

Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Mitigating the Challenges of Measurement in Indian Organizational Context

Neha Jain

Northcap University, Gurugram, Haryana

Purnima Singh

Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) are widespread in Indian organizations. The objective of this study is to construct a culture specific tool (directed towards Indian population) that would not directly question an employee but could still gauge his propensity to indulge in counterproductive work behaviors. This tool is designed to have two dimensions- rating of counterproductive work behavior (CWB Rating) and respondent's propensity to indulge in counterproductive work behavior (CWB Self). Day to day work situations were presented followed by two sets of questions (one for each dimension). The responses were taken on a four point rating scale. Four categories of behaviors were identified from the pool of behaviors, these were lying, production deviance, bullying and aggression based on a pilot study which showed highest prevalence of these behaviors in Indian Organizations. The methodology for tool development process took place in three stages: stage 1, focusing on instrument development, stage 2, focusing on instrument refinement and stage 3, focusing on instrument validation. The sample consisted of 352 employees working both in public and private sector organizations. The age varied from 20 to 60 years. The sample was drawn from organizations based in Delhi. Split half reliability of these scales was found to be .91 and .90 respectively. The results of Confirmatory factor analysis showed that two factor structure had an acceptable fit. The tool justified the objective with which it was constructed.

Keywords: Counterproductive work behavior, Tool development, measure, Indian Organizations

Research in the field of counterproductive work behavior has progressed systematically in the last three decades. In early 1990s the approach was to study individual dysfunctional behaviors without focusing on the underlying behavioral construct, for example researchers examined topics like lateness (Blau, 1995), violence (Rogers & Kelloway, 1997), sabotage (DiBattista, 1989), theft (Greenberg, 1990) and absenteeism (Johns, 1994). Some of the popular terms used to refer to these behaviors were "organizational misbehavior" (Vardi & Weitz, 2004), dysfunctional behavior (Griffin et al., 1998), aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1998), antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg,

1997), organizational deviant behaviors (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), counterproductive work behaviors (Fox & Spector, 1999), delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) and revenge (Bies et al., 1997). Include concepts from recent research, procrastination (Lorinkova & Perry, 2014), presenteeism (Koopmans et al., 2011), and cyberstalking (O'Neill et al., 2014) can also be added to this list.

In the late 90s and early 20's came the concept of clubbing these behaviors under one broad category. Robinson and Bennett (1995) defined it as behavior that voluntarily

violates organizational norms, thereby threatening the well-being of members and the organization itself. Later Sackett (2002) defined counterproductive work behaviors as behaviors that run counter to an organization's legitimate interest. Gruys and Sackett (2003) further elaborated this definition by focusing on intentional behavior on the part of an organizational member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interest.

Later phase of research in the area of counterproductive work behavior has focused on its consequences. Lau, Au, and Ho (2003) defined counterproductive work behavior as any voluntary organizational behavior that affects an individual's job performance or undermines organizational effectiveness. Spector and Fox (2005) defined "counterproductive work behavior" as a set of distinct acts that share the characteristics that are volitional and harm or intend to harm organizations and/ or organization stakeholders, such as clients, coworkers, customers and supervisors.

Review of existing measures

CWBs constitute one of the important facets of work performance. They are part of contextual performance, influencing the organizational, psychological, and social context in which the task is performed (Collins & Griffin, 1998). They relate closely to how the task is done than to what the task is. Therefore, they have an important impact on overall work performance (Krings & Bollmann, 2011). Measurement of CWBs poses a challenge for researchers. Efforts to measure the concept started from the pioneering work of Hollinger (1986) when he developed a measure of Organizational Deviance. This was followed by the work of Robinson and Bennett (1995) when they developed an Organizational Deviance Scale that measured 11 categories of organizational deviance which is similar to

counterproductive work behavior. A number of researchers in the 1990's came up with measurements in the form of checklists wherein several forms of counterproductive work behaviors were measured by asking the respondents "how often they indulged in them?" Prominent checklists have been by Knorz and Zapf (1996), Skarlicki and Folger (1997), Fox and Spector (1999) and Newman and Baron (1998).

