Running head: LACK OF SELF-CONTROL AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

Lack of Self-Control Breeds Counterproductive Work Behavior in Mental Health Workers

Erick Guerrero

The University of Chicago

Lack of Self-Control Breeds Counterproductive Work Behavior in Mental Health Workers

Mental health professionals are supposed to provide services with a benevolent and caring attitude. Certainly, this professional and caring attitude is also expected in mental health workers' behavior within the organization. However, when the organization displays practices that are perceived by mental health workers as unfair and unjust, I suspect that these professionals would display the same retaliatory and vindictive attitudes against the organization that are usually associated with other worker's behaviors (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001; Jones, 2004; Martinko, Gundlach & Douglass, 2002). Workers' vindictive retaliation, termed counterproductive work behavior has been researched in "white collar" work environments, whose work setting, structure, rules and conduct expectations is comparable to mental health workers. Thus, given the similarities between white collar and mental health workers' organizations, it is logical to think that the dynamics that contribute to white collar workers' counterproductive work behavior can also impact the attitude of mental health workers.

Despite similarities between mental health and white collar workers, the research literature has not assessed the potential of mental health workers to display counterproductive work behavior. Most of the research on counterproductive work behavior has been conducted in industrial work environments where certainly work behavior such as sabotage (Sharlicki & Folger, 1997), theft (Greenberg, 1990; 1993) and apathy (Douglass & Martinko, 2001; Martinko, Gundlach & Douglass, 2002) affect the production of goods. However, this counterproductive work behavior is more dangerous in environments such as mental health services where the direct effect of such behavior impacts work relationships, services and ultimately, vulnerable clients. Hence, there is a high cost if mental health workers displace their resentment onto

clients. Therefore, it is imperative to identify the contributing factors of counterproductive work behavior beyond mental health worker's resentment at the organization.

To identify causes of counterproductive work behavior in mental health workers, this paper will draw from the research literature on white and blue collar workers. This literature explains that counterproductive work behavior is mainly triggered by anger and resentment against perceived organizational unfairness (Boye & Jones, 1997; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001; Jones, 2004; Spector, 1997). In addition, counterproductive work behavior has also been explained by dimensions that include workers' psychology (Boye & Jones, 1997; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001; Jones, 2004; Spector, 1997) gender (Eagly and Steffan) and work situations (Marcus & Schuler 2004; Ones, 2002). However, these dimensions have been found present when workers' display counterproductive work behavior, but no causation has been proven yet.

Thus, I posit that although there are associations among the dimensions of work situation and psychology with workers' counterproductive work behavior, in mental health workers, self-control can proof a direct causation of counterproductive work behavior. In addition, this negative work behavior can also be explained by gender because males exhibit lower self-control than females (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Therefore, mental health workers' self-control and gender certainly can be the most reliable cause of counterproductive work behavior, regardless of whether workers experience different psychology or work situations. However, the empirical and conceptual characteristics of self-control and gender have not been addressed in relation with mental health worker's counterproductive work behavior.

Although research in counterproductive work behavior has been very prolific, it has focused on limited relations using qualitative analysis with unsubstantiated hypotheses (Ones,

2002). Thus, theoretically driven empirical research can help unite the diverse findings shedding light into the causes of this negative behavior.

This paper attempts to answer the need for causal relationships in the study of counterproductive work behavior. Hence, to justify the reason to experimentally test this cause-effect, I will describe the definition of counterproductive work behavior and the theory of self-control. Then, I will review the research literature on the dimension that have predicted counterproductive work behavior and argue the direct role of self-control in those dynamics. Afterwards, I will discuss how the theory of self-control and the concept of counterproductive work behavior vary based on gender. Finally, I will evaluate how well the relationship of these two theoretical concepts explains the dynamics in mental health services.

Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive work behavior encompasses a wide range of workers' negative behaviors that threaten the survival, productivity and other legitimate objectives of an organization. The most researched counterproductive work behavior include absenteeism (Hacket, 1997), theft (Greenberg, 1990; 1993), sabotage (Sharlicki & Folger, 1997), drug use (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), and overt acts of aggression or extreme apathy (Douglass & Martinko, 2001; Early & Steffan, 1986; Martinko, Gundlach & Douglass, 2002 & Neuman, 1998).

