

Adaptation and Validation of Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (45 And 32)

¹Dr. Khalida Rauf, ²Asim Farooq

¹(Assist. Professor), Department of Psychology, Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences & Technology, Karachi, Pakistan

²Department of Psychology, Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences & Technology, Karachi, Pakistan

Abstract: Present study aimed to adapt the Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (Spector et al., 2006), by providing an Urdu version of the said scale which has been validated upon the indigenous population. For this purpose ITC (2010) guidelines were followed, & the resultant scale after pilot testing (N=60) was validated by administration on 450 working adults, including males (N=288), & females (N=162).107 were re-administered for test-retest reliability (males= 60, females=47). Reliability Analysis was carried out by assessing Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, Split-half (Guttman) reliability, & Test-retest reliability. For validity analysis, scores on CWB-C 45, & 32 were correlated with scores of Subjective Job Stress Scale (Motowidlo et al., 1986), Rosenberg's Self-Esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965), & Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985).

Keywords: Counterproductive work behaviors, Adaptation, Standardization, & Cross cultural analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the dawn of industrialization, technological advancement, and globalization, the present day work force has become much more diverse. People with different backgrounds, attitudes and personalities perceive the same event differently and these differences lead to conflicts which have their implications at workplace, such as counterproductive work behaviors (Dilchert, Ones, Davis, & Rostow, 2007). These (CWBs) are such harmful and intentional acts which are directed towards damaging the set goals, and resources of an organization or its members. Studies have revealed that these undesired behaviors are pervasive in majority of work environment and across different industries and countries (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007).

Sackett defines (2002) CWBs as those "intentional behavior on the part of an organization member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests" this definition of CWBs has three main dimensions of CWBs, that they should be intentional not accidental (Gruys & Sackett, 2003), person carrying out these behaviors should be a part of that organization, and behaviors should be against the interests and set goals of that organization. Moreover, Marcus & Schuler (2004) suggested that the potential for harm should also be incorporated into CWB models. These are also responsible for producing a negative impression on both external and internal stakeholder of the organization. This situation becomes more serious when we consider the recent financial scandals/issues in western markets, elevations in deviant behaviors among workforce, unethical practices, law suits, & billions of dollars spend on overcoming such effects (Murphey, 1993; Levine, 2010).

In recent times, many organizational researchers have examined it from various aspects (Penny & Spector, 2005). Initially, the focus was on defining, identifying, and measuring different dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), later the emphasis shifted towards assessing moderators for CWBs, such as organizational factors/characteristics (Fox et al., 2001), personality types and traits, as well as other person variables (Aquino, Lewis, &

Bradfield, 1999; Salgado, 2002). Later role of emotions, cognitions (Fox & Spector, 1999; Fox, et al., 2001) and motivation (Mehta, 2004) were also incorporated into CWBs explanatory models.

Robinson and Bennett (1995), developed multidimensional scaling techniques for arriving at a typology of deviant work related activities (CWBs). A cross factorial analysis produced four categories of deviant behaviors at work place. (1) The minor-interpersonal category contains behaviors as favoritism and gossiping, and was called as political deviance. (2) The serious-interpersonal category contains behaviors as abuse and theft, and was called as personal aggression. (3) The minor-organizational category contains behaviors as withdrawal and was called as production deviance. (4) The serious-organizational category contains behaviors as sabotaging and damaging organizations property, and was called as property deviance.

Gruys (1999) used the same framework and classified CWB into eleven different categories, along two main dimensions, namely (1) interpersonal-organizational, & (2) task-Relevance, these are: (a) theft and loot, (b) property damage, (c) information misuse/misguide, (d) time and resource wastage (e) clumsy behavior, (f) absenteeism, (g) bad work, (h) alcohol and substance use/abuse, (i) drug use/abuse, (j) inappropriate verbal actions/abuse, and (k) physical actions/abuse/aggression (Gruys, & Sackett, 2003). Additionally, Andersson, and Pearson (1999), identified workplace rudeness as violation of workplace and interpersonal norms for gaining respect.

