



## EVALUATING THE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIORS OF EMPLOYEES AT WORK PLACE: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS

SIDRA TARIQ<sup>1</sup>, MUHAMMAD ZEESHAN SHAUKAT<sup>2</sup>, ABDUL AZIZ KHAN NIAZI<sup>3</sup>, ABDUL BASIT<sup>4</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to find the measures to reduce the counterproductive behavior of employees working in public sector organizations. It is an empirical study that evaluates the relationships among the employees' counterproductive behaviors. The study keeps qualitative research philosophy and the process of reasoning is the act of making generalized conclusions which have an inductive approach. The research methodology is based on primary data from panel of experts by using Interpretive Structural Modeling (ISM) coupled with cross-impact Matrix Multiplications Applied to classifications (MICMAC). The research survey conducted from experts by presenting a matrix-type questionnaire appropriate for structural studies. Final data has been analyzed through ISM and MICMAC methods. Research of the literature review and data collection results in nineteen factors of counterproductive behavior of employees. ISM shows that work overload and ineffective communication are the most critical factors. MICMAC analysis reveals that there is no autonomous factors, one in dependent quadrant, two in independent quadrant and rests are in linkage quadrant. This research is conducted in a real life field based on original public sector organizations that provide real time practical solutions of the problem. This study added a sufficient contribution in the field of research for future research to address the counterproductive behavior.

**KEYWORDS:** Counterproductive behavior, employees, ISM, MICMAC, public sector organizations

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs) are those behaviors of employees which include the actions that workers used to mistreat their organization or organizational members (Bowling & Gruys, 2010). Sackett and DeVore (2001) further elaborated it as a type of behaviors that shows counter to the interests of the organization, which individuals, usually, consciously choose to engage for examples stealing of property, destruction of property, misuse of information, misuse of time and resources, unsafe behavior, poor attendance, poor quality of work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate verbal action and inappropriate physical actions. The main reasons behind the counterproductive work behavior in an organization are usually too wide which includes environmental reasons, lack of training, employee personality, life changes and external factor (Grijalva et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2013). Communal disputes within the organization can also expedite bad behavior of employees. Communal conflict with the supervisor can lead to counterproductive work behaviors such as confrontation, sabotage, and being hand in glove with associate to engage in aberrant behavior (Makhdoom et al., 2019). Counterproductive behaviors of employees can lower the productivity of organization and also cause the reduction of good will of the organization (Shockley et al., 2012). On the other hand, these behaviors can cause heavy financial losses to the organization (Lipińska-Grobely, 2021). It makes difficult for an organization to work properly in the presence of counterproductive behaviors of employees. It becomes necessary for the organizations to identify these behaviors and remove them from the workplace for the better future of the organization. This research highlighted the factors which cause counterproductive behaviors of employees in the organization and their effects on the organization as a whole. These counterproductive behaviors can't fully be removed from organization but the amount of these behaviors can be reduced. The study prepares a list of counterproductive behaviors from the review of literature (Table 1). Some of the important objectives are given below:

- To parities the behavior and hierarchical structure on relations of the behaviors.
- To classify the counterproductive behaviors.
- To formulate the policy guideline for management.

### 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

During the last thirty years the modernity of the economy has get going at a rapid pace than ever. Today, we live in a community

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Business Management, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup> Hailey College of Commerce, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup> Corresponding Author, Department of Management, New Campus, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

<sup>4</sup> Lahore Institute of Science and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