Later Bennett and Robinson (2000) revised their earlier scale and developed a revised version of the scale for measuring workplace deviance (which is quite similar to CWB). The scale included two broad, theoretically derived measures of workplace deviance. Recent attempts to measure CWB have been by Gruys and Sackett (2003), Blau and Anderson (2005) and Burk-Lee and Spector (2006). These checklists though widely used for measuring CWB have a major limitation. These checklists ask the respondent directly "how often they indulge in these behaviors?" This technique of directly asking the respondents about negative behavior has issues of social desirability. Some researchers have even tried to add some positive behaviors along with these negative ones. Scoring on these positive filler questions is not done. They are added to the checklist to deviate respondent's attention from the negative behaviors. Despite this it has been found that the technique fails to motivate the respondents to answer honestly. One reason for this could be respondents' hesitance to accept that he/she themselves indulge in negative behavior. Another attempt has been to measure these behaviors through integrity tests which is widely researched and is also used for recruitment purposes (Berry et al., 2007). Research in this direction was initiated by an early report by the American Psychological Association, where they concluded that integrity tests are the most valid predictors of CWB (Goldberg et al.,

1991). Overt integrity tests measuring attitudes and opinions towards a particular CWB were considered to be relevant. In recent decades, prolific research has consistently endorsed operational validities for integrity tests predicting counterproductive work behaviors (Van Iddekinge, Roth, Raymark, & Odle-Dusseau, 2012a). The following conceptual issues have been identified which pose a challenge in the measurement of the concept:

Generic vs. situation-specific measures

The current trend in the field of counterproductive work behavior measurement has been the usage of standardized self-report tools or checklists that are assumed to be applicable to all jobs (tools such as Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Spector et al., 2006). Such an approach carries with it a number of disadvantages. Counterproductive behaviors vary from organization to organization. The shortcoming of generic measures is that they may include behaviors that may not be relevant to a particular job. In doing this, the existing CWBs are left unmeasured. Generic counterproductive measures tend to overlook occupation-specific forms of counterproductive work behavior. This further leads to a lack of construct validity of generic measures due to the inclusion of irrelevant items (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The inclusion of irrelevant behaviors may result in underestimation of the extent to which counterproductive behavior occurs in the organization.

Sub-dimensions of counterproductive work behavior

The second issue that has been ignored in the conceptualization is the existence of various sub-dimensions of counterproductive work behavior. Though research on various individual forms has been quite intense, including various sub-dimensions in the measurement tool is neglected. Past

research suggests that there has been a clear distinction between counterproductive work behavior targeting the organization vs. counterproductive work behavior targeting the individuals (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Dalal, 2005). There has been a provision of measurement of these two dimensions in almost all widely used measures (eg. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Marcus et al., 2002).

Another dimension that exists in the measurement tools is the distinction between minor vs. major counterproductive work behaviors. This dimension, too, has been a part of almost all measurement tools. What remains a lacuna is the inclusion of occupation-specific sub-dimensions of counterproductive work behavior.

Fidelity-bandwidth principle

The bandwidth fidelity issue is concerned with whether the predictor and criteria variables should be assessed using broad or narrow measures. Fidelity refers to quality of information or measurement. The principal states that when there is greater fidelity there is lower bandwidth, and when there is greater bandwidth there is less fidelity (Cronbach, 1960). It is stated that the level of specificity of predictor and criteria should match each other (Hogan & Roberts, 1996). Broad predictors should yield strong relationships with broad criteria and narrow predictors should yield strong relationship with narrow criteria. While measuring counterproductive work behavior one needs to consider the breadth of the variable. Measurement tools that include heterogeneous items measuring various dimensions are broad in nature (e.g. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Spector et al., 2006). The level at which counterproductive work behavior is measured has an effect on the relationship it has with other constructs (Berry et al., 2007). When counterproductive measure contains homogeneous items, it is considered to be narrow in nature and narrow

predictors are likely to yield stronger relationship with narrow criterion variables. It is suggested that one should examine the presence of broadly conceptualized general performance constructs (Harrison et al., 2006; Viswesvaran, Schmidt & Ones, 2005).

Need for a culture specific tool

It is important to understand that the experiences of both productive and counterproductive work behaviors may differ across countries as a result of different norms, beliefs and values within the countries (Coyne et al, 2013). Hofstede in 2001 identified five cultural dimensions which explain these differences. In Indian context the dimension of power distance indicates high levels of inequality of power and wealth within the society. Similarly on the dimension of long-term orientation, Indian culture is found to be perseverant and parsimonious. Scores on masculine vs. feminine dimension indicate wide gap between values of males and females. These demographic variations play an important role in determining an individual's behavior. Therefore it is imperative to take into account various predisposing (Porter, 1990) and precipitating variables when examining organizational functioning (Sinha, 1988) and organizational management. Along with these variations, other differences exist too, as several studies have shown (Dayal, 1977; Gupta, 1991a; Pareek, 1977; Sinha, 1980, 1988). Work relationships and management in Indian organizations are significantly different from those in the west. Panda and Gupta (2004) identified seven pan Indian cultural preferences. Accordingly, cultural dimensions such as collectivism, respect for status and power, the primacy of personalized relationships, desire to be embedded in a group, familism, context sensitivity, and cynical views about others dominate work life in Indian organizations. Similarly, the social values that are embedded and also govern the organizational behavior of people in