During the last decade, research on these behaviors has been extensively diverse. As a result, the term 'counterproductive work behavior' became the umbrella of any negative behavior that is directed against the workplace such as antisocial behaviors (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989) deviance (Hollinger, 1986) retaliation (Sharlicki & Folger, 1997) or revenge (Bies, Tripp & Kramer, 1997). However, these behaviors

have been studied separately, thus not sharing a common definition or theoretical framework (Ones, 2002).

The variety of behaviors included in counterproductive work behavior and the dynamic of how these behaviors appear at work can be associated with another concept, citizenship behavior (Kelloway, et al. 2002). Citizenship behavior can be understood as overperformance at work, whereas counterproductive work behavior could be understood as underperformance (Kelloway, et al. 2002). Hence, measuring either concept could depend on the framing of the wording, either positive, referring to citizenship behaviors or negative to counterproductive work behavior. Certainly, if the extent of the concept of counterproductive work behavior is not understood, counterproductive work behavior and citizenship behaviors could be confounded when measured. However, the definition of counterproductive work behavior extends further than the citizenship behavioral dispositions, as it includes a volitional act (purpose), a potential and a prediction of harm, and a determination to act against a legitimate interest (Marcus & Schuler 2004). In fact, the definitions of these concepts have been tested rigorously and their confounding potential was null, showing that citizenship behavior is different than counterproductive work behavior mainly related to negative emotions (Kelloway, et al. 2002).

Self-control

The causal factor in this paper comes from The General Theory of Crime, which explains criminal behaviors based on the theory of self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). The theory of self-control argues that the developmental and environmental conditions, such as nurturing and limit setting shape individuals' impulsivity, low frustration tolerance and need for immediate gratification. In other words, self-control is the individual's ability to consider long-term consequences before satisfying his or her needs. Thus, low self-control can be explained by

an individual's poor history of nurturing, limit setting and moral framework that promotes impulsivity and frustration associated with criminal behavior (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990).

Self-control should not be confused with two other concepts that also allude to an individual's control: Locus of control and self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is similar to self-control in that it stresses the perception of control in skills and situations. However, self- efficacy refers specifically to one's beliefs in own ability (Martincevic, 2004) whereas self-control relates to the intrinsic ability to manage gratification and frustration tolerance. In addition, self-control is different than locus of control in that locus of control refers to the individual's perception of where the control is, either in the self (internal), or outside of the self (external) (Storms & Spector, 1987). However, self-control describes not a perception but a behavioral response based on intrinsic levels of impulsivity, frustration tolerance and ability to delay gratification. Nonetheless, external locus of control has predicted counterproductive work behavior (Storms & Spector, 1987; Trevino and Youngblood, 1990). Thus, a sense of control either perceived or enacted can be associated with counterproductive work behavior.

Struggles Finding the Relationship between Self-Control and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Two previous studies have measured self-control to explain delinquent acts in work situations (Gibson & Wright, 2001; Marcus & Schuler, 2004). In Gibson & Wright's study, low self-control was associated with employees' delinquent acts. High school student workers with low self-control and influence from delinquent peers were more likely to display counterproductive work behavior.

This study used a large self-report secondary data and utilized OLS and other statistically rigorous approaches to find an effect between self-control and delinquent behavior. However,

this study presented some limitations measuring self-control. First, they used adolescent workers whose developmental stage is associated with a sensation seeking and impulsive attitude that make them more prone to display deviant behaviors (Guerrero, 2004). In addition, these young participants only held temporary employment, which may have contributed to their lack of commitment and higher delinquency. Finally, the authors surveyed self-control leading to a potential response bias, because participants may not necessarily report or know their levels of self-control.

