

The Relationship Between Perceived Gender Discrimination and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

2017

Rachel Jaffe
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

Recommended Citation

Jaffe, Rachel, "The Relationship Between Perceived Gender Discrimination and Counterproductive Work Behaviors" (2017). *Honors in the Major Theses*. 198.

<http://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorsthesis/198>

This Campus Access is brought to you for free and open access by the UCF Theses and Dissertations at STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors in the Major Theses by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact lee.dotson@ucf.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED GENDER DISCRIMINATION
AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS

by

RACHEL JAFFE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology
in the College of Science
and in The Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term, 2017

Thesis Chair: Dr. Mindy Shoss

ABSTRACT

Counterproductive work behaviors are costly behaviors that individuals employ in retaliation to adverse stimuli in the workplace. This study specifically examined the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and counterproductive behaviors, using the variable of control as the mediator. This study also investigated the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and job turnover intentions as well as organizational commitment. Measures for perceived gender discrimination, control, counterproductive work behaviors, job turnover and organizational commitment were used to survey 97 participants on their workplace experiences and attitudes. It was found that perceived gender discrimination had a significant, positive correlation with counterproductive behaviors, as originally hypothesized. Perceived gender discrimination also had a significant negative correlation with organizational commitment. Control did not significantly correlate with counterproductive work behaviors, meaning it did not function as a mediator between counterproductive work behaviors and perceived gender discrimination, as hypothesized. The intent of this thesis was to examine perceived gender discrimination and control as antecedents of counterproductive behaviors. My findings suggest that perceived gender discrimination is correlated with these negative behaviors, thus promoting the importance of implementing programs to facilitate its reduction.

DEDICATION

For my supervising professor Dr. Mindy Shoss for her endless guidance, support and most importantly, for introducing me to my passion for research,

For the Work Stress in Context lab for all of their support, thank you for letting me be the ‘little sister’ of your lab,

And most of all, for my mother and best friend, Stephanie Jaffe, who is the most devoted and hardest working woman I know. I am me because of you, and for that I am eternally grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
HYPOTHESIS	7
METHOD	9
RESULTS	12
DISCUSSION	17
APPENDIX	21
REFERENCES	27

LIST OF FIGURES

Table 1.....	13
Table 2.....	14
Table 3.....	15

INTRODUCTION

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are defined as negative behaviors that an employee might exhibit in response to adverse stimuli in the office (Spector & Fox, 2002). These negative behaviors range in extremity from theft to tardiness to sabotage and can run against a company's mission. They can incite major financial damage due to the direct expenditure of funds that are allocated annually to correcting the consequences of such behaviors. CWBs directly cost US businesses over 50 billion dollars each year (Mount et al. 2006) and are thought to account for 20% of failed businesses (Coffin, 2003). Because of the massive losses CWBs can cause, significant research has been published regarding their antecedents and effects.

Counterproductive behaviors can be driven by a multitude of causes. One source of CWBs is a perceived loss of control, which encourages the individual to employ CWBs to regain their control (Shoss, Jundt, Kobler, Reynolds, 2015). This study investigates one potential threat to employees' sense of control in the workplace, perceived gender discrimination, and the potential impact of this threat to control on employees' CWBs. By retaliating with CWBs, the individual may feel that their control has been re-exerted psychologically in a situation that they may feel is otherwise out of their control. The issue of perceived gender discrimination within the workplace has been examined in workforce related research for decades. However, there has been limited research conducted regarding the direct impact of perceived gender discrimination on one's propensity to engage in CWBs. The purpose of this study is to fill the gap in literature regarding perceived gender discrimination and counterproductive work behaviors, as well as to investigate 1) how perceived control resulting from perceived gender discrimination is associated with

CWBs, 2) if perceived gender discrimination is related to an employee's intentions to quit, and 3) if perceived gender discrimination is related to the organizational commitment of an individual.