Indian organizations are strikingly different from those of the West. Hierarchy in relationships and structures (Dumont, 1970; Kakar, 1978; Kothari 1970; Roland 1984), use of power play both positively (Roland, 1984) and negatively such as manipulation (Tripathi, 1981) and ingratiation (Pandey 1981). Another Sinha (1985) study discusses "aaram" culture in Indian organizations. This basically refers to not working diligently and a preference for relaxing. Sinha and Sinha (1990) even called it a "chalta hai" orientation, highlighting the poor quality of work employees do in order to finish the work. These orientations characterize Indian psyche in many aspects of their life. Overall, Indian culture represents a diverse population, regional variations, strong kinship ties, and embedded social relationships (Singh, 2009). These cultural orientations along with organizational climate influence the work environment. In this backdrop, coupled with increase in instances of negative behaviors in today's organizations a need to develop a tool that could account for some of these variations was felt.

Present study

Available tools fail to take into account few specifics. Indulging in such behaviors is not considered to be socially desirable, and responses may have limited reliability. Another issue is the prevalence of different negative behaviors in different contexts. The checklist is equipped to measure the occurrence of only few behaviors from the pool of behaviors. Those behavioral categories may not be applicable universally. When measuring the concept in Indian context one needs to take care of not missing out on other behavioral categories applicable here. Based on the researcher's own assessment, discussions with researchers engaged in research in organizational contexts and employees working in

organizations, it was decided to develop a measure with two dimensions.

The tool was developed in three stages. In stage 1 a pool of 35 counterproductive work behaviors was generated. In stage 2 Interitem correlations, variance and exploratory factor analysis was carried out and in stage 3 of the study confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was done in order to verify the proposed dimensionality remaining items and for the process of construct validity.

Stage 1 (Instrument Development)

Item Generation

Here, in this step, the purpose was to create a pool of counterproductive work behaviors thought to be prevalent and common in Indian organizations. For doing this, 50 employees working in different organizations were gathered, and their views on "What they consider as counterproductive work behavior and whether they exist in their organizations?" and "Which, according to them, are the most prevalent counterproductive work behavior in the organizations?" was noted down. A working definition of counterproductive work behaviors was explained to them to make them understand the concept. Based on the analysis of behaviors provided by these employees a list of behaviors was created to be included in the tool. The researchers also independently reviewed some organizations' reports on their employees' indulgence in counterproductive work behavior. Based on this one behavior thought to be important and prevalent in the Indian organizations and not mentioned by the employees interviewed earlier was also added to the list. A thorough review of the literature of research done in this area in the Indian context was also considered.

Item Review

The items generated through the first step were reviewed by a panel of experts coming from various related areas of

expertise, such as Industrial psychology, Human resource management, Organizational research, etc. All the experts had the highest academic qualifications and also had immense experience in their respective fields. The listed behaviors were evaluated against the operational definition of the concept. The experts also judged the items' clarity of understanding, relevance to organizations, language used, and difficulty level. All the items were rated on the above-mentioned criteria. Out of the initial 35 items, 20 were finalized for the final tool, and 15 were dropped.

Stage 2 (Instrument refinement)

Sample

The questionnaire was administered to 352 employees working both in public and private sector organizations. The age of the respondents varied from 20 to 60 years. The sample was drawn from organizations based in Delhi (India). Information on demographic variables was also collected. The survey was not forced in any form and it was made clear to the respondents that the data they provided would be strictly kept confidential and only be used for research purposes. It took approximately 15 to 20 minutes for the respondents to complete the questionnaire. The final questionnaire had 20 statements. For each behavior day to day situations that one frequently comes across in work settings were presented. Each situation was followed by two questions, "To what extent do you think this behavior is counterproductive?" and "What is the likelihood that you would indulge in similar behavior if you were in a similar situation?". The first dimension signifies the extent to which one thinks a particular behavior to be counterproductive (Rating of counterproductive work behavior), and the second-dimension gauges the likelihood of the respondent to indulge in that behavior (Self). The responses for both questions were taken on a four-point rating scale where 1 stood for "great extent," 2 stood for "less."

3 stood for “lesser,” and 4 stood for “not at all.”

The following four forms of counter-productive work behaviors were taken: lying, production deviance, aggression, and bullying. Five situations were taken for each behavior. Each of these forms, with their operational definition, is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Forms of Counterproductive Work Behavior along with their definitions

Definitions
Lying – A false statement, given in order to deceive.
Bullying – It is a persistent negative interpersonal behavior experienced by people at work.
Aggression- It is any form of behavior directed towards the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such behavior.
Production Deviance – Any act directed at destroying or hampering the organization’s production.