Marcus & Schuler (2004) also measured self-control and counterproductive work behavior raising an important distinction between these two concepts. They argued that low self-control is the inability to consider long-term consequences, thus it should predict people's ability to manage their need for immediate gratification. If counterproductive work behavior is conduct that leads to long-term consequences, then self-control should be able to predict these behaviors that inhibit work productivity. Marcus & Schuler's major contribution was highlighting the dimensions that predicted counterproductive work behavior (Ones, 2002). They tested counterproductive work behavior in German blue collar workers based on four dimensions (triggers, opportunity, internal control and propensity), that although were differently named than the common dimensions in the study of counterproductive work behavior, encompass the same concepts. Results supported that out of 24 predicting variables associated with these dimensions, the self-control theory proved the most powerful predictor of counterproductive work behavior.

Marcus & Schuler's (2004) study, although rigorous, presented some methodological limitations as well. First, the study thoroughly described the four dimensions associated with workers' counterproductive work behavior. But these researchers did not provide a theoretical framework or a model that explained why and how a particular dimension would predict

counterproductive work behavior. In addition, the accuracy of their results could not be determined because they did not report the validity and reliability of their measures. Moreover, Marcus & Schuler relied on self-response of self-control, as did Gibson & Wright, (2001), which potentially led to response bias. Finally, these researchers did not integrate gender and white collar workers which are two variables with theoretical implications to predict counterproductive work behavior.

In general, the most overarching concern about these two studies is that they measured self-control and treated it as yet another predicting variable of worker's counterproductive work behavior. Instead, this experimental paper argues that self-control is a primary variable that offers the closest direct relationship with counterproductive work behavior regardless of the dimensions discussed on (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Although, understanding the effect of self-control across the different dimensions may be important, this paper will focus on supporting the role of self-control as a causal variable of counterproductive work behavior in mental health workers. Nonetheless, it is important to understand these dimensions to determine the role of self-control as a direct cause of counterproductive work behavior.

Self Control and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Researchers of counterproductive work behavior have been concerned with questions about when this behavior happens and how is it displayed. Specifically, the questions have included: why some workers display this behavior and others do not, which workers are more likely to display this negative behavior and who or what is likely to be the target of counterproductive work behavior. As a result of these questions, researchers have developed five explanatory dimensions of counterproductive work behavior that include workers' perceptions and beliefs (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001), psychological states (Boye & Jones, 1997; Spector,

1997), situational circumstances (Greenberg, 1990) targets of this behavior (Jones, 2004) and the role of gender (Eagly and Steffan, 1986; Martinko, Gundlach & Douglass, 2002). All of these dimension stress that workers' causal reasoning about their work environment and about expected outcomes drive individual counterproductive work behaviors (Martinko, Gundlach, & Douglas, 2002). The five different explanatory dimensions are discussed below, followed by a discussion on how self-control more directly causes counterproductive work behavior:

The first and most reliable dimension associated with counterproductive work behavior is workers' beliefs and perceptions (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). These are workers' beliefs that they would not be caught or would not be punished if they display counterproductive behavior in the organization. However, workers' job satisfaction has also explained variability in counterproductive work behavior (Boye & Jones, 1997; Hacket, 1997). In these two studies workers were more likely to engage in antisocial behaviors such as theft and violence, or be absent (Hacket, 1997) when their job satisfaction was low.

The second dimension includes research on workers' psychological state such as frustration, stress and negative emotions. Spector (1997) found that frustration explained a significant variability of counterproductive work behavior when assessing the role of antisocial behaviors. Likewise, workers' retaliatory behaviors against the organization were predicted by their level of stress and negative emotions. These emotions played a moderating role between stressors and counterproductive work behavior (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001).

The third dimension that facilitates workers' counterproductive work behavior is situational circumstances. These circumstances refer to instances when organizations provide limited information and limited empathy to workers after executing practices that are considered

unjust (Greenberg, 1993). Workers then are more likely to steal from the organization to get even and stabilize the inequity that was prompted by the unfair practices (Greenberg, 1990; 1993).

The fourth dimension describes who or what becomes the target of workers' counterproductive work behavior. This is an important issue, especially to mental health services, because shifting the target of counterproductive behaviors from the organization to vulnerable clients can be very damaging. This potential dynamic of mental health workers harming clients has not been addressed by the research literature. To date, one study has found that workers' perception of who is to blame for the injustice determines where they are likely to target their counterproductive work behaviors on, either onto their organization or their supervisor (Jones, 2004). If the injustice included procedural justice characteristics (voice), workers targeted their counterproductive behavior onto the organization. However, when interpersonal and informational unfair practices were employed, workers were more likely to target their counterproductive behavior onto supervisors.