Fox, & Spector (1999), developed the model along the lines of aggression and its antecedents and consequences. According to their Stressor-emotion model of CWB (Spector & Fox, 2005), whenever the goal directed behavior of an employee is hampered in an organizational setting, frustration occurs and it potentiates to direct employee's behavioral responses toward aggression. In addition, other variable like job dissatisfaction also plays mediating role in this process. Personality variables also affect these affective outcomes. These include locus of control, anxiety, and anger. According to this model, individuals who possess external locus of control, along with elevated levels of trait anger and anxiety, were more prone to have a negative state of mind (clouded judgment/ negative affect), thus highly vulnerable to displaying counterproductive work behaviors.

Counterproductive work behaviors have been known to be associated with many other variables of interest at occupational settings. Whether they be the cause, or resulted from a cause, their coexistence with such variables provide us with opportunities for in depth analysis. Occupational stress, self-esteem, and job satisfaction are among such variables. According to Greiner, Krause, Ragland, & Fisher, (1998), "Work-related stress occurs due to poor technical or organizational work design due to which job requirements are unsuited or inequitable with the mental regulation processes, such as information processing, evaluations, scheduling, and implementations". Therefore the presences of Counterproductive work behaviors along with elevated levels of job stress have been reported frequently by the researchers (Kahn &Boysiere, 1992; Tubre& Collins, 2000; Bacharach, Bamberger, &Sonnenstuhl, 2002; Penney & Spector, 2005; Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006).

Self-esteem is the overall (negative or positive) emotional evaluation of an individual about his or her own worth" (Hewitt, 2009). A negative correlation among self-esteem and counterproductive work behaviors has been pointed out by researchers (Baumeister, Smart, &Boden1996; Ferris, Brown, & Heller, 2009; Whelpley& McDaniel, 2011). It is argued that higher levels of self-esteem will stop an individual from engaging in counterproductive works behaviors. As individuals with higher self-esteem will be psychologically well adjusted, and capable of managing the effects of stress effectively. Job satisfaction is the degree to which an individual is satisfied with his current job. (Moorman,1993). Occurrence of counterproductive work behaviors used to decrease the amount of satisfaction. Subsequently lower levels of job satisfaction induce vulnerability towards engaging in counterproductive work behaviors (Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006; Zulkifli, 2011).

At present, there has been exhaustive literature covering various aspects of CWBs, and as a result different psychometric instruments have been developed for measuring CWBs. Among such instruments one most widely used and thoroughly studied is Counterproductive work behavior Check list (Spector et al., 2006). This instrument has been developed in English Language and has been used in researches in western countries.

Unfortunately, till now, there is no such instrument in Urdu to be used with local population. Therefore, there is a strong need to develop indigenous instruments that could be used with local population. One approach is to translate previously

developed instruments in other languages into local language. It should be noted that translation of psychometric instruments does not refer to mere translation of words; rather it serves to communicate the construct under examination. (Vijver &Poortinga,1997; Vijver &Tanzer, 1997; Wainer, 1999). Therefore, the word “Adaptation” is favored upon “translation” in psychological literature (Oakland, & Lane, 2004; Sireci, Yang, Harter, & Ehrlich, 2006).Based on this approach, the present study is aimed at providing a sound translation with adequate psychometric properties of CWB-C into Urdu. This effort will be helpful in recruiting, selection, and screening purposes, as well as beneficial for researchers who are going to investigate the CWB phenomenon in local Pakistani population, providing basis for cross cultural comparison in this (I/O & CWB) domain.

II. METHODS

Translation

Translation procedure was based upon guidelines by Hambleton, &Patsula (1998) and International Test Commission (2010).

Expert Committee: An expert committee was formed having five bilingual experts, chaired by a professional psychologist having PhD in Psychology. Committee was charged with providing suggestions for selection and modifications in formats and items, according to the Pakistani cultural context.

Forward Translation: Five independent professional translators, who had proficiency in both target and source languages, were approached. After each translation was submitted, a discussion was held with the translator in which translation was reviewed, problems, and their solutions were discussed in detail. When all the translations were received, a final discussion was held with expert committee, for preparation of a synthesized version.

Backward Translation: Five independent professional translators, having proficiency in both languages, were approached. After each translation was submitted, discussion was held with the translator for a detail review. Final discussion was held with expert committee and similarities and differences in all translations, in comparison with the synthesized forward translated version were reviewed, and necessary amendments were made.