where money, products and talent are unconfined across borders with greater ease. With the passage of time where the increasing the counterproductive behaviors are also increase with its different forms consumers, vender and retailer frequently come from many parts of the world resulting in an increasingly manifold workforce and business environment (Parashakti et al., 2020). And there are lots of factors which are the cause of counterproductive behavior of employees such as work overload, ineffective communication, lack of freedom, lack of job engagement, lower wages, lack of training, unfavorable working condition, job stress, unacceptable practices, inequitable treatment, deviant personality attributes, desire for extrinsic benefits, long working hours, lust of power, drug addiction, lack of expertise, unnecessary socializing, goldbricking, work place politics etc. (Barabasz & Belz, 2014; Gregg, 2008; Lallukka et al., 2004; McGowan, 2019; Thuy, 2019). When there is ineffective communication in an organization the amount of workload on employees automatically increases (Junaidi et al., 2020). For instance, if a company installs new software and executives of the company do not communicate effectively and do not guide their employees regarding the software properly it is understood that employees can't run software perfectly. They can face difficulties in their work which is directly proportional to work overload. There must be effective communication between front line staff and senior management. Similarly, if there is lack of freedom in an organization and there is no suitable environment of work, in this situation employees can also face work overload. Lack of job engagement in an organization and the people have to work forcefully, they can't work in their regarding field, it can also increases work overload on employees (Barabasz & Belz, 2014). Furthermore, lack of training of employees, employees did not work properly and experience a lot of work overload (Brownell & Tanner, 2012). Organization ensures that they make training sessions in a different way via email and social media, over the phones and in presentation, meetings and one-to-ones. Lower wages are a main and big reason of counterproductive behavior of employees. Lower wages are also the cause of stress, low self-esteem and greater chance to engage in unhealthy behaviors like smoking. Unfavorable working conditions or poor working conditions include the things which are not suitable for employees like physically dangerous environment, not enough space, bad lighting in short anything which creates a hazard to employees. Poor working conditions can lead to the bad behavior of employees. Poor job performance is defined as behavior of employee or performance of employee is below the required standards. Poor performance at work mostly destroy the daily tasks of the organization sometimes poor performance is not intentionally it can be fix by some solid guidance and the organizational management team must try to fix it well rather than later. Performance is based on the ability and motivation (Dalal, 2005). For the betterment of performance in the organization motivate them properly or guide them they can perform easily or some training sessions are also very important for the good output from employees. A list of factors has been finalized (Table 1).

**Table 1: List of Factors**

Sr.	Factor	References
1	Work Overload	Fong and kleiner (2004)
2	Ineffective Communication	Thuy (2019)
3	Lack of Freedom	Gregg (2008)
4	Lack of Job Engagement	Sun and Bunchapattanasakda (2019)
5	Lower Wages	Newman (2017)
6	Lack of Training	Brownell and Tanner (2012)
7	Unfavorable Working Condition	Wütschert et al. (2022)
8	Job Stress	LaMontagne et al. (2007)
9	Unacceptable Practices	Singh and Twalo (2015)
10	Inequitable Treatment	Putnam et al. (2014)
11	Deviant Personality Attributes	Khattak et al. (2019)
12	Desire for Extrinsic Benefits	Twenge et al. (2010)
13	Long Working Hours	Johnson and Lipscomb (2006)
14	Lust of Power	Mcgowan, 2019
15	Drug Addiction	Wentland, et al, 2005
16	Lack of Expertise	Sloan (2004); Wu and Fang (2007)
17	Unnecessary Socializing	Chen and Ayoun (2019); Palaszczuk (2020)
18	Goldbricking	Sao et al. (2020)
19	Work Place Politics	Hussain (2020); Webster et al. (2018)

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The study follows a post-positivist research philosophy and the process of reasoning is the act of making generalized conclusions which have an inductive approach. It is an empirical study meant to evaluate the relationships among the employees' counterproductive behaviors. For recognition of factors, the technique which is used in literature review and verification, and expert's opinion has been occupied. The scope of the study is to reach out to the population of public sector organizations. The study keeps a mixed methodology. The research survey is done from experienced persons by presenting

a matrix-type questionnaire appropriate for structural studies (Abbass et al., 2022). Final data is analyzed by utilizing the Interpretive Structural Modeling (ISM) and cross-impact Matrix Multiplications Applied to classifications (MICMAC) methods.

#### 4. ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

ISM is a well-established methodology to find the relationship of factors (Abbass et al., 2021; Basit et al., 2021; Shaukat et al., 2021). After gathering the data SSIM is established. For this purpose, firstly make a table set the numbers and factors vertically or horizontally respectively. After this step applying the response against its factors which is may be V,O,A and X. Structural self-interaction in ISM used the expert based opinion on various management technique and developing the contextual relationship among factors.

Development of Structural Self-Interaction Matrix (SSIM): SSIM is developed on the base of contextual relationship to achieve final result (Table 2).