Finally, the last explanatory dimension relates to the role of gender in self control and counterproductive work behaviors. Males display more deviance than women in general (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Douglass & Martinko, 2001; Martinko & Moss, 199; Neuman, 1998). Some explanations stress the role of socialization styles, males' propensity to be more instrumental when displaying negative emotions and males' belief that others have more control of the situation (Hollinger & Clark, 1983). Consistent with this reasoning, it is expected that male workers commit more counterproductive work behaviors than their female counterparts (Eagly and Steffan, 1986; Martinko, Gundlach & Douglass, 2002).

These five predicting dimensions provide solid support for their association with counterproductive work behavior. However, these dimensions can be argued to be only a setting

associated with counterproductive work behavior. Thus, it is more important to understand how a worker's personal characteristic, such as self-control manages to withhold or release the impulse to display this negative work behavior. For instance, the first dimension argues that perceived impunity facilitates counterproductive work behavior. However, despite of the perception of not getting caught, it is still up to the individual to act against the organization. Hence, workers' impulsivity and ability to evaluate long-term consequences can more accurately explain when workers display this negative work behavior even if they believed that they would not get caught.

Moreover, the second dimension stresses the psychological state of individuals contributing to this negative work behavior. However, workers may feel frustrated or stressed out and not display this negative work behavior. Frustration tolerance, ability to control their environment and impulsivity are areas of self-control that are more consistent with the display of criminal behavior present in many counterproductive work behaviors (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). The third dimension argues that every time the organization acts unfairly, workers find ways to get even, in this case by stealing. But regardless of the situational disposition, it is well researched the fact that theft depends on workers' poor impulse control, low frustration tolerance and poor consideration of long term consequences (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). The next predicting dimension stresses that workers' selection of targets of counterproductive work behavior is based on who or what they identify as responsible for unfair organizational practices. However, as the theory of self-control posits displaying inappropriate behavior onto relationships is related to individuals' impulsivity as well as the energy required to display negative behaviors and the proximity of the target (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990).

The last dimension stresses that higher counterproductive work behavior is less common in female workers than in workers that are male (Eagly and Steffan, 1986). In addition, male

workers also present lower self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). Thus, male workers with lower self-control are reported more likely to be aggressive and inappropriate in relationships than female workers (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990).

In general, the self-control theory provides a powerful concept that can provide the unifying framework that research in counterproductive work behavior is lacking. Particularly, self-control is relevant to studying counterproductive work behavior in mental health care because self-control is an informal expectation on workers in this setting (Hasenfeld, 1974). Mental health workers need to portray that they are mature and in control, yet sensitive and respectful of clients' decisions.

Self-Control and Counterproductive Work Behaviors in Mental Health Services

There is a categorical dimension that has not been researched but that is very pertinent to this paper, type of employment (professional, white and blue collar work). The dimensions researched above focused on blue or white collar workers, not describing dynamics in mental health professionals. However, many white-collar workers can be considered professional workers. Thus, to understand mental health professional's criminal behavior we can draw from the dynamics that affect white collar criminal behavior.

White collar criminal behavior has been highly misunderstood and generally believed to occur less often than blue-collar workers' behavior (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). In addition, white-collar workers may perpetrate crimes of less importance than blue-collar workers (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). The reason for this low severity of crime has been understood as white-collar workers facing stricter social and work norms (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). However, this low crime incidence is a misguided notion (Sutherland, 1983). Criminal behaviors

may be perceived differently in professional environments. Thus, professionals can still display damaging behaviors that remain unnoticed.

The cost of not assessing mental health workers' counterproductive work behavior is very high. Mental health organizations' main service relies on building trusting and harmonious relationships with clients suffering from debilitating illnesses (Hasenfeld, 1974). But, if workers have low self-control, they can displace their resentment onto clients deteriorating the trust and hope that the therapeutic relationship offers them. Hence, the therapist-client relationship can shift from a benevolent and caring one, to one that becomes an instrument for mental health workers to display their vindictive attitudes.