Item Selection

This step involved screening of items and then retaining them on the basis on mean, skewness and correlations. In the first step items having extreme mean values and high skewness was deleted. Analysis showed that none of the items both for rating and self-dimensions had extreme mean values. On this basis all the items in both dimensions were accepted as the skewness for all the items was also found to be below +_3. In the second step discrimination index was calculated. In this step on the basis of the total CWB score two groups (Group A having score 75 percentile and above and Group B having scores 25 percentile and below) were identified. For both parts rating and self of the questionnaire t-score was calculated for each item for Group A and Group B. Only those items were selected where t-score was

significant at .01 level. For all items t-scores were significant at .01 level. In other words, no items were dropped at this level (Table 2). In the third step inter item and item total correlations were calculated. A good scale should be composed of highly interrelated items (DeVellis,1991). Inter- item correlations were calculated for all the items for both the dimensions. (Rating and self of the scale). All the correlations were found to be significant (Table 3- 10.). For Item Total Correlations, each item was correlated with its total CWB score. All the items were found to be significant in this step. No item was dropped at this step too.

Factor Analysis

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis to analyze the interrelationships of the items and to suggest additional items for deletion. Factor analysis was computed using SPSS. The entire set of statement was analyzed using exploratory factor analysis using oblimin rotation as the means of factor extraction as the factors were expected to correlate. The various indications of factor analysis are good for both the dimensions of counterproductive work behavior. For the first dimension the output shows a total cumulative variance of 53.86%, the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .94, Barlett’s test of sphericity was significant($\chi^2 = 3038.589$, $df = 190$, $p < .001$) Table 11 shows the factor loadings for the first dimension of counterproductive work behavior on all the items. Three factors emerged for the first dimension. For the second dimension the output shows a total cumulative variance of 52.53%, the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .94, Barlett’s test of sphericity was significant($\chi^2 = 3495.535$, $df = 190$, $p < .001$) Table 12 shows the factor loadings for the first dimension of counterproductive work behavior on all the items. Two factors emerged for this dimension.

Split half reliability index was calculated (CWB Part A =.91, CWB Part B = .90).

Stage 3(Instrument validation)

The sample size for the process of construct validation of the instrument was (n = 352) from both public and private sector organizations. The age of the respondents varied from 20 to 60 years. The sample was drawn from organizations based in Delhi (India). Information on demographic variables was also collected. Out of this (n = 115) were female employees and (n = 237) were male employees. Around 60 % of the employees had a monthly salary between 40 to 60 thousand. Rest 40% of the employees drew salaries less than this. We performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to cross validate the results of factor analysis. LISREL (Joreskog & Sorborn,1993) was used to evaluate the fit of the measurement model. The results of CFA or confirmatory factor analysis (Table 13) show a model with a good reasonable data fit. Default model in the first row shows the values for the measurement model x and the second row shows the values for null also called the alternate model. χ^2 is a function of the sample size and the difference between the observed covariance matrix and the model covariance matrix. For default model it is 1995.15 and for the null model it is 7706.55. GFI indicates the goodness of fit indices(Jorskog & Sorborn, 1981) and AGFI is adjustment of goodness of fit indices (Jorskog & Sorborn, 1981). Both GFI and AGFI are the absolute indices. RMSEA is the root mean square error of approximation (Steiger & Lind,1980). Good models are considered to have a RMSEA of .05 or less. Models whose RMSEA is .1 or more have a poor fit. Our model has a value of .07. IFI refers to incremental fitness indices and CFI refers to comparative fitness indices (Bentler,1990). CFI depends in large part on the average size of the correlations in the data. If the average correlation between

variables is not high, then the CFI will not be very high. CFI values above 0.90 show a model that fits well. The CFI value for our model is .92. Overall the results show a model with a good data fit.

Table 2. Mean, SD, Variance, Skewness and Discriminative Index of the final statements