**Table 2: Structural Self Interaction Matrix (SSIM)**

Code	Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	Work Overload		V	O	O	O	V	V	V	V	O	O	O	V	V	O	O	V	O	O
2	Ineffective Communication			A	V	O	O	X	O	O	X	X	O	O	O	V	O	V	V	V
3	Lack of Freedom				X	O	O	O	X	X	V	A	O	A	O	A	V	O	O	
4	Lack of Job Engagement					A	V	V	V	V	V	A	O	O	V	O	V	V	A	
5	Lower Wages						O	O	A	A	O	V	O	O	O	O	V	O	X	
6	Lack of Training							V	A	A	V	V	O	V	O	V	O	O	V	
7	Unfavorable Working Condition								V	A	O	O	A	V	V	A	A	V	A	
8	Job Stress									X	A	V	A	X	A	O	A	X	V	
9	Unacceptable Practices										O	V	X	A	O	V	X	O	V	
10	Inequitable Treatment											X	V	A	X	A	X	V	V	
11	Deviant Personality Attributes												X	A	A	O	A	O	A	
12	Desire for Extrinsic Benefits													V	V	O	O	A	O	
13	Long Working Hours														O	A	V	O	A	
14	Lust of Power															A	O	A	O	
15	Drug Addiction																V	O	V	
16	Lack of Expertise																	O	A	
17	Unnecessary Socializing																		V	
18	Goldbricking																			
19	Work Place Politics																			

Constructing Initial Reachability Matrix: It is created from SSIM. It is developed in the form of 0 and 1 (Table 3). The following symbols are used to denote the relationship between the factors (i and j): (a) V for the relation for i factor to j factor it means that factor i is influenced the j factor, (b) A for the relation of factor j to the factor i it means that factor i is influenced by factor j, (c) the symbol X for both direction relationship that means that i and j influence each other and (d) the symbol O denoted that there is no relationship between the factors that means i and j are totally unrelated.

**Table 3: Initial Reachability Matrix**

Code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
4	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
6	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
8	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
9	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
11	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
15	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
16	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
18	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
19	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1

Constructing Final Reachability Matrix: In the next step final reachability matrix is formed (Table 4). It is used to incorporate the transitivity concepts and making modification.

**Table 4: Final Reachability Matrix**

Code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	Driving
1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	19
2	0	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	18
3	0	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	18
4	0	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	18
5	0	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	0	1	1*	1	1	17
6	0	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	18
7	0	1	1*	0	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1	17
8	0	1*	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1*	18
9	0	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	18
10	0	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	0	1	1	1	1*	1	0	1	1	1	1	16
11	0	1	1	1	0	0	1*	1*	0*	1	1	1	1*	1*	0	0	1*	1*	1	14
12	0	0	1*	0	0	1*	1	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1	0	1*	1*	1*	1	14
13	0	0	1	0	0	1*	1*	1	1	1	1	0	1	1*	0	1	1*	1*	1	13
14	0	0	0	0	0	1*	1*	1	1*	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1*	1*	1	10
15	0	0	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	0	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1	16
16	0	0	1	0	0	1*	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1*	0	1	1*	1*	1	12
17	0	0	0	1*	1*	0	1*	1	0	0	1*	1	1*	1	0	1*	1	1	1	12
18	0	0	0	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	0	1	0	1	1*	0	1	1*	1	1	13
19	0	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	1	18
Dependence	1	12	16	14	14	17	19	19	17	17	19	14	17	19	10	17	19	19	19	299

Level Partitioning: Reachability and antecedent set for each factor is developed with the help of final reachability matrix.

**Table 5: Iteration I**

Cod e	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Lev el
1	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1	1	
2	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,19	
3	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,19	
4	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,15,17,18,19	2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,15,17,18,19	
5	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,15,17,18,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,17,18,19	
6	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,12,13,14,15,16,18,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,12,13,14,15,16,18,19	
7	2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	/
8	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	/
9	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,19	
10	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,16,19	
11	2,3,4,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	2,3,4,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,17,18,19	/
12	3,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,17,19	3,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,17,19	
13	3,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,17,18,19	3,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,17,18,19	
14	6,7,8,9,10,11,14,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	6,7,8,9,10,11,14,17,18,19	/
15	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,15,19	3,4,6,7,8,9,15,19	
16	3,6,7,8,9,10,11,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,12,13,15,16,17,18,19	3,6,7,8,9,10,16,17,18,19	
17	4,5,7,8,11,12,13,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	4,5,7,8,11,12,13,14,16,17,18,19	/
18	4,5,6,7,8,9,11,13,14,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	4,5,6,7,8,9,11,13,14,16,17,18,19	/
19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19	/

Conical matrix is obtained by collecting the factors of the same level in the rows and the same level in the columns to achieve the final reachability matrix firstly identify the drive power of the factors (Table 13). This drive power is obtained by sum up the numbers from the rows and column the rows after sum up the numbers next step is to rank the drive and dependence power.