Pilot Study: For pilot study, sample consisted of 60 respondents (n=60, 30: females; & 30: males), out of them, 10 were Psychology major students (8 female, 2 male), having part time work experience, 30 were school teachers (12 male, 18 female), & 20 were paramedics (16 male, 4 female), with age range between 22-47, and mean age of the sample was 32.31. Scores on both measures were correlated, which showed that translated items elicited responses which were same in intensity and frequency, as they were in their counterparts on original English version.

Sample& Procedure

Sample was obtained from different organizations, both government and private sector employees were recruited. It consisted of 450 individuals (males = 288, & females = 162).After acquiring formal permission, possible candidates were reached at their workplace, usually during office breaks. They were given a brief description of the study, were assured of their confidentiality and were presented with consent forms. **Inclusion criteria:** (1) employed for more than 3 months at current job, (2) total work experience should be at least or greater than 6 months, (3) educational level should be equal to or greater than Grade 8 (middle).

Instruments

Following instruments were used for data collection, it is to be noted that Urdu versions of all scales were utilized, including the consent form.

Demographic Form: Designed to obtain information regarding gender, age, educational level, and work experience, including recent and previous one.

Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist: The CWB-C (Spector, et al., 2006) has two forms, one has 45 items measuring CWBs along two basic dimensions of Organization and Person variables. Second, a condensed version has 32

item and five subscales. These include (1) Abuse, (2) Production deviance (3) Sabotage (4) Theft (5) Withdrawal. Responses are recorded on a likert type five point scale, ranging from *never (1) to every day (5)*. The Revised alpha coefficients are as follows; Abuse .85, Production Deviance .63, Sabotage .55, Theft .63, Withdrawal .64, CWB-O .86, CWB-P .86, & CWB-Total .90.

Subjective Job Stress Scale: The SJSS (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986), is used to assess job stress, likert type measurement which consists of four items, two are positively scored (1, & 3), while other two items (2, & 4) are reverse scored. Have five response options from Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (5). Alpha value for internal consistency is .83. For this study its Urdu translation by Rauf, & Farooq (2014) was used.

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale. The RSES (Rosenberg, 1965) is a self-report instrument designed to measure global feelings of self-worth. It is consisted of ten items, among which five are positively scored (item # 1, 2, 4, 6, & 7), while the other five items (item #3, 5, 8, 9, & 10) are reverse scored. The scale utilizes likert type measurement, with four options. Urdu translation of Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale by Sardar (1998) was utilized, demonstrating good internal consistency of .71.

Job Satisfaction Survey: JSS(Spector, 1985), is a self-report survey for assessing job satisfaction, 36 items long, having nine different subscales. This is also a likert type scale, having six response options ranging from Disagree very much (1), to Agree very much (6). Internal consistency for the whole scale is .91, while it ranges from .60 to .91 for subscales. For this study, Urdu translation of job Satisfaction Survey by Shahzad, & Begum (2011) was used. The reported values of internal consistency for this translation are .76 for the whole measure, and ranging from .70 to .82 for the nine subscales.

Scoring and Statistical Analysis

After data collection, all scales were scored according to the standard procedures, statistical analysis were carried out by the aid of IBM SPSS v.20.

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient: Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated for two categories, and for five subscales of CWB-C.

Split-half Rreliability coefficient: For the 45 item scale, two halves containing 22 items each was formed, and for the 32 item scale, two halves containing 16 items each were formed.

Test-retest reliability: 107 respondents were contacted for the second time, after two weeks of the initial administration. The test-retest reliability coefficient was measured by the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between the scores of two administrations.

Validity Analysis: Convergent validity of CWB-C (translated version) was assessed by computing Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, between scores obtained on CWB-C with scores obtained on Subjective Job Stress Scale, Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale, and Job Satisfaction Survey.

Operational Definitions

Source Language: Language of the source text (Pym, 2011).

Target Language: Language of the Target Text (Pym, 2011).

Adaptation: Modifying a source text into target text (Pym, 2011).

Forward Translation: Translating source text form source language, into target text in target language (Pym, 2011).

Back Translation: Translating target text back into source text, in source language (Pym, 2011).

Counterproductive Work Behaviors. "Set of distinct acts that are volitional, which harm or intend to harm organizations and coworkers" (Spector & Fox, 2005).

CWB-O. CWB's aimed towards the organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

CWB-P. CWB’s aimed towards other people at work area (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Abuse: “Harmful behaviors toward coworkers, physically or psychologically through making threats, nasty comments, ignoring the person, or undermining the person’s ability” (Spector & Fox, 2005).