This experimental research proposes to manipulate self-control and observe gender to test the direct causal connection with counterproductive work behaviors in mental health workers. Self control will be manipulated by the use of priming. Priming is a method that is reliable eliciting feelings and perceptions (Rasinski, Visser, Zagatsky & Rickett, 2005). In addition, a reliable scale on counterproductive work behavior will test dimensions of behaviors that are likely to happen in mental health services, such as abuse, theft and withdrawal. However, the predicting dimensions of counterproductive work behavior (beliefs, psychology, situation, etc) will not be tested directly, because it is assumed that the random sample will select a diverse group with these different characteristics. Thus, the hypotheses drawn for this experiment are focused on testing rigorously the effect of self-control and gender on the occurrence of counterproductive work behavior.

Hypothesis 1: Mental health workers that are primed to recall a situation in which they had little or no self-control will subsequently decide to engage in more counterproductive work behaviors than workers not primed.

Hypothesis 2: Mental health workers who are male and are primed with low self control will subsequently decide to engage in more counterproductive work behaviors, compared with female workers primed with high-self-control.

Method

Participants

Forty mental health workers from five different mental health organizations in Illinois will participate in the experiment. All of these organizations will share the same organizational structure including size, mental health programs and requirements for hiring mental health workers. These workers will include counselors with bachelor's degrees and social workers and therapists with master's degrees. Eight mental health workers from each organization will be randomly selected to participate in the experiment.

Instruments

This experiment will diminish the normative pressure of surveys that ask intimate information by using an implicit method to elicit honesty more reliably (Rasinski, Visser, Zagatsky & Rickett, 2005). This experiment will use priming to trigger low and high self-control and determine its causal relationship with counterproductive work behaviors. Priming has become a reliable approach to measure cognitive dimensions of individuals (Erdley & D'Agostino, 1988). In addition, priming has been successfully used when variables such as stressors and strains are manipulated (Erdley & D'Agostino, 1988; Moss & Lawrence, 1997; Rasinski, Visser, Zagatsky & Rickett, 2005).

The two studies (Gibson & Wright, 2001; Marcus & Schuler, 2004) that considered self-control to predict negative work behaviors used the survey method leading to response-bias. These results are expected when surveying this type of construct, which is contaminated with

normative pressures, response bias, and with a belief that assumes that participants' can readily access self-awareness when filling out the survey. Thus, the use of priming in this experiment will indirectly promote their low or high self control by asking them to remember a situation when they exercised strong or minor self-control at work (See tools in Appendices B and C). Asking participants to remember a situation or to select words to elicit a state of mind has been successfully used on various issues such honesty (Rasinski, Visser, Zagatsky & Rickett, 2005) stress (Moss & Lawrence, 1997), negative emotions (Erdley & D'Agostino, 1988) and self-construal (Gardner, Gabriel & Lee, 1999).

In addition to the self-control manipulation, this experiment will use the counterproductive work behavior scale from (Fox, et al, in press), (See tool in Appendix E). This counterproductive work behavior scale showed significant consistency (Cronbach's alpha of .86) in different administrations (Fox & Spector, 1999; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). This tool is comprised of 34 items that question participants in five dimensions of counterproductive work behavior, such as sabotage, withdrawal, production deviance, theft and abuse. Actually, during the pilot testing, the items that were selected the most included withdrawal items such as came work late without notice (54.1 percent), and took a longer lunch (61.6 percent), and most important for this experiment were the high selection of abuse items such as ignored someone at work (50 percent), told people my job is lousy (48.7 percent) or insulted or made fun or someone at work (26.4 percent), (See distribution on Appendix D). These abusive behaviors can be the most damaging if mental health workers target them onto co-workers or clients.

Finally, the reliability of self-reports for the instrument of counterproductive work behavior is reliable because it is assumed that workers are the only ones that could know about

their own way to react to unfair practices (Fox & Spector, 1999). Thus, the counterproductive work behavior scale is written in language that is easily understood and that is not judgmental.