**Table 6: Iteration II**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1,2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	1	1	
2	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10	2,3,4,5,6,9,10	
3	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	II
4	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16,	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,15	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,15	
5	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,15	2,3,4,5,6,9,10	
6	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	II
9	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16,	2,3,4,5,6,9,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,12,13,15,16	
10	2,3,4,5,6,10,12,13,16,	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	2,3,4,5,6,10,12,13,16	II
12	3,6,9,10,12,13,16	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12	3,6,9,10,12	
13	3,6,9,10,13,16,	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15	3,6,9,10,13	
15	3,4,5,6,9,10,13,15,16,	2,3,4,6,9,15	3,4,6,9,15	
16	3,6,9,10,16,	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,12,13,15,16	3,6,9,10,16	II

**Table 7: Iteration III**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1,2,4,5,9,12,13,15	1	1	
2	2,4,5,9,12,13,15	2,4,5,9	2,4,5,9	
4	2,4,5,9,12,13,15	2,4,5,9,15	2,5,9,15	
5	2,4,5,9,12,13,	2,4,5,9,15	2,4,5	
9	2,4,5,9,12,13,15	2,4,5,9,12,13,15	2,4,5,9,12,13,15	III
12	9,12,13	2,4,5,9,12	9,12	
13	9,13	2,4,5,9,12,13,15	9,13	III
15	4,5,9,13,15	2,4,9,15	4,9,15	

**Table 8: Iteration IV**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1,2,4,5,12,15	1	1	
2	2,4,5,12,15	2,4,5	2,4,5	
4	2,4,5,12,15	2,4,5,15	2,4,5,15	
5	2,4,5,12,	2,4,5,15	2,4,5	
12	12	2,4,5,12	12	IV
15	4,5,15	2,4,15	4,15	

**Table 9: Iteration V**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1,2,4,5,15	1	1	
2	2,4,5,15	2,4,5	2,4,5	
4	2,4,5,15	2,4,5,15	2,4,5,15	V
5	2,4,5,	2,4,5,15	2,4,5	V
15	4,5,15	2,4,15	4,15	

**Table 10: Iteration VI**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1,2,15	1	1	
2	2,15	2	2	
15	15	15	15	VI

**Table 11: Iteration VII**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1,2	1	1	
2	2	2	2	VII

**Table 12: Iteration VIII**

Code	Reachability Sets	Antecedent Sets	Intersection Sets	Level
1	1	1	1	VIII

This abridge conical matrix represents the factors and their interdependencies in order to form nodes (Table 14). In this conical matrix the top level factors laying at the top of the table and the second top level factors are placed at second cone and so on, until the all levels are filled up with their respective factors at the lowest position.

**Table 13: Conical Matrix**

Code	7	8	11	14	17	18	19	3	6	10	16	9	13	12	4	5	15	2	1
7	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	0	1*	1*	1	0
8	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	0
11	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	0	1	0	1*	1*	1	1	0	0	1	0
14	1*	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	0	1*	1	0	1*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1*	0	1*	1	1*	1*	0	0	0
18	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	0	1*	0	1	1*	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
19	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	0
3	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	0
6	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	0
10	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	0	1*	1	1*	1*	0	1	0
16	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1*	0
13	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	0
5	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	0	1*	0
15	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	0	1*	1*	1	0	0
2	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1	1	0
1	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1

**Table 14: Abridged Representation of ISM Modeling**

		Reachability Sets																							
		Code	Level	7	8	11	14	17	18	19	3	6	10	16	9	13	12	4	5	15	2	1			
Antecedent Sets	I	7	I	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	0	1*	1*	1	0	19		
		8	I	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1*	0	18	
		11	I	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	0	1	0	1*	1*	1	1	0	0	1	0	18	
		14	I	1*	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	0	1*	1	0	1*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
		17	I	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1*	0	1*	1	1*	1*	0	0	0	17	
		18	I	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	1	0	1*	0	1	1*	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	18	
		19	I	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	0	17	
		3	II	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	0	18
		6	II	1	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	0	18
	10	II	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1	0	1*	1	1*	1*	0	1	0	16		
	16	II	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1	1*	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14		
	9	III	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1*	0	14		
	13	III	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13		
	12	IV	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	10		
	4	V	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	0	16		
	5	V	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1*	1*	1	1	0	1*	0	12		
	15	VI	1	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1	0	1*	1*	1	1	0	12		
	2	VII	1	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1*	1	1	1	0	13		
1	VIII	1	1	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	1*	1*	1*	1*	1	1	18			
						1	12	16	14	14	17	19	19	17	17	19	14	17	19	10	17	19	19	19	
		Dependence Power																							