Production Deviance: “Purposeful failure to perform job tasks effectively” (Spector & Fox, 2005).

Sabotage: “Defacing or destroying physical property belonging to the employer or others at work place” (Spector & Fox, 2005).

Theft: “Stealing or looting from employer or coworkers” (Spector & Fox, 2005).

Withdrawal: “Restricting working time to less than is required by the organization” (Spector & Fox, 2005).

Self Esteem: “Overall emotional evaluation of an individual about his or her own worth” (Hewitt, 2009).

Job Stress: Negative psychological and emotional response, when job requirements do not match the capabilities, and taxes coping resources (McGrath, 1976).

Job Satisfaction: Amount to which an individual is content and satisfied with his or her current job (Moorman, 1993).

III. RESULTS

Mean and standard deviation of demographic, and research variables were calculated. It consisted of 450 individuals (males = 288, & females = 162), Age ranged from 22 years to 58 years, with 36.63 as mean age of the sample. Educational level of respondents ranged from Matriculation (10th grade) to Doctorate (Ph.D.), with 13 years of education as mean educational level of the sample. Descriptive for research variables were computed for Counterproductive work behavior Checklist, Subjective Job Stress Scale, Rosenberg’s Self-esteem Scale, and Job Satisfaction Survey (Table 1). Study was also aimed at assessing reliability and validity of the translated version (Table 2).

Table: 1

Showing Descriptive Statistics for Sub scales of counterproductive work behavior Checklist, Subjective Job Stress Scale, Rosenberg’s Self Esteem Scale, and Job Satisfaction Scale (N=450)

Sub-scales	Min	Max	M	SD
CWBC-Abuse	17	64	20.36	6.48
CWBC-Production Deviance	3	13	4.41	1.57
CWBC-Sabotage	3	10	3.96	1.33
CWBC-Theft	5	19	5.31	1.19
CWBC-Withdrawal	4	17	7.06	2.59
CWBC-Organizational	21	38	32.28	11.36
CWBC-Personal	22	85	25.69	7.55
CWBC-Total	44	172	59.29	13.46
SJSS	5	18	13.93	4.21
RSES	10	43	33.26	3.18
JSS-Total	86	197	136.53	19.23

Note: CWBC=Counterproductive work behavior Checklist, SJSS=Subjective Job Stress Scale, RSES=Rosenberg’s Self Esteem Scale, JSS=Job Satisfaction Scale

IV. DISCUSSION

The translation and adaptation procedures were carried out in accordance with ITC (2010), and Hambleton, & Patsula's (1998) guidelines. Results from descriptive analysis, suggest that Pakistani work force has slightly higher levels of Production Deviance, Sabotage, Withdrawal, and organizational sub scales. While slightly lower levels were observed for Abuse, Theft, and Personal sub scales. These could be best understood by the local cultural values in which interpersonal relations are more preferred (especially on production). These higher and lower values contribute to produce a composite value, the total score which is somewhat similar, considering the slightly higher value which could be understood by higher standard deviations for total score in the local population sample (Table 1).

For the reliability assessment, three widely accepted approaches as indicated in the literature (Nunnally, 1978; Anastasi, 1988) were carried out. To assess internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient values were calculated. In case of five subscales of the 32 item version, alpha values ranged from .65-.87. For subscales of the 45 item version, alpha values ranged from .87-.92. It is evident that the translation of the Counterproductive work behavior Checklist (both versions) has demonstrated adequate internal consistency for all sub scales. In some cases alpha values in this study have surpassed those of the original scale. This could be attributed to the sample size difference, as the alpha values for original version are calculated from a number of studies (N=731-738, except Abuse, Person, & Total subscales N=460). In contrast the present study generated alpha values from a single sample, in which the missing values questionnaires were discarded, and were not included in the calculation. Minimal standard deviations in some cases also account for these improved values for Alpha Coefficient (Table 2).

Table: 2

Showing Reliability & Validity Analysis for Sub-scales and Total score of CWB-C (N=450, except test-retest, n=107).