Experimental Design

This experiment will use a two-factor design, manipulating self-control (high versus low), and observing gender (male versus females). Specifically, mental health workers will be randomly assigned to one of the two conditions (see Appendix B and C). In addition, gender will be evaluated as well (see Appendix A). Finally, age, years of experience and profession within mental health (social work or psychology) will be considered controlled variables.

Manipulation Checks

After the manipulation of self-control, therapists will be asked to use a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7, to assess how much control they believe they had in the situations provided. In addition, therapists will be asked to list three conditions that made the situation either low self-control (condition 1) or high self-control (condition 2). The two manipulation checks method aims at evaluating if the tool primed what was actually designed to prime, self control.

Procedures

Mental health workers from five organizations will be asked to meet at the University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration. Workers will be compensated for their participation with a gift certificate and a voucher to attend a summer workshop in the same school.

Workers will be given instructions via e-mail and postal mail before coming to the university. The instructions will include assurance of confidentiality and of their right to quit the experiment at any time, assurance that the experiment is not related to their employers in any

way, and information about the nature of the experiment. They will be told that this is an experiment to understand the developmental needs of helping professionals.

Random assignment of mental health workers will ensure that all of them have the same likelihood to be tested in either of the two conditions. Once workers meet at their assigned room, reassuring information on confidentiality and right to quit will be provided. After the reassurance is provided, the manipulation tool will be handed. Condition one and two will include a manipulation that will read "*Please remember a situation at work when you experience [minimal – Condition 1 / high- Condition 2] self-control. After you remember this situation, please write it down in detail.*"

The self-control manipulation will use remembering and writing as a priming mechanism to solicit the sense of low or high self-control. Soliciting past cognitive experience as a priming mechanism has proven very effective when dealing with intimate experiences or feelings (Erdley & D'Agostino, 1988; Moss & Lawrence, 1997); self-control experiences is one of these cognitive and emotional structures that individuals could access using this method.

The self-control manipulation is expected to last from 20 to 25 minutes depending on how much detail participants write. Immediately after mental health workers in both conditions complete the self-control manipulation, they will be provided the counterproductive work behavior tool. This tool will have a scenario that participants will respond to. This scenario will be an unfair organization decision affecting their benefits and salary (e.g. "Your organization has decided to cut in half your days of vacation, as well as sick days…"). After the participants read the scenario, they will be asked to consider the scenario and rate with the items described in the tool how likely were they to engage in any of those behaviors.

It is important to note that the most reliable method to evaluate causality between self-control and counterproductive work behavior is to prime the low self-control status and take advantage of that status to have participants answer how they would react to similarly unjust scenarios in the organization. Thus, the priming effect would not be either effective asking for past behaviors, nor practical if wanting current behaviors.

The counterproductive work behavior tool consists of 34 items, which have been completed in other administrations within 25 to 30 minutes (Fox, Spector and Miles, 2001). The full administration of the self-control manipulation and the counterproductive work behavior tool is planned to last from 45 to 55 minutes.

It is important to stress that self-control is primed with a past experience, yet their state of low or high self-control is in the present. In order to be consistent with this temporal issue, the scale of counterproductive work behavior will ask what *would* they do based on a pretended unfair organizational situation, rather than asking what they did in the *past.* The point is that aligning both concepts in the present will more likely indicate more consistent effects.

After therapists complete the counterproductive work behavior tool, they will be debriefed. The debriefing process will provide mental health workers with detailed information about the experiment. In addition, the researcher will promote discussion about the implications of their participation and also will assess for any residual attitudes related to workers' involvement in the experiment.

References

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (1996). *Beyond Distrust: 'Getting Even" and the Need for Revenge*. In R. M. Kramer and T. Tyler (eds), Trust in Organizations. Newbury Park, CA: Safe Publications.

Boye, M. W. & Jones, J. W. (1997). *Organizational Culture and Employee Counter-Productivity*. R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), Antisocial Behavior in Organizations (pp. 172-184). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Douglass, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the Role of Individual Differences in the Prediction of Workplace Aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 547-559.

Eagly, A. & Steffan, V. J. (1986). Gender and Aggressive Behavior: A Meta- Analytical review of the Social Psychological Literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 309-330.

Erdley, A.C. & D'Agostino, P.R. (1988). Cognitive and Affective Components of Automatic Priming Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 741-747.

