International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Volume 14, Issue 12, 2020

Work Stress and Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Agus Suroso[a], Timea Gal[b], Ade Irma Anggraeni[c], [a,c]Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia, [b]Debrecen University, Hungary, Email: [c]ade.anggraeni.gardjito@gmail.com

Role theory is seen as a construct in the relationship of work-family conflict and work stress. In adult life, work and family are two things that must be done together. Family is the main reason to work for income, and work is a source of income to meet family needs. Stress is seen as an adaptive response to a situation that is being perceived as a challenge or a threat to one's health. Job stress is a feeling of pressure or pressure experienced by employees in facing their work. Under certain conditions, employees may feel less motivated to meet their expectations in socialising and meeting social norms, but are instead motivated to oppose these norms. Both work-family conflict and stress can affect the emergence of counterproductive work behaviour. The results showed that work-family conflict, especially work interfering with family, has an effect on stress. Conflicts in the work domain that interfere with family responsibilities can create stress for employees. The results also showed that stress has an effect on counterproductive work behaviour, thus supporting the research hypothesis. The stress felt by respondents is a strong reason for the occurrence of counterproductive work behaviour.

Keywords: *Work Stress, Work Family Conflict, Counterproductive Work Behaviour*

INTRODUCTION

The psychological aspect of hotel employees is important because they are prone to experience role conflicts, especially dual role conflicts for those who are married. Multiple role conflicts arise when an employee has more than one situation that must be fulfilled, resulting in more responsibilities, such as conflict between work and family or what is called work-family conflict. Work-family conflict arises because roles in work and family cannot be carried out parallel or side by side. In some cases the demands that occur at work can hinder the fulfillment of family responsibilities (work-family conflict or work interfering with family), and vice versa demands by the family or the responsibility to take care of the family can interfere with the implementation of duties at work (family-work conflict or family interfering with work). The

consequences that arise when a person experiences work-family conflict are negative effects such as symptoms of depression, stress, physical health, and tension (Kossek et al., 2011). Apart from stress, Germeys & Gieter (2017) stated that there are other effects caused by work-family conflict, which can trigger counterproductive work behaviour. One of the things that can be categorised as counterproductive work behaviour that occurs is that employees make a large number of mistakes in completing work. Employees must be very careful not to have the potential to have counterproductive work behaviour due to the stress they experience. They must be clever in managing tasks so as not to cause procedural errors and failure of administrative processes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Work-Family Conflict

Role theory was developed by Khan et al., (1964) by linking it to organisational behaviour. Khan emphasizes the role theory on the basic nature of individuals as social beings who behave in accordance with where they are, for example in an organisational environment. Therefore, the family must always support its working members so that it runs smoothly, and the working family members must be able to complete their work properly in order to fulfill their family responsibilities maximally. However, to be able to run both of them well, individuals often experience disturbances that cause conflict. Conflicts and their consequences can occur because individuals have two roles, namely the role in the family and the role in work at the same time which runs unbalanced. This conflict is known as a work-family conflict.

Stress

Stress is a psychological response to the demands of something being faced that exceeds individual abilities. The adaptive response in question can be observed from psychological reactions (emotions) and physical reactions (physiological) (McShane & Glinow, 2005). Beehr and Franz (1987) define job stress as a process that causes people to feel sick, uncomfortable or tense because of a particular job, workplace or work situation.

Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Counterproductive work behaviour is a condition that is closely related to employee work motivation. The way that employees oppose these social norms is by violating organisational rules or harassing the people in it. Spector et al., (2006) define counterproductive work behaviour as behaviour that is carried out by employees on purpose to harm the organisation and the people in it, either directly or indirectly.

The Effect of Work-Family Conflict on Stress

The effect of work-family conflict on stress is divided into two main parts: the work-family conflict (work interfering with family) which is a conflict due to work demands interfering with family responsibilities, such as long working hours and lack of adequate supervision; and family-work conflict (family interfering with work), which is a conflict that occurs as a result of family demands to interfere with work responsibilities, such as economic problems and child care.