Sub-scales	Reliability Analysis			Validity Analysis		
	# of Items	Alpha value	Test-Retest	SJSS	RSES	JSS
Abuse	17	.87	.72**	.63*	-.23*	-.30*
Theft	5	.65	.67**	.42*	-	-
Withdrawal	4	.72	.62**	.28*	-.14*	-.18*
P-Deviance	3	.67	.78**	.42**	-.19**	-.23**
Sabotage	3	.71	.72**	-	-	-.11*
Organization	21	.87	.83**	.67**	-.27*	-.32*
Person	22	.88	.84**	.67**	-.21*	-.22*
Total	45	.92	.91**	.71**	-.31**	-.12*

*p< 0.05, **p< 0.01 Note: CWBC=Counterproductive work behavior Checklist, SJSS=Subjective Job Stress Scale, RSES=Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale, JSS=Job Satisfaction Scale.

For assessing the Test-retest reliability, 107 (males= 60, females=47) respondents were contacted after two weeks of the initial administration (Table 2). The test-retest reliability as measured by the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient for all sub scales was as follows: Abuse ($r=.72, p<.01$), Theft ($r=.67, p<.01$), Withdrawal ($r=.69, p<.01$), Production Deviance ($r=.78, p<.01$), Sabotage ($r=.72, p<.01$), Organization ($r=.83, p<.01$), Person ($r=.84, p<.01$), and Total ($r=.91, p<.01$) (Table 2). The high positive correlation indicated that the scores of translated version possess sufficient stability within them overtime, and are not so affected by temporary changes in the environment or mood of the respondents.

Another indicator of internal consistency is the Split-half reliability assessment; scores on both 45 item scale and 32 item scale was individually analyzed to check their split-half reliability. For the 45 item scale, two halves containing 22 items each were formed, and the value obtained for Guttman coefficient was .86 (Table 3a). While, for the 32 item scale, two halves containing 16 items each were formed, and the value obtained for Guttman coefficient was .85 (Table 3b). These all three different measures of reliability indicate towards one common conclusion, that the translated version of counterproductive work behavior checklist has demonstrated sufficient psychometric reliability to be used for research purposes.

Table: 3a

Showing Split Half reliability of the CWB-C 45(N=450)

Split-Half Reliability				
Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.83	
		N of Items	22 *	
	Part 2	Value	.76	
		N of items	22 **	
	Total N of Items			44
	Correlation Between Forms			.78
Spearman-Brown Coefficient		Equal Length	.84	
		Unequal Length	.84	
Guttman Split-half Coefficient			.86	

*first half = Item # 1-22, **second half = Item # 23-44

Table: 3b

Showing Split Half reliability of CWB-C 32(N=450)

Split-Half Reliability				
Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.82	
		N of Items	18 *	
	Part 2	Value	.74	
		N of items	18**	
	Total N of Items			32
	Correlation Between Forms			.77
Spearman-Brown Coefficient		Equal Length	.83	
		Unequal Length	.82	
Guttman Split-half Coefficient			.85	

*first half = Item # 1-18, **second half = Item # 19-32

For assessing the validity of final translated version, its convergent validity was established with a construct which has shown to be present in the equation regarding counterproductive work behavior. To determine convergent validity, in light of literature it was hypothesized that counterproductive work behaviors will have a positive relation with measure of Job or occupational stress. For this purpose scores on Counterproductive work behavior Checklist (45, and 32) were correlated with scores obtained from Subjective Job Stress Scale (Table 2). Results obtained showed that scores of Subjective Job Stress Scale correlated positively with sub scales of counterproductive work behavior, such as with Abuse ($r=.72, p<.01$), with Theft ($r=.67, p<.01$), with Withdrawal ($r=.69, p<.01$), with Production Deviance ($r=.78, p<.01$), with Sabotage ($r=.72, p<.01$), with Organization ($r=.83, p<.01$), with Person ($r=.84, p<.01$), and with total score ($r=.91, p<.01$) (Table 17, and 18). These findings are in line with those of previous researches accordingly (Kahn &Boysiére, 1992; Tubre& Collins, 2000; Bacharach et al., 2002; Penney & Spector, 2005; Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006), and demonstrate that the translated version is a valid measure of counterproductive work behaviors.