**4.1. DEVELOPMENT OF ISM MODEL**

ISM model has been constructed by following the classical procedure devised by Warfield (1973) as figure 1. ISM model reveals that work overload (1), ineffective communication (2), drug addiction (15) occupy bottom of the model and are key factors; lack of job engagement (4), lower wages (5), unacceptable practices (9), desire for extrinsic benefits (12), long working hours (13) occupy middle part of the model and are mediating factors; whereas lack of freedom (3), lack of training (6), unfavorable working condition (7), job stress (8), inequitable treatment (10), deviant personality attributes (11), lust of power (14), lack of expertise (16), unnecessary socializing (17), goldbricking (18), work place politics (19) occupy the top of the model and are least critical factors.

Digraph is converted into the interpretive structural model by replacing the factors' nodes with statement (Figure 1). It is used at high level of research such abstraction of element for long range of planning also it can be used in more structured and detailed process and design such as human resource competitive planning and management research. Application of interpretive structural modeling is used to analyze problem and system in various fields. This digraph shows clearly all levels and each level contains its factors.





## 5. RESULTS

Discussion on results consist of review of literature, MICMAC and ISM. The literature review is driven to make the list of factors for identifying the reason of counterproductive behavior of employee. As a result, various factors are obtained from which we chose most common of them that are verified by the field experts using ISM technique. Regarding the organization, the current requirements of business this research has influenced the factors that harmful for the business and its productivity.

**Table 15: Comparative Representation of Results of Literature, MICMAC & ISM**

Code	Factors	Driving	Dependence	Effectiveness	Cluster	Level	Key Factor
1	Work Overload	19	1	18	Independent	VIII	Key Factor
2	Ineffective Communication	18	12	6	Linkage	VII	
3	Lack of Freedom	18	16	2	Linkage	II	
4	Lack of Job Engagement	18	14	4	Linkage	V	
5	Lower Wages	17	14	3	Linkage	V	
6	Lack of Training	18	17	1	Linkage	II	
7	Unfavorable Working Condition	17	19	-2	Linkage	I	
8	Job Stress	18	19	-1	Linkage	I	
9	Unacceptable Practices	18	17	1	Linkage	III	
10	Inequitable Treatment	16	17	-1	Linkage	II	
11	Deviant Personality Attributes	14	19	-5	Linkage	I	
12	Desire for Extrinsic Benefits	14	14	0	Linkage	IV	
13	Long Working Hours	13	17	-4	Linkage	III	
14	Lust of Power	10	19	-9	Independent	I	
15	Drug Addiction	16	10	6	Dependent	VI	
16	Lack of Expertise	12	17	-5	Linkage	II	
17	Unnecessary Socializing	12	19	-7	Linkage	I	
18	Goldbricking	13	19	-6	Linkage	I	
19	Work Place Politics	18	19	-1	Linkage	I	

Table (15) shows the key factor after the comparison of results of literature, MICMAC and ISM. All the factors along with their deriving and dependence power is clearly mentioned.

### 5.1. Discussion

**Table 16: Contrasting Results of the Study**

Study	Focus	Variables	Results	Method	Country
Current	Counterproductive behavior of employee in public sector organization	19 (table 1)	Key factor of the research shows the major reason of counterproductive behavior of employee	ISM	Pakistan
Harbring et al. (2017)	Reducing counterproductive work behavior in teams and hierarchical relationships	Organizational factors, personality traits	Personality traits and organizational factors plays an important role in reducing CWB	Linear regression model	India
Zheng et al. (2017)	Why do employees have CWB the role of founders	Different psychological factors and organizational environment by founders	Psychological contracts, organizational justice and trust development from founders make people loyal toward organization.	Theoretical framework	China
Makhdoom et al. (2019)	Counterproductive work behavior as an outcome of job burnout	Job burnout, withdrawal, abuse, sabotage, and etc.	Job satisfaction plays an important role if the employees are satisfy from job they can't do CWB	Regression analysis	USA

## 6. CONCLUSION

This research study was conducted to evaluate the counterproductive behaviors of employees at work place. For the purpose of data collection, this study used public sector organizations of Pakistan as the population. Interpretive structural modeling and MICMAC were used as the data analysis techniques to analyse the data collected from the sample. Research of the literature review and data collection resulted in nineteen factors of counterproductive behavior of employees. Overall results of the study show that factors that were identified in this study are the reason of CWB in the public sector organization of Pakistan. This study gives proper practical solutions of the problem. There are many reasons of counterproductive behavior like miscommunication, inappropriate environment, greed of money, less salary, burnout, conflict with other co-workers, use of drug, communication gap between upper level staff and lower level staff, personality traits, etc. The study also proved



that the work overload is the key factor in this matter.