Previous research on the effect of work-family conflict on stress has been carried out by Netemeyer et al (1996), Vercruyssen & Putte (2013), Lu et al., (2017), Karakas & Tezcan (2018) and occurs in individuals because work and family problems affect stress. The researchers propose the following hypothesis:

H 1a: Work-family conflict affects stress
H 1b: Family-work conflict affects stress

Effect of Work-Family Conflict Against Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Research that finds the effect of work-family conflict on counterproductive work behaviour has been carried out, including by Germeys & Gieter (2017) and Selvarajan et al., (2019). Germeys & Gieter (2017) found that there is a significant influence between work-family conflict on counterproductive work behaviour. This effect occurs on days when employees experience work-family conflicts. When employees experience work-family conflicts, they are more vulnerable to engaging in counterproductive work behaviour, both CWBi and CWBo.
In contrast to Germeys & Gieter (2017) and Selvarajan et al., (2019) tested a model that examines the effect of work-family conflict and family-work conflict on counterproductive work behaviour, and states that there is no striking study that found a relationship between work-family conflict and counterproductive work behaviour. Furthermore, Selvarajan et al., (2019) argue that the lack of research is due to the lack of a theoretical model to understand the mechanisms for the effect of work-family conflict on counterproductive work behaviour.

Using regulatory focus theory, especially on the focus of promotion, the effect of work-family conflict on counterproductive work behaviour is based on the principles of growth, progress, and achievements obtained by individuals in carrying out their roles. However, in its implementation, the different roles that are carried out cannot run in balance. When individuals focus more on pursuing one particular achievement due to family and work demands, the potential for imbalance will be even higher. The effect that occurs when there is an imbalance of achievement between family and work is an individual's outlet for their behaviour in the family / work such as counterproductive work behaviour. Individuals with high family-work conflicts have more difficulty fulfilling their responsibilities towards the family, so that they

are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviour aimed at organisations, such as arriving late or leaving early, so the researchers propose the following hypothesis:

H 2a: Work-family conflict affects the counterproductive work behaviour
H 2b: Family-work conflict affects counterproductive work behaviour

Effects of Stress on Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Affective event theory (AET) is a theoretical mechanism of the effect of stress on counterproductive work behaviour. Increased individual stress can cause negative emotional reactions such as anger, frustration, and fatigue, which can affect employee behaviour and the potential to engage in counterproductive work behaviour (Sprung & Jex, 2012). Negative emotions play an important role in triggering counterproductive work behaviour, such as the findings of research conducted by Chen & Spector (1992), Fox et al., (2001), Spector (2005), Gallagher et al., (2008), Salami (2010), and Sprung & Jex (2012). When employees feel the injustice they are experiencing, as well as the workload that is increasing and causing stress, employees have the potential to take their stress out on negative things, so researchers propose the following hypothesis:

H 3: Stress affects counterproductive work behaviour

RESEARCH METHODS

This type of research used in this research is explanatory research with a quantitative approach, namely testing the hypotheses that have been formulated to determine the influence between the variables to be studied. The objects in this study are work-family conflict, stress, counterproductive work behaviour. The subjects of this study were hotel employees. The sampling method used was purposive sampling, using the criteria that the members of the population were married.

Based on the theoretical framework, the data analysis technique used in this research is quantitative analysis using multiple linear regression analysis and moderating variable regression analysis with the interaction method with the help of the SPSS program.

Validity test

The validity test in this study uses the CFA (Confirmatory Factor Analysis) method. The sample size in the CFA method should be 100 or greater, or five times more than the number of variables used (Hair et al., 2014). In this study, the sample used was 250, so it met the required sample size. Based on the number of samples, the research instrument is declared valid and can be continued for the next test if the factor loading of each item is ≥ 0.40 (Hair et al., 2014).

After testing, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling value was 0.787 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was 4989,319, with a sig value of 0.000. These results indicate that with a significance value < 0.005, the sample is sufficient for further analysis, or 78.7% of the variance can be explained by these factors so that factor analysis can be continued.