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,* 291-309.

Fox, S. & Spector, P. E. (1999). A Model of Work Frustration-Aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20,* 915-931.

Fox, S. & Spector, P. E., Penny, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (In press). The Dimensionality of Counterproductive; Are All Counterproductive Behaviors Created Equal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.*

Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Lee, A. Y. (1999). "I" Value Freedom, But "We" Value Relationships: Self-Construal Priming Mirrors Cultural Differences in Judgment. *Psychological Science*, 10, 321-326.

Gottfredson, M. R. and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Grasmick G. H., Tittle, R. C., Bursick J. R., Arneklev, J. B. (1993). Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 30*, 5-29.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee Theft as a Reaction to Underpayment Inequity: The Hidden Cost of Pay Cut. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 561-568.

Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the Name of Justice: Informational and Interpersonal Moderators of Theft Reactions to Underpayment Inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54*, 8-103.

Guerrero, E. (2004). Implications of Parental Supervision in High Sensation Seeking Adolescents from Single Parent Families. *Journal of Hispanic American Psychiatry*, 4, 6-9.

Hasenfeld, Y. (1974). *Human Service Organizations: A Conceptual Overview*. Hasenfeld, Y, English, R. Eds. Human Service Organizations. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

Hollinger, R.C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and Informal Social Controls of Employee Deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly, 23*, 333-343.

Jones, D. A. (2004). *Counterproductive Work Behavior Toward Supervisors & Organizations: Injustice, Revenge, & Context.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference.

Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J., & Nault, A. (2002). Self-Reported Counterproductive Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Separate but Related Constructs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10,* 143-151.

Martincevic, M. F. (2004). Self Efficacy in the Context of Organizational Psychology. *Psiholoska Orbsorja, Horizons of Psychology, 13,* 77-106.

Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward and Integrative Theory of Counterproductive Workplace Behavior: A Causal Reasoning Perspective. International *Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10,* 36 –50.

Martinko, M. J. & Moss, S. E. (2001). *An Exploratory Study of Workplace Violence and Aggression*. In S. Barr (ed.) Proceeding of the Southern Management Association Conference, Orlando, FL, 86-88.

Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of Counterproductive Behavior at Work: A General Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 647-660.

Moss, S. E. & Lawrence, K.G. (1997). The Effects of Priming on the Self-Reporting of Perceived Stressors and Strains. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18,* 393-403.

Neuman, J. H. (1998). Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression. Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes, and Preferred Targets. *Journal of Management, 24,* 391-419.

Ones, D. S. (2002). Introduction to the Special Issue on Counterproductive Behavior at Work. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 10, 1-4

Rasinski, K. A., Visser, P. S., Zagatsky, M., & Rickett, E. M. (2005). Using Implicit Goal Priming to Improve the Quality of Self-Report Data. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 41., 321-327

Sharlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the Workplace: The Role of Distributive, Procedural and Interactional Justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 434-443.

Spector, P. E. (1997). The Role of Frustration in Antisocial Behavior at Work. In R. A. Giacalone & J. J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Storms, P. L. & Spector, P. E. (1987). Relationships of Organizational Frustration with Reported Behavioral Reactions: The Moderating Effects of Locus of Control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60*, 635-637.

Sutherland, E. (1983). *White Collar Crime: The Uncut Version*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Trevino, L. K., & Youngblood, S. A. (1990). Bad Apples in Bad Barrels: A Causal Analysis of Ethical Decision-Making Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 378-385.

Appendix A: Experimental Design

Target	High Control	Low Control
Male	A	B
Female	C	D

The experimental design in this paper has a two factor design. This design is Gender (Male X Female) and Self-Control (High X Low).

Appendix B: Manipulation of Low Self-Control Tool

Name:
Years of Experience as a mental health provider:
Profession: Social Workers, Therapist or Case manager
Gender:
Age:
Education:

Please remember a situation at work when you experienced minimal self-control. After you remember this situation, please write it down in detail.

1. Using the scale below, circle the number that represents how much control you had in the situation that you described above.

No Self-control High Self-control
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. List three major factors that contributed to the high or low self-control described above.