Items	Mean	SD	Variance	Skewness	t
Lying 1(R)	1.75	.909	.827	.717	08.824
Lying 1(S)	2.58	1.168	1.365	-.194	16.964
Lying 2(R)	1.91	1.092	1.193	.647	18.028
Lying (S)	2.55	1.151	1.326	-.153	15.289
Pro Dev 1(R)	1.83	1.059	1.121	.552	09.839
Pro Dev 1(S)	2.68	1.272	1.618	-.448	20.595
Aggress 1(R)	2.00	1.127	1.270	.442	12.756
Aggress 1(S)	2.60	1.155	1.333	-.307	17.548
Lying 3(R)	1.86	1.123	1.261	.783	15.721
Lying 3(S)	2.32	1.254	1.573	.107	18.307
Lying 4(R)	1.88	1.110	1.231	.743	18.696
Lying 4(S)	2.70	1.269	1.611	-.378	21.957
Pro Dev 2(R)	2.18	1.087	1.182	.108	12.184
Pro Dev 2(S)	2.41	1.097	1.203	-.078	15.255
Aggress 2 (R)	1.86	1.098	1.205	.695	17.815
Aggress 2(S)	2.55	1.250	1.563	-.257	16.992
Pro Dev 3(R)	1.95	1.031	1.063	.581	13.619
Pro Dev 3(S)	2.52	1.103	1.216	-.265	14.997
Lying 5(R)	2.04	1.147	1.316	.190	09.763
Lying 5(S)	2.44	1.193	1.424	-.267	11.536
Pro Dev 4(R)	1.90	1.187	1.410	.729	09.385
Pro Dev 4(S)	2.78	1.238	1.533	-.452	17.795
Aggress 3(R)	1.93	1.041	1.084	.529	13.293
Aggress 3(S)	2.54	1.130	1.278	-.244	16.696
Pro Dev 5(R)	1.93	1.102	1.215	.618	20.511
Pro Dev 5(S)	2.79	1.230	1.512	-.503	16.972
Bullying 1(R)	1.95	1.166	1.361	.366	13.082

Bullying 1(S)	2.51	1.219	1.485	-.417	17.006
Bullying 2(R)	1.87	1.168	1.364	.555	18.008
Bullying 2(S)	2.57	1.358	1.845	.327	13.367
Bullying 3(R)	1.90	1.042	1.085	.454	13.695
Bullying 3(S)	2.46	1.133	1.283	-.188	15.051
Bullying 4(R)	1.88	1.160	1.346	.655	19.949
Bullying 4(S)	2.57	1.318	1.738	-.263	22.908
Aggress 4(R)	1.96	1.124	1.264	.448	10.840
Aggress 4(S)	2.68	1.227	1.505	-.468	16.029
Bullying 5(R)	2.19	1.181	1.395	.138	16.749
Bullying 5(S)	2.65	1.216	1.479	-.402	08.948
Aggress 5(R)	2.02	1.209	1.462	.502	09.672
Aggress 5(S)	2.88	1.245	1.549	-.680	09.835

Pro Dev= production deviance, Aggress= aggression

Table 3. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of lying on the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Lying 1	1				
2. Lying 2	.436**	1			
3. Lying 3	.316**	.456**	1		
4. Lying 4	.390**	.498**	.535**	1	
5. Lying 5	.310**	.297**	.292**	.300**	1

Table 4. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of Production deviance on the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Prod D 1	1				
2. Prod D 2	.299**	1			
3. Prod D 3	.358**	.460**	1		
4. Prod D 4	.360**	.412**	.385**	1	
5. Prod D 5	.338**	.385**	.462**	.488**	1

Table 5. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of Aggression on the rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Aggression 1	1				
2. Aggression 2	.453**	1			
3. Aggression 3	.262**	.312**	1		
4. Aggression 4	.311**	.391**	.478**	1	
5. Aggression 5	.305**	.429**	.312**	.469**	1

Table 6. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of Bullying on rating dimension of counterproductive work behavior

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Bullying 1	1				
2. Bullying 2	.484**	1			
3. Bullying 3	.380**	.392**	1		
4. Bullying 4	.388**	.541**	.335**	1	
5. Bullying 5	.320**	.304**	.281**	.378**	1

Table 7. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of lying on the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Lying 1	1				
2. Lying 2	.513**	1			
3. Lying 3	.365**	.483**	1		
4. Lying 4	.501**	.601**	.522**	1	
5. Lying 5	.399**	.408**	.338**	.411**	1

Table 8. Inter item correlations on all the five statements of Production deviance on the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Prod D 1	1				
2. Prod D 2	.508**	1			
3. Prod D 3	.429**	.530**	1		
4. Prod D 4	.367**	.463**	.475**	1	
5. Prod D 5	.480**	.463**	.470**	.604**	1

Prod D = production deviance

Table 9. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of Aggression on the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Aggression 1	1				
2. Aggression 2	.451**	1			
3. Aggression 3	.466**	.469**	1		
4. Aggression 4	.396**	.411**	.483**	1	
5. Aggression 5	.279**	.350**	.359**	.501**	1

Table 10. Inter-item correlations on all the five statements of Bullying on the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Bullying 1	1				
2. Bullying 2	.583**	1			
3. Bullying 3	.483**	.382**	1		
4. Bullying 4	.598**	.533**	.459**	1	
5. Bullying 5	.204**	.276**	.355**	.280**	1

Table 11. Factor loadings, eigenvalues, and % of variance explained for CWB(R) dimension of counterproductive work behavior obtained by Direct Oblimin Rotation.