The output component matrix shows the correlation value or the relationship between each item with the 13 factors that are formed but are still randomly scattered, so a rotation is carried out to ensure each item is correlated on which factor. The test results have dropped several items, so we retest by removing these items. The results found that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling value increased to 0.829 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value became 2634,524, with a sig value of 0.000. These results indicate that with a significance value < 0.005, the sample used is sufficient for further analysis or 82.9% of the variance can be explained by these factors, so that factor analysis can be continued. The overall value of the Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) shows a number> 0.5

Total Variance Explained shows that a factor with an eigen value > 1 forms 6 factors. The output rotated component matrix shows the correlation value or the relationship between each item with the 6 factors that are formed after rotation,

Reliability Test

Reliability testing in this study uses Cronbach's Alpha analysis. Hair et al., (2014) states that a research instrument is said to be reliable if it has a Cronbach's alpha value ≥ 0.70, although a value ≥ 0.60 can still be said to be reliable. the value of Cronbach's alpha for each variable is ≥ 0.60, so the instruments on each variable are declared unreliable.

Classic assumption test

Normality test

Graphical analysis of normality in this study is to look at the distribution of data on a normal probability plot by comparing the cumulative distribution of the real data with the cumulative distribution of the normal distribution. The line pattern representing the actual data distribution does not appear to follow the diagonal so that the data is not normally distributed. Hair et al., (2014) stated that although data that is normally distributed both in visual and value form is very important, the sample size needs to be considered because it can affect the results. The sample size determined by the researcher can have an effect on increasing statistical power by reducing errors in sampling. This effect also applies to abnormalities, where a larger sample size reduces the detrimental effects of the abnormality.

Furthermore, Hair said deviations from normality could have a big impact on research results for small samples less than 50, especially for sample sizes less than 30 or more. These impacts are negligible for large sample sizes such as 200 or more, unless the abnormality causes violations of other assumptions. This study uses a sample of 250, so that considering the impact of the sample size, even though the data is not normal in the model it can still be tolerated.

Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity test was performed to determine the variance of variables in the regression model that was not the same (constant). To detect the presence or absence of heteroscedasticity symptoms, a graphical analysis method was carried out by observing a scatterplot. Based on the scatterplot display on the three models, it can be seen that the plot spreads randomly above or below the zero value on the Studentized Residual Regression axis. The scatterplot display does not show a certain regular pattern such as wavy or widening then narrowing. Therefore, heteroscedasticity testing using graphical analysis methods did not occur heteroscedasticity symptoms.

Multicollinearity Test

If the regression equation model contains multicollinearity symptoms, it means that there is a (near perfect) correlation between the independent variables. A good regression equation model should not have a correlation between the independent variables. To determine the presence or absence of multicollinearity symptoms, one way that can be done is to look at the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values of each independent variable on the dependent variable. A regression equation is said to not experience symptoms of multicollinearity if the Tolerance value is > 0.01, and the VIF value is < 10.

Based on the tests carried out for each model, the Tolerance value in the three models each showed a value greater than 0.01, and the overall VIF value was less than 10, so it was concluded that there was no multicollinearity symptom.

Autocorrelation Test

The autocorrelation test aims to determine whether there is a correlation between members of a series of observational data described according to time (times-series) or space (cross section). The autocorrelation test in this study was carried out using the Durbin Watson test by comparing the calculated Durbin Watson value (d) with the Durbin Watson table value, namely the upper limit (dU) and the lower limit (dL). In this study n (sample size) = 250, and k (number of independent variables) = 3, so that the dU value is 1.80154 and 4-dU = 2.19846 so that it can be concluded that the model has met the autocorrelation test.

Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis 1

A constant value of 8.358 indicates that if work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) is 0, then the stress (STR) is 8.358. The regression coefficient for work interfering with family is 0.451, indicating that if the work interfering with family is increased by 1 unit, the stress will increase by 45.1%. The coefficient of work interfering with family shows a positive direction with the Sig. amounting to .000 at a significance level of 0.05, meaning that the value of Sig. is smaller than 0.05, so it can be concluded that work interfering with family has a positive effect on stress (H1a accepted).

