macro trends*, Vol. 2, Issue 4.
15. Suzy Fox and Paul E. Spector (2005), Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets.
16. Suzy Fox, Paul E. Spector and Don Miles (2001), Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 59, 291–309.
17. Van der Bijl, J. J., & Shortridge-Baggett, L. M. (2002), The theory and measurement of the self-efficacy construct. In E. A. Lentz & L. M. Shortridge-Baggett (Eds.), *Self-efficacy in nursing: Research and measurement perspectives,* pg. 9-28.