Induction of measures of Self-esteem and Job satisfaction was based on previous findings, as both are independent but related constructs (Table 2). It was hypothesized that scores on both measures will have a negative relationship with scores on counterproductive work behavior checklist (Baumeister et al., 1996; Ferris et al., 2009; Whelpley& McDaniel, 2011). Results from the correlation analysis (Table 2) showed that scores on Rosenberg’s Self Esteem Scale correlated negatively with scores on sub scales of counterproductive work behavior checklist, as with Abuse ($r= -.23, p<.05$), with Withdrawal ($r= -.14, p<.05$), with Production Deviance ($r= -.19, p<.01$), with Organization ($r= -.27, p<.05$), with Person ($r= -.21, p<.05$), and with total score ($r= -.31, p<.01$).Results for correlation analysis carried out among scores of Job Satisfaction Survey and counterproductive work behavior checklist (Table 2) showed that scores obtained on job satisfaction survey correlated negatively with scores on subscales of counterproductive work behavior checklist, such as with Abuse ($r= -.30, p<.05$), with Withdrawal ($r= -.18, p<.05$), with Production Deviance ($r= -.23, p<.01$), with Sabotage ($r= -.11, p<.05$), with Organization ($r= -.32, p<.05$), with Person ($r= -.22, p<.05$), and with total score ($r= -.12, p<.05$). These results demonstrate the adequate convergent validity of the translated version of counterproductive work behavior check list (45 and 32). The findings are in line with previous findings (Judge, et al., 2006; Zulkifli, 2011). The procedures used for determining the validity of the current scale, and the results obtained by applying these measure in the present study, show that translated version of counterproductive work behavior checklist is a valid instrument to be used as a research instrument.

In summary, obtained results are in favor that translated version has shown higher levels of cultural adaptability, along with retaining the basic psychometric structure and properties of the original scale, making it a reliable and valid instrument.

V. CONCLUSION

Present study showed that the Urdu translation of Counterproductive work behavior Checklist (45 and 32), is a reliable and valid measure of counterproductive work behaviors and for assessing counterproductive work behaviors in local population. Furthermore, this study also showed that occurrence of counterproductive work behaviors are tied with the presence of job stress and have adverse effects for individual’s self-esteem and job satisfaction. Results are also consistent with the existing literature. Therefore the present Urdu translated version can serve the basis of cross cultural comparisons as well.

Limitations and Future Directions

Like every research in social sciences, there are chances of several limitations arising during the study, even after the careful designing and planning. First, respondents were recruited from only one city, and were limited in number (N=450) which may hamper the generalization of these results across all Pakistani population. Secondly due to the sensitive nature of the questionnaire, and the permission issues, convenient sampling approach was followed all over. Third, representation of females in the sample was low as compared with males; this could be attributed to the social conditions due to which females have lower ratio in working population as compared to males. Also for validity analysis, only those constructs were used for which scales were available in Urdu, like Self Esteem and Job Satisfaction. Thus some constructs showed weak correlations with CWBs (self-esteem), but these have been proven by past researches as

well. These limitations may further restrict generalization. Although sample recruited belonged to different areas and sectors of industry, some areas may not have proper representation, such as military personal, peons, technicians, labor, etc.

Therefore it is recommended that additional data be collected, based on random sampling, from different cities and trades, from all economic classes, and norms should be developed according to the trade, sector, education, and socioeconomic status independently. This will aid not only in the generalization but also in the interpretations of results for a specific individual. These limitations ask the author for further revision of the scale.

Finally, it is noteworthy that despite these above mentioned limitations, the presented Urdu Translation of counterproductive work behavior checklist is a valid and reliable measure, providing basis for cross cultural comparisons and a starting point for research regarding counterproductive work behaviors among Pakistani respondents.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anastasi, A. (1988). *Psychological Testing*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- [2] Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (3), 452–471. doi: 10.2307/259136
- [3] Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20 (7), 1073-1091. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199912)20:7<1073::AID-JOB943>3.0.CO;2-7
- [4] Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P. A., & Sonnenstuhl, W. G. (2002). Driven to drink: Managerial control, work-related risk factors, and employee problem drinking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 637-658. doi: 10.2307/3069302
- [5] Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J.M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103, 5-33. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.103.1.5
- [6] Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3, 349-360. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.349
- [7] 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(2), 410-424. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410
- [8] Bruk-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(2), 145-156. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.11.2.145.
- [9] Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., Davis, R. D., & Rostow, C. D. (2007). Cognitive ability predicts objectively measured counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 616. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.616
- [10] Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2009). Organizational supports and organizational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, 279-286. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.09.001
- [11] Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 915-931. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199911)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.3.CO;2-Y
- [12] Fox, S., & Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (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(3), 291-309. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803
- [13] Greiner, B.A., Krause, N., Ragland, D.R. & Fisher, J.M. (1998). Objective stress factors, accidents, and absenteeism in transit operators: a theoretical framework and empirical evidence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(2), 130-146. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.3.2.130