Items	Factor loadings	Initial Eigen values			Total	% of variance explained
		1	2	3		
1	Lying			.534	8.408	42.040
2	Lying	.604			1.216	6.081
3	Production deviance	.666			1.150	5.748
4	Aggression	.814			.980	4.798
5	Lying	.680			.839	4.196
6	Lying	.784			.719	3.595
7	Production deviance		.561		.701	3.503
8	Aggression	.648			.655	3.273
9	Production deviance		.503		.638	3.191
10	Lying		.782		.594	2.968
11	Production deviance	.512			.550	2.749
12	Aggression		.691		.517	2.587
13	Production deviance		.422		.468	2.342
14	Bullying		.564		.444	2.219
15	Bullying	.664			.403	2.017
16	Bullying		.525		.388	1.939
17	Bullying	.691			.370	1.849
18	Aggression			.569	.344	1.721
19	Bullying			.773	.343	1.713
20	Aggression			.801	.294	1.470

Table 12. Factor loadings, eigenvalues, and % of variance explained for CWB(S) dimension of counterproductive work behavior obtained by Direct Oblimin Rotation .

Items	Factor loadings	Initial Eigen values		Total	% of variance explained
		1	2		
1	Lying	.694		9.244	46.222
2	Lying	.735		1.262	6.312
3	Production deviance	.606		.929	4.644
4	Aggression	.729		.804	4.022
5	Lying	.626		.775	3.874
6	Lying	.674		.737	3.686
7	Production deviance	.673		.665	3.323
8	Aggression	.635		.581	2.903
9	Production deviance	.711		.571	2.855
10	Lying		.752	.536	2.679
11	Production deviance		.663	.524	2.618
12	Aggression		.734	.478	2.391
13	Production deviance	.685		.471	2.357
14	Bullying	.826		.438	2.188
15	Bullying	.623		.420	2.099
16	Bullying	.656		.376	1.879
17	Bullying	.672		.342	1.711
18	Aggression		.451	.317	1.587
19	Bullying		.831	.301	1.503
20	Aggression		.774	.229	1.147

Table 13. Multiple Fit Indices of the Measurement Model compared with the Null Model for CWB

Model	χ^2	χ^2/df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	IFI	CFI
Default Model (2 Factor)	1995.15	2.69	0.77	0.74	0.07	0.82	0.92
Null Model	7706.55	9.88	0.22	0.18	0.16	0.00	0.00

Discussion

Organizations as a unit exist in larger socio-cultural contexts. The context in which they are embedded is likely to influence the

functioning of the organizations. Indian society is a fast changing and growing economy which is also witnessing rising expectations of people. There is immense

population pressure, often creating scarcity of resources, giving rise to an element of uncertainty in individuals' psyche. For a large segment of the population financial hardships, large number of dependents along with varying socio-economic conditions gives rise to a unique set of behaviors. The purpose of this study was to construct a culture specific tool for the measurement of counterproductive work behavior. Non-western, collectivist cultures such as one prevalent in Indian organizations are very sensitive to acceptance of negative behaviors due to the stigma attached to them. This present study was an attempt to indirectly gauge the occurrence of such behaviors so as not to directly attack the employee. Four most prevalent forms of counterproductive work behaviors were identified based on the pilot study. These behaviors were lying, production deviance, aggression and bullying. Situations were included in the questionnaire related to these four forms of counterproductive work behavior. In this instrument respondents were asked whether a certain behavior performed by another person was counterproductive work behavior. This kind of an approach helps in avoiding directly asking the respondent. The situations included were ordinary day to day situations to which people can relate easily. This technique helps us in camouflaging the actual negative behavior. Another issue which we try to handle in this measure is the researcher labeling a particular behavior as counterproductive. One needs to be careful about what one calls as "counterproductive". Any behavior may not be regarded as counterproductive in all contexts and by all respondents. A behavior seen as counterproductive in one organization may not be seen as counterproductive in the other. To handle this we asked the first question in every situation as "to what extent you think this behavior is counterproductive" (also called the rating of counterproductive work behavior). Once an

individual accepts that the behavior is counterproductive we ask the second question which was "what is the likelihood that you would indulge in the same behavior if you were in a similar situation?" (also called the self-dimension of counterproductive work behavior). The responses are taken on a 4-point Likert scale starting from "high probability" to "not at all".