The regression coefficient for family interfering with work is 0.049, indicating that if family interfering with work is increased by 1 unit, then the stress will increase by 4.9%. The coefficient of family interfering with work shows a positive direction, but the Sig. amounting to .613 is greater than the significance level of 0.05, so it is concluded that family interfering with work has no effect on stress (H1b is rejected) .

Hypothesis 2

A constant value of 4.609 indicates that if work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) is 0, then the counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) is 8.358. The regression coefficient for work interfering with family is 0.154, indicating that if work interfering with family is increased by 1 unit, the counterproductive work behaviour will increase by 15.4%. The coefficient of work interfering with family shows a positive direction with the Sig. amounting to .001 at the 0.05 significance level, meaning that the Sig. smaller than 0.05, so it can be concluded that work interfering with family has a positive effect on counterproductive work behaviour (H2a accepted).

The regression coefficient for family interfering with work is 0.017, indicating that if family interfering with work is increased by 1 unit, the counterproductive work behaviour will increase by 1.7%. The coefficient of family interfering with work shows a positive direction, but the Sig. amounting to .747 is greater than the significance level of 0.05, so it can be concluded that family interfering with work has no effect on counterproductive work behaviour (H2b is rejected) .

Hypothesis 3

A constant value of 3.992 indicates that if stress (STR) is 0, then the counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) is 3.992. The stress regression coefficient of 0.184 shows that if the stress is increased by 1 unit, the counterproductive work behaviour will increase by 18.4%. The stress coefficient shows a positive direction with a Sig value. amounting to .000 at a significance

level of 0.05, meaning that the value of Sig. is smaller than 0.05, so it is concluded that stress has a positive effect on counterproductive work behaviour (H 3 accepted).

Discussion

Work-family conflict affects stress

The results showed that work-family conflict, especially work interfering with family, has an effect on stress. Conflicts in the work domain that interfere with family responsibilities can create stress for employees. Panatik et al., (2012) also found that work interfering with family is highly correlated with stress and psychological stress. The problems experienced by respondents at work make respondents more sensitive so that it is easy to get involved in conflicts between employees and with family members at home. The results of this study further support previous research conducted by Vercruyssen & Putte (2013), Lu et al., (2017) and Karakas & Tezcan (2018), which states that work-family conflict has a positive effect on stress. In contrast to work interfering with family, family-work conflict (family interfering with work) was found to have no effect on stress. Panatik et al., (2012) found the same result, where stress caused by conflict in the family was lower in influencing work implementation. This is because families provide more social support to individuals. Family support plays an important role in protecting and maintaining an individual's mental health, and is considered the strongest social support that can support an individual emotionally and behaviourally. Work-family conflict affects counterproductive work behaviour. The results showed that work-family conflict, especially work interfering with family, had an effect on counterproductive work behaviour. These results also support previous research conducted by Germeys & Gieter (2017), and Selvarajan et al., (2019).

Work interfering with family is positively related to counterproductive work behaviour, this is because employees think that conflicts that occur in the work domain that cause problems in the family are caused by the organisation, so the organisation must take responsibility for the consequences. Dissatisfaction due to organisational responses that did not match expectations in resolving these conflicts resulted in employees tending to be involved in counterproductive work behaviour by retaliating against the organisation (CWB-O) or against people in the organisation (CWB-I) (Selvarajan et al. , 2019). In contrast to work interfering with family, family interfering with work was not found to affect counterproductive work behaviour. Based on respondents' answers to open questions and linked to regulatory focus theory, employees refer to the premise of hedonism. Based on this theory, even though employees experience conflicts in the family domain that have the potential to interfere with work performance, individual cognitive responses guide them in choosing a preventive focus.