Appendix C: Manipulation of High Self-Control Tool

Name:
Years of Experience as a mental health provider:
Profession: Social Workers, Therapist or Case manager
Gender:
Age:
Education:

Please remember a situation at work when you experienced high self-control. After you remember this situation, please write it down in detail.

1. Using the scale below, circle the number that represents how much control you had in the situation that you described above.

No Self-control High Self-control
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. List three major factors that contributed to the high or low self-control described above.

Appendix D: Counterproductive Work Behaviors by Subscale and Percent Reported

CWB Item Number and Item	Dimension	%[a]
Purposely wasted your employer's materials/supplies	Sabotage	29.8
Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property	Sabotage	3.0
Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work	Sabotage	7.9
Came to work late without permission	Withdrawal	54.1
Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren't	Withdrawal	49.9
Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take	Withdrawal	61.6
Left work earlier than you were allowed to	Withdrawal	43.0
Purposely did your work incorrectly	Production deviance	11.2
Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done	Production deviance	29.2
Purposely failed to follow instructions	Production deviance	12.7
Stolen something belonging to your employer	Theft	11.8
Took supplies or tools home without permission	Theft	26.1
Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked	Theft	15.4
Took money from your employer without permission	Theft	3.5
Stole something belonging to someone at work	Theft	2.6
Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for	Abuse	48.7
Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work	Abuse	10.1
Been nasty or rude to a client or customer	Abuse	32.5
Insulted someone about their job performance	Abuse	26.0
Made fun of someone's personal life	Abuse	28.0
Ignored someone at work	Abuse	50.1
Blamed someone at work for error you made	Abuse	15.7
Started an argument with someone at work	Abuse	26.0
Verbally abused someone at work	Abuse	10.7
Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work	Abuse	18.5
Threatened someone at work with violence	Abuse	2.8
Threatened someone at work, but not physically	Abuse	6.4
Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad	Abuse	8.5
Did something to make someone at work look bad	Abuse	8.1
Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work	Abuse	7.0
Looked at someone at work's private mail/property without permission	Abuse	12.2
Hit or pushed someone at work	Abuse	3.4
Insulted or made fun of someone at work	Abuse	26.4

[a] Percent of sample reporting engaging in behavior.

Appendix E: Counterproductive Work Behavior Tool.

Your organization has decided to reduce your benefit package in half. This is your vacation, sick and training days. In addition, your organization decided to freeze your salary as well. Using the items below, rate how you would realistically react?

CWB Item Number and Item	Never - Sometimes- Everyday				
Purposely waste your employer's materials/supplies	1	2	3	4	5
Purposely damage a piece of equipment or property	1	2	3	4	5
Purposely dirty or litter your place of work	1	2	3	4	5
Come to work late without permission	1	2	3	4	5
Stay home from work and say you are sick when you aren't	1	2	3	4	5
Take a longer break than you are allowed to take	1	2	3	4	5
Leave work earlier than you are allowed to	1	2	3	4	5
Purposely do your work incorrectly	1	2	3	4	5
Purposely work slowly when things need to get done	1	2	3	4	5
Purposely fail to follow instructions	1	2	3	4	5
Steal something belonging to your employer	1	2	3	4	5
Take supplies or tools home without permission	1	2	3	4	5
Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked	1	2	3	4	5
Take money from your employer without permission	1	2	3	4	5
Steal something belonging to someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Tell people outside the job what a lousy place you work for	1	2	3	4	5
Start or continue a damaging or harmful rumor at work	1	2	3	4	5
Being nasty or rude to a client or customer	1	2	3	4	5
Insult someone about their job performance	1	2	3	4	5
Make fun of someone's personal life	1	2	3	4	5
Ignore someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Blame someone at work for errors you made	1	2	3	4	5
Start an argument with someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Verbally abuse someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Make an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Threaten someone at work with violence	1	2	3	4	5
Threaten someone at work, but not physically	1	2	3	4	5
Say something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad	1	2	3	4	5
Do something to make someone at work look bad	1	2	3	4	5
Play a mean prank to embarrass someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Look at someone at work's private mail/property without permission	1	2	3	4	5
Hit or push someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
Insult or made fun of someone at work	1	2	3	4	5