### **6.1. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS**

This study is the source of influencing the counterproductive behavior and also it enhancing the most practical causes of counterproductive behavior in organizations. It contributes a practical model which is based on a large number of factors about counterproductive behavior of employees in public sector organization. It put a value able and logical order for the future researcher.

### **6.2. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

This study also has some methodological limitations like the data is collected from a specific field and specific focus group. The scope of the study is also limited and it used qualitative study. This study is only conducted in public sector organization of Pakistan. That's why the generalize ability of research is also limited. There may be many factors to a problem but in this study the research is conduct on limited factors. If the number of factors are increases the complexity of methodology also increases. So in this study only limited number of factors are considered. Some other factors which are least affecting or may not be create issues not be taken in the ISM model. Further researchers may be not use these factor on other statistical model to validate the authenticity of this hypothetic model.

### **6.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES**

This study recommended the future researchers to use some other quantitative techniques like wavelet analysis or use total interpretive structural modeling or use some other new methodology to find out majority of factors and solutions of the problems. Researchers not only focus on the specific group but also focus large number respondents in order to achieve large number of responses from different sectors. They also use some other instrument of research rather than matric questionnaire. Prepare large number of list factors using most accurate and authentic technique of data collection. The researchers must take into the international level.

### **6.4. CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY**

This study added valuable contribution in the research for example identification of factors for avoiding counterproductive behavior, ISM model, driving dependence diagram, comparative discussion, conical matrix and abridge model results, and etc. all these are simplify form of a complex and large data.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abbass, K., Niazi, A. A. K., Song, H. M., Qazi, T. F., & Basit, A. (2021). Aftermath of COVID-19 pandemic period: Barriers in implementation of social distancing at workplace. *Library Hi Tech*, 40(2), 569-585
- Abbass, K., Asif, M., Niazi, A. A. K., Qazi, T. F., & Basit, A. (2022). Understanding the interaction among enablers of quality enhancement of higher business education in Pakistan. *PLOS One*, 17(5), e0267919.
- Barabasz, A., & Belz, G. (2014). Reaction to organisational change: the psychodynamic perspective. *Management Science in Transition Period in Moldova and Poland: Responsible Use of Resources*, 27-36.
- Basit, A., Scholz, M., Niazi, A. A. K., Qazi, T. F., Rao, Z. R., & Shaukat, M. Z., (2021). Structural modeling on the determinants of effectiveness of SOPs containing COVID-19 in mass gatherings. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 4754.
- Bowling, N. A., & Gruys, M. L. (2010). Overlooked issues in the conceptualization and measurement of counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(1), 54-61.
- Brownell, S. E., & Tanner, K. D. (2012). Barriers to faculty pedagogical change: Lack of training, time, incentives, and tensions with professional identity *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 11(4), 339-346.
- Chen, H., & Ayoun, B. (2019). Is negative workplace humor really all that" negative"? Workplace humor and hospitality employees' job embeddedness. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 79, 41-4
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241.
- Fong, K., & Kleiner, B. H. (2004). New development concerning the effect of work overload on employees. *Management Research News*, 27(4/5), 9-16.
- Gregg, M. (2008). Freedom to work: The impact of wireless on labour politics. *Media International Australia*, 125(1), 57-70.
- Grijalva, E., & Newman, D. A. (2015). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): Meta-analysis and consideration of collectivist culture, Big Five personality, and narcissism's facet structure. *Applied Psychology*, 64(1), 93-126.
- Johnson, J. V., & Lipscomb, (2006). Long working hours, occupational health and the changing nature of work organization. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 49(11), 921-929.
- Junaidi, A., Sasono, E., Wanuri, W., & Emiyati, D. (2020). The effect of overtime, job stress, and workload on turnover intention. *Management Science Letters*, 10(16), 3873-3878.
- Khattak, M. N., Khan, M. B., Fatima, T., & Shah, S. (2019). The underlying mechanism between perceived organizational injustice and deviant workplace behaviors: Moderating role of personality traits. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 24(3), 201-211.
- Lallukka, T., Sarlio-Lähteenkorva, S., Roos, E., Laaksonen, M., Rahkonen, O., & Lahelma, E. (2004). Working conditions