Stress has an effect on counterproductive work behaviour

Respondents who cannot control their own attitudes, and are supported by environmental factors that are not in accordance with their wishes and expectations, emotions that are difficult to control, and disharmonious daily relationships are vented to negative things. Clercq, Haq and Azeem (2019) state that employees who get pressure in the organisation, get less attention from the leadership, and where there is a lack of welfare, are more likely to vent their negative emotions on things that can damage the organisation directly or indirectly. Direct counter-productive behaviour includes destroying office inventory or spending office investment for personal gain, while indirect counter-productive behaviour includes ignoring co-workers or talking badly about colleagues or their leaders. Apart from Clercq, Haq and Azeem (2019), the results of other studies conducted by Chen & Spector (1992), Fox et al., (2001), Spector (2005), Gallagher et al., (2008), Bowling & Eschleman (2010), Salami (2010), and Sprung & Jex (2012) also found that stress has an effect on counterproductive work behaviour.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study have implications for policies to better understand and pay attention to employees. If the psychological factors of employees are managed properly, employees will not experience work-family conflicts that can cause stress and engage in counterproductive work behaviour. The questionnaire was given through social networks using google docs. The limitation experienced is that the questionnaire distribution process coincides with the global Covid-19 pandemic, so that most respondents work at home (work from home) and influence respondents' answers to the questions asked. Apart from this, there were respondents who were involved in the Covid-19 handling task force so that they did not focus on answering every question.

REFERENCES

Aube, *et al*., 2007. Perceived Organisational Support and Organisational Commitment, The Moderating Effect of Locus of Control and Work Autonomy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 22 No. 5, 2007 pp. 479-495. DOI 10.1108/02683940710757209

Beehr, T.A. and Franz, T. 1987. *The Current Debate about the Meaning of Job Stress. In: Ivancevich, J.M. and Ganster, D.C., Eds., Job Stress: From Theory of Suggestion*. Haworth Press, New York, 5-18.

Bellavia. G. & Frone, M. 2005. Work-family conflict. Handbook of Work Stress. *Sage Publications*: Thousand Oaks.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. 2000. Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360. (Diadaptasi ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia oleh Suyasa, P. T. Y. S., 2013)

Besral, dan Widiantini, W. 2015. Determinan Stres pada Pegawai Kementerian Kesehatan Indonesia. *Kesmas: Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat Nasional Vol. 9, No. 3*. Februari 2015.

Boles, J. H., Howard, W. G., & Donofrio, H. H. 2001. An investigation into the inter-relationships of work family conflict, family work conflict and work satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13 (3), 376-390.

Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. 1992. Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 65*(3), 177–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1992.tb00495.x

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., Mermelstein, R. 1983. A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 24, 385-396. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404

Colquitt, Jason A., Lepine, Jeffery A. & Wesson, Michael J. 2009. *Organisational Behaviour. Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*. New York : McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. 1999. A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 20*(6), 915–931. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199911)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.0.CO;2-6

Fox, S., P.E. Spector and D. Miles. 2001. Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) in Response to Stressors and Organisational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions. *J. Vocat. Behav*. 59: 291-301.

Gallagher, V.C., K.J. Harris and M. Valle. 2008. Understanding the use of intimidation as a response to job tension: Career implications for the global leader. *Career Development International Vol. 13 No. 7, 2008 pp. 648-666*. DOI 10.1108/13620430810911100

Germeys, L., & Gieter, Sara D. 2017. Clarifying the dynamic interrelation of conflicts between the work and home domain and counterproductive work behaviour. *European Journal Of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 2017 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1314266.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. 1995. Multivariate data analysis. *Englewood Cliffs*, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hair. J. F., *et.al*,. 2014. Multivariate data analysis ed. 7th. England: pearson education limited

Hargis et al., 2011. What's Really Important? Examining the Relative Importance of Antecedents to Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Managerial Issues* Vol. XXIII Number 4 Winter 2011: 386-408. DOI: 10.1037/t06070-000

Jamadin *et al*., 2015. Work - Family Conflict and Stress: Evidence from Malaysia. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, Vol. 3, No. 2, February 2015. DOI: 10.7763/JOEBM.2015.V3.200

Kahn, R.L, *et al*., 1964. *Organisational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity*. Wiley.