In the traditional view with which we started, it was thought that all four dimensions would be distinct from each other. The results of factor analysis show a different picture. Three factors emerged for the first dimension of the situations given. The extracted factors do not have a clear loading for any dimension. The first factor has the maximum loading of 18 situations with a mix of all four dimensions (Cronbach alpha = .88). The second factor has a loading of 2 situations; again, the factors had a mix of all the dimensions (Cronbach alpha = .81). The results of factor analysis done for the second part show an extraction of 2 factors. Here, the maximum loading is on the first factor, i.e., 17 situations (Cronbach alpha = .92), including all the dimensions. The second factor has a loading of 3 situations (.73). The results show an overlapping of dimensions in the emerging factors. This depicts that though there are several dimensions of counterproductive work behavior, there lies a thin line of difference between them. The entire four dimensions taken here for this study are not clearly differentiated from each other. A plausible explanation for this is that when people look at any negative behavior there is a tendency to club all negative things together. They broadly differentiate between positive and negative. The forms of counterproductive work behavior are actually finer academic variations for researchers. This instrument measures a global concept of counterproductive work behavior. To use the scale further we will have to treat it as a unidimensional concept, which would include

all the four dimensions taken in this study. As a unidimensional concept, the scale will measure counterproductive work behavior rather than any of the four dimensions separately.

The construct validation process was done using confirmatory factor analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis proved that the hypothesized two factor structure fit the data. Two scales reflect the dimension of rating and the other reflect the dimension of self-emerged. However, this is just the first step in proposing such an approach in the measurement of this concept, as there is no prior consistent conceptual approach suggesting the same. Also construct validation is an ongoing process. Discriminant validity needs to be established.

Feedback from few of the respondents suggests that the tool is easy to understand and respond. The negative behaviors being so sensitive in nature are questioned indirectly, which is the measure's biggest strength. Looking at the future implications, some recent counterproductive work behaviors that were not considered earlier, such as cyberstalking, procrastination, presenteeism, etc., which are seen in organizations, can also be included. As the two-dimensional approach proposed here is a new measurement perspective, traditionally prevalent counterproductive work behaviors were only considered. Now, talking about the limitations, it was realized that if these reports are part of the appraisal system of an employee and are not anonymous in nature, then it still is a challenge to get honest figures. Employees tend to be more honest in their responses when anonymity is maintained. Another limitation of the tool is that it fails to measure the two traditional forms of counterproductive work behaviors, i.e., behavior directed towards organization and behaviors directed towards person. As we wanted to handle issues of social desirability,

the entire approach remained more focused on that objective.

References

- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349–360.
- Berry, C. M., Sackett, P. R., & Wiemann, S. (2007). A review of recent developments in integrity test research. *Personnel Psychology*, 6, 271–301. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00074.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett P.R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 92, 410-424.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Bies, R.J., Tripp, T.M., & Kramer, R.M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R.A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp.18-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blau, G. (1995). Influence of group lateness on individual lateness: A cross-level examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 1483-1496.
- Blau, G. & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 595-614.
- Bruck-Lee, V., & Spector, P. E. (2006). The social stressors-counterproductive work behaviors link: Are conflicts with supervisors and coworkers the same? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 145-156.
- Collins, J.M., & Griffin, R.W. (1998). The psychology of counterproductive job performance. In R.W. Griffin, A.O'Leary-Kelly, & J.M. Collins (Eds.). *Dysfunctional behavior in Organizations: Non-Violent dysfunctional behavior. Monographs in*

- organizational behavior and relations*, 23, part B, pp. 219-242.
- Cook, T.D. & Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis for Field Settings*. Rand McNally, Chicago, Illinois.
- Coyne, I.J....et al, (2013). The relationship between productive and counterproductive work behavior across four *European countries*. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(4), pp. 377-389.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1960). *Essentials of psychological testing*. Harper, New York.
- Dalal, S. R. (2005). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 90, No. 6, 1241-1255.
- Dayal, I. (1977). *Change in work organizations: Some experiences of renewal of social systems*. New Delhi, India: Concept.
- DeVellis, R. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage
- DiBattista, R.A. (1989, October). Designing a program to manage the risk of sabotage. *Supervision*, pp.6-8.
- Dumont, L., 1970. Homohierarchus: The caste system and its implications. Chicago, IL: Chicago
- Fox, S. & Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration- aggression. *A Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20, 915-931.
- Giacalone, R.A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Anti social behavior in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goldberg, L. R., Greiner, J. R., Guion, R. M., Sechrest, L. B., & Wing, H. (1991). Questionnaires used in the prediction of trustworthiness in pre-employment selection decisions: An APA task force report. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 2, 399 – 432.
- Griffin, R. W., A. O'Leary-Kelly & J. Collins. (1998). Dysfunctional Work Behaviors in Organizations. In *Trends in Organizational Behavior*. Eds. C. L. Cooper and D. M. Rousseau. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 65-82.
- Gruys, M. L. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). The dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. Gupta, A.K. (1991a). Why does poverty persist in regions of high biodiversity? : a case for indigenous property right system. *Int. conf. on Property Rights & Genetic Resources* sponsored by IUCN, UNEP and ACTS at Kenya, June 10-16, 1991.
- Gupta, A.K. (1991a). Why does poverty persist in regions of high biodiversity? : a case for indigenous property right system. *Int. conf. on Property Rights & Genetic Resources* sponsored by IUCN, UNEP and ACTS at Kenya, June 10-16, 1991.
- Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (2), 305-325.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 273-279.
- Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. (1996). Issues and non-issues in the fidelity/bandwidth tradeoff. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 627-637.
- Hollinger, R.C. (1986). Acts against the workplace: Social bonding and employee deviance. *Deviant Behavior*, 7, 53-75.
- Johns, G. (1994). How often were you absent? A review of the use of self-reported absence data

- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1986). LISREL IV: Analysis of linear structural relationships by maximum likelihood, instrumental variables and least squares methods (4th ed.). Mooreseville, IN: Scientific Software *Journal of Applied Psychology*,79,372-391.
- Kakar, S., 1978. The inner experience: A psychoanalytic study of childhood and society in India, New Delhi, Oxford university Press.
- Knorz, C. & Zapf, D. (1996). Mobbing a severe form of stressors at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*,40, 12- 21.
- Kothari, R, 1970. Politics in India. New Delhi: Orient Longma.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hilderbrandt, V.H., Schanfelli, W.B., & Vander. Beek, A.J.(2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: a systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environment Medicine*. Aug:53(8): pp. 856-66.
- Krings, F., & Bollmann, G. (2011). Managing counterproductive work behaviors. In G. Palazzo & M. Wentland (Eds.), *Responsible Management Practices for the 21st century* (pp. 151-159). Paris: Pearson.
- Lau, V. C. S., Au, W. 21T., & Ho, J. M. C. (2003). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18: 73-99.
- Lorinkova, N. M., & Perry, S. J. (2014). When is empowerment effective? the role of leader exchange in empowering leadership, cynicism, and time theft. *Journal of Management*, doi:10.1177/0149206314560411
- Marcus, B., Schuler, H., Quell, P., & Hümpfner, G. (2002). Measuring counterproductivity Development and initial validation of a German self-report questionnaire. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 18-35.
- Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management*, 24, 391-411.
- O'Neill, T. A., Hambley, L. A., & Bercovich, A. (2014). Prediction of cyberslacking when employees are working away from the office. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 34(0), 291- 298. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.015
- Pandey, J., 1981. Ingratiation tactics in India *Journal of Social Psychology* 113,147-148.
- Panda, A. & Gupta, R.K. (2004). Mapping cultural diversity within India: A meta analysis of some recent studies. *Global Business Review*, 5, 27-49.
- Pareek, U. (1977). *Managerial role effectiveness*. New Delhi : Learning Systems (CR Reading 9), 14.
- Porter, M.E. (1990). *Competitive Advantage of Nations*. Free Press, New York.
- Roland, A, 1984. 'The self in India and America'. In: V. Kavolis (4.). *Designs of sellhood*. New Jersey: Associated University Press.
- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 555-572.
- Rogers, K. & Kelloway, K. (1997). Violence at work: Personnel and organizational outcomes, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2: 63-71.
- Sackett, P.R. (2002) The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 5-11.
- Singh, P. (2009). Understanding the social world: Issues and challenges. In Misra, G. (Eds.) *Psychology in India, Vol 2: Social and Organizational Process*.
- Sinha, D. (1985). Psychology in rural areas: The case of a developing country. In R. Diaz-Guerrero (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and national*

- studies in social psychology*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Sinha, D., & Sinha, M. (1990). Dissonance in work culture in India. In A. D. Moddie (Eds.), *The concept of work in Indian society*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced study.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1980). *The nurturant task leader*. New Delhi: Concept Publisher.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1988). Reorganizing values for development. In D. Sinha and H. S. R. Kan (Eds.) *Social values and development: Asian perspective*, pp. 275-284. New Delhi, Sage.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Spector, P. E. (1978). Organizational frustration: A model and review of the literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 815-829.
- Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. (2002). An Emotion-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior: Some Parallels Between Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269-292.
- Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.) *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*. Washington DC: APA Press.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
- Tripathi, R. C., 1981. 'Machiavellianism and social manipulation'. In: J. Pandey (ed.). *Perspective on experimental social psychology in India*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Roth, P. L., Raymark, P. H., & Odle-Dusseau, H. N. (2012a). The criterion-related validity of integrity tests: An updated meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 499-530. doi:10.1037/a0021196.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in organizations: Theory, research, and management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? A meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 108-131.

Neha Jain, Ph.D, Program Chair, Department of Psychology. Associate Professor - Psychology & OB, School of Management & Liberal Studies, The Northcap University, Sector - 23 A, Gurugram - 122017, Haryana

Purnima Singh, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.