- [14] Gruys, M. L. (1999). The dimensionality of deviant employee performance in the workplace. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- [15] Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30-42. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00224
- [16] Hambleton, R. K., & Patsula, L. (1998). Adapting tests for use in multiple languages and cultures. *Social Indicators Research*, 45, 153-171. doi:10.1023/A:1006941729637
- [17] Hewitt, John P. (2009). *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- [18] IBM Corp. (Released 2011). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 20.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp
- [19] International Test Commission (2010). *International Test Commission Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests*. [http://www.intestcom.org] accessed on 09/06/2013.
- [20] Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, Job Attitudes, and Workplace Deviance: Test of a Multilevel Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 126-38. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.126
- [21] Kahn, R.L., & Boyers, P. (1992). Stress in organizations. In M. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, 571-650). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- [22] Levine, E. L. (2010). Emotion and power (as social influence): Their impact on organizational citizenship and counterproductive individual and organizational behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 4-17. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.011
- [23] Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.647
- [24] McGrath, J. E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organizations. In Dunnett, M. D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing
- [25] Mehta, K. R. (2004). Examining the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Louisiana State University.
- [26] Moorman, R.H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 759-776. doi:10.1177 / 0 0 1872679304600604
- [27] Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 618-629. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.71.4.618
- [28] Murphey, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- [29] Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [30] Oakland, T. and Lane, H. (2004). Language, reading, and readability formulas: Implications for developing and adapting tests. *International Journal of Testing*, 4(3), 239-252. doi: 10.1207/s15327574ijt0403_3
- [31] Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 777-796. doi:10.1002/job.336
- [32] Pym, A. (2011). *Translation Research Projects* (3, ed). Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.
- [33] Rauf, K. & Farooq, A. (2014). Translation and adaptation of subjective job stress scale into Urdu. *Pakistan Business Review*, 16, page 177-195.
- [34] Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management Journal*, 38 (2), 555-572. doi:10.2307/256693.
- [35] Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- [36] 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. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00189
- [37] Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 117-125. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00198
- [38] Sardar, S. (1998). Study of relationship among childhood paternal loss, sex role orientation, self-esteem and locus of control in male and female students. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Karachi, Pakistan
- [39] Shahzad, S., & Begum, N. (2011). Urdu Translation and Psychometric Properties of Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in Pakistan. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 9, 57-74.
- [40] Sireci, S. G., Yang, Y., Harter, J., & Ehrlich, E. J. (2006). Evaluating Guidelines for Test Adaptations: A Methodological Analysis of Translation Quality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(5), 557-567. doi:10.1177/0022022106290478
- [41] Spector, P. E. (1975). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions of employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(5), 635-637. doi:10.1037/h0077157
- [42] Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713. doi:10.1007/BF00929796
- [43] Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151-174). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- [44] 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 (3), 446-460. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005
- [45] Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). Jackson and Schuler (1985) revisited: A meta-analysis of the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict, and job performance. *Journal of Management*, 26, 155-169. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(99)00035-5
- [46] Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1997). Towards an integrated analysis of bias in cross-cultural assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 13, 29-37. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.13.1.29
- [47] Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Tanzer, N. K. (1997). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 54(2), 119. doi:10.1016/j.erap.2003.12.004
- [48] Wainer, H. (1999). Comparing the incomparable: An essay on the importance of big assumptions and scant evidence. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 18(4), 10-16. doi:10.1111/j.1745-3992.1999.tb00277.x
- [49] Whelpley, C. E., & McDaniel M. A. (2011). Self esteem and Counterproductive Behaviors: A Meta analytic Review. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Chicago. Retrieved from: www.people.vcu.edu/~mamcdani/Publications/Whelpley%20&%20McDaniel%20%282011,%20April%29.pdf (accessed on 3/23/2013)
- [50] Zulkifli, I. (2011). The Influence of HRM Practices and Job Satisfaction on Workplace Deviance. Unpublished M.S. Thesis, University Utara Malaysia.