Karakaş, A. and Tezcan, N.S. 2018. The Relation Between Work Stress, Work-Family Life Conflict and Worker Performance: A Research Study on Hospitality Employees. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 21, pp. 102-11.

Kossek *et al*., 2011. How Work–Family Research Can Finally Have an Impact in Organisations. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology, 4 (2011)*, 352–369. DOI: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01353.x

Leung, Chan, and Yu. 2009. Integrated model for the stressors and stresses of construction project managers in Hong Kong. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management. J. Constr. Eng. Manage*. 2009.135:126-134. DOI:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2009)135:2(126)

Lu *et al*., 2017. The relationship between job satisfaction, work stress, work–family conflict, and turnover intention among physicians in Guangdong, China: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e014894. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014894

McShane, Steven L., dan Glinow Von, Mary Ann. 2005. *Organisational Behaviour. 3rd edition*. McGrawHill. USA.

Montgomery, D.C., Blodgett, J.G. and Barnes, J.H. 1996. A Model of Financial Securities Salespersons' Job Stress. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 21- 38. https://doi.org/10.1108/08876049610119776

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J. S. and and Mcmurrıan, R.. 1996. Development and Validation of Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict Scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81. No. 4, 400-410. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

Parkes, K. R. 1991. Locus of control as moderator: An explanation for additive versus interactive findings in the demand-discretion model of work stress?. *British Journal of Psychology*, 82(3), 291–312. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1991.tb02401.x

Patten, D. M. 2005. An Analysis of the Impact of Locus of Control on Internal Auditor Job Performance and Satisfaction. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 20 (8), 1016-1029. DOI 10.1108/02686900510625343

Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. D. 2007. Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 43*(3), 564–575. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.564

Rotter, J. B. 1966. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80 (1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0092976.

Salami. 2010. Job Stress and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: Negative Affectivity as a Moderator. *The Social Science* 5(6): 486-492. DOI: 10.3923/sscience.2010.486.492

Selvarajan, *et al*., 2019. Work–Family Conflict and Counterproductive Work Behaviours: Moderating Role of Regulatory Focus and Mediating Role of Affect. *Organisation Management Journal*. DOI: 10.1080/15416518.2019.1574547

Siu *et al*., 2002. Managerial Stress in Greater China: The Direct and Moderator Effects of Coping Strategies and Work Locus of Control. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 2002, 51(4), 608-632. DOI: 10.1111/1464-0597.00111

Spector *et al*., 2006. The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviours created equal?. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68, 446–460. DOI:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005

Spector, E.Paul. 1982. Behaviour in organisations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, vol 91 (3), pp 482-497.

Spector, E.Paul. 1986. Perceived Control by Employees: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Concerning Autonomy and Participation at Work. *Human Relations*, Volume 39, Number 11, PP.1005-1016.

Spector, P. E. 1988. Development of the work locus of control scale. *Psychological of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335-340. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x

Spector, P.E. 2010. The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review* Volume 21, Issue 4, December 2011, Pages 342-352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.002

Spector, P.E., Fox, S. 2005. The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behaviour. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behaviour: Investigations of actors and targets* (p. 151–174). American Psychological Association.

Sprung, J.M. and Jex, S.M. 2012. Work Locus of Control as a Moderator of the Relationship Between Work Stressors and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 2012, Vol. 19, No. 4, 272–291. DOI: 10.1037/a0030320

Storms, Philip L, and Spector, Paul E. 1987. Relationships of organisational frustration with reported behavioural reactions: The moderating effect of locus of control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 1987, 60, 227-234. Printed in Great Britain. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1987.tb00255.x

Vercruyssen & Putte. 2013. Work–family conflict and stress: indications of the distinctiveness of role combination stress for Belgian working mothers. *Community, Work & Family*, 16:4, 351-371, DOI: 10.1080/13668803.2013.776515

Yang, *et al*., 2000. Sources of Work-Family Conflict: A Sino-U.S. Comparison of the Effects of Work and Family Demands. *Hong Kong University of Science & Technology Business*

School Research Paper Series; Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 113-123, 2000. DOI: 10.2307/1556390