- and health behaviours among employed women and men: the Helsinki Health Study. *Preventive medicine*, 38(1), 48-56.
- LaMontagne, A. D., Keegel, T., & Vallance, D. (2007). Protecting and promoting mental health in the workplace: developing a systems approach to job stress. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 18(3), 221- 228.
- Lipińska-Grobelny, A. (2021). Organizational climate and counterproductive work behaviors—the moderating role of gender. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 34(4), 513-525.
- Makhdoom, I. F., Atta, M., & Malik, N. I. (2019). Counterproductive Work Behaviors as an Outcome of Job Burnout among High School Teachers. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 41(2), 79-92.
- McGowan, (2019). The Lust for Power and the Logic of Enjoyment. *Crisis & Critique*, 6(1), 205-224.
- Newman, N. (2017). Reengineering workplace bargaining: how big data drives lower wages and how reframing labor law can restore information equality in the workplace. *U. Cin. L. Rev.*, 85, 693
- Palaszczyk, A. (2020). Socializing at Work an Investigation of Small Talk Phenomenon in the Workplace. *Exploring Business Language and Culture*, 201-217.
- Parashakti, R. D., Fahlevi, M., Ekhsan, M., & Hadinata, A. (2020). The influence of work environment and competence on motivation and its impact on employee performance in health sector. In *3rd Asia Pacific International Conference of Management and Business Science (AICMBS 2019)* (Vol. 259, p. 267).
- Putnam, L. L., Myers, K. K., & Gailliard, B. M. (2014). Examining the tensions in workplace flexibility and exploring options for new directions. *Human Relations*, 67(4), 413-440.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2002). Counterproductive beh Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 117-125.
- Sao, R., Chandak, S., Patel, B., & Bhadade, P. (2020). Cyberloafing: Effects on employee job performance and behaviour. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(5), 1509-1515.
- Shaukat, M. Z., Scholz, M., Qazi, T. F., Niazi, A. A. K., Basit, A., & Mahmood, A. (2021). Analyzing the stressors for frontline soldiers fighting against COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 751882.
- Shockley, K. M., Ispas, D., Rossi, M. E., & Levine, E. L. (2012). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between state affect, discrete emotions, and job performance. *Human Performance*, 25(5), 377-411
- Silverman, K., Wong, C. J., Grabinski, M. J., Hampton, J., Sylvest, C. E., Dillon, E. M., & Wentland, (2005). A web-based therapeutic workplace for the treatment of drug addiction and chronic unemployment. *Behavior Modification*, 29(2), 417-463.
- Singh, P., & Twalo, (2015). Mismanaging unethical behaviour in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 31(2), 515-530.
- Sun, L., & Bunchapattanasakda, C. (2019). Employee engagement: A literature review. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(1), 63-80.
- Thuy, L. P. (2019). Ineffective communication between direct manager, employee and low promotion satisfaction at Melcosa VietNam Ltd.
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142.
- Warfield J. N. (1973). Binary matrices in system modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, (5), 441-449.
- Webster, J. R., Adams, G. A., Maranto, C. L., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). “Dirty” workplace politics and well-being: the role of gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 42(3), 361-377
- Wu, C. H., & Fang, K. (2007). *The impact of organizational learning on lack of team's expertise risk in information systems projects*. In *IEEE 95 International Conference on e-Business Engineering (ICEBE'07)* (pp. 738- 743).
- Wütschert, M. S., Romano-Pereira, D., Suter, L., Schulze, H., & Elfering, (2022). A systematic review of working conditions and occupational health in home office. *Work*, 72(3), 839-852.
- Zhao, H., Peng, Z., & Sheard, G. (2013). Workplace ostracism and hospitality employees’ counterproductive work behaviors: The joint moderating effects of proactive personality and political skill. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 219-227.
- Zheng, W., Wu, Y. C. J., Chen, X., & Lin, S. J. (2017). Why do employees have counterproductive work behavior? The role of founder’s Machiavellianism and the corporate culture in China. *Management Decision*, 55(3), 563-578.