The pervasiveness of a difference in treatment between genders in the workplace is still a pressing issue, 29.3% of overall claims filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 2014, were gender related (EEOC, 2014). Because of the detrimental losses caused by CWBs, it would be advantageous to the economy, as well as to employee wellbeing, to study and analyze the implications of the effects of perceived gender discrimination on CWBs. If perceived gender discrimination is associated with increased CWBs, perhaps by shedding light on these added costs, organizations could be encouraged to address such issues with greater tenacity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

The goal of this study is to examine the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs. In a study completed by Shoss et al. (2015), it was found that a person's coping mechanism in the case of CWBs is a utility of the source and controllability of the stressor. An individual might perform CWBs in an attempt to regain control within his or her negative work environment. Individuals believe that by engaging in activities such as theft, abuse, absence, etc., they will ultimately feel more at ease and in control of the stressor. These findings add the element of control as a mediator between CWBs and perceived gender discrimination when employed as a coping tactic in response to negative stimuli.

Individuals can be driven to perform CWBs by a variety of stressors. One prominent antecedent of CWBs established in the prior literature is sexual harassment. Numerous studies have linked sexual harassment in the form of physical or verbal incidents to the performance of CWBs (Popovich & Warren, 2010). However, there is little research regarding the effects of perceived gender discrimination on an employee's propensity to engage in CWBs. Because perceived gender discrimination is less overt than sexual harassment, the individual may cope with the situation differently.

A study that investigated behavioral backlash to perceived discrimination in the workplace (Lindsey et al. 2015) focused on when and how women respond to perceived gender discrimination. It was theorized that in attempts to rebuild one's self-esteem and the feeling of authority, an individual might respond to perceived gender discrimination with behavioral confrontation (Swim & Thomas, 2006). Although the measure in the Lindsay et al. (2015) study

does not quite meet the criteria for counterproductive work behaviors, it suggests that in order to regain control after faced with perceived gender discrimination, one might retaliate in a variety of ways. That study also analyzes how one's "core social goals" or interpersonal or intrapersonal relationships, stigma, or status quo, might influence the coping mechanism when exposed to perceived discrimination. However, because CWBs are less overt than a direct confrontational reaction, engaging in these behaviors may not depend as much on social values

Perceived Gender Discrimination

The issue of perceived gender discrimination in the workplace has been a prominent and relevant topic in the last few years specifically (Sipe, Larson, McKay, & Moss, 2016). The matter of discrimination based on one's perception of gender is purely a constructed paradigm founded on the human mechanisms that recognize male and female characteristics in individuals. Perception is a key component in this study, specifically since discrimination can be difficult to define or distinguish. The issue of discrimination within various gender identities such as transgender individuals is an entirely different study that would be greatly advantageous to explore as well. However, my particular research focuses on the perceived gap in the treatment of the two primary gender constructs of male and female in the workplace, and the behavioral and attitudinal effects that perceptions of those treatments may generate.

According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the definition of gender discrimination is to treat an individual unfavorably on the grounds of his/her gender. In a workplace setting, this might effect promotions, lay-offs, salary, etc. The EEOC then differentiates gender discrimination from sexual harassment, which is defined as "unwelcome sexual advances" such as "quid pro-quo" situations where there is an exchange of sexual favors

for a desired outcome. Cases of sexual harassment are more overt than gender discrimination and can also include any outright verbal or physical action regarding the gender of the victim.

Another form of sexual harassment is defined as “environmental harassment” where an individual is directly impacted by hostility or intimidation, so much so that their workplace performance could be affected (McKinney & Maroules, 1991). It is important to distinguish between discrimination and harassment because they are two separate behaviors that could have different effects on CWBs. At present, there is limited research regarding perceived gender discrimination on record.

Although perceived gender discrimination is different from sexual harassment, research on sexual harassment and CWBs can provide helpful insights. In particular, an integral study into sexual harassment’s effects on an individual’s propensity to perform CWBs was completed by Gettinger (2008). Interestingly, Gettinger (2008) found that the pervasiveness of sexual harassment accounted for a much stronger predictor of CWBs than the severity of the harassment itself. There was a strong correlation between CWBs such as sabotage, cyber loafing, and work withdrawal with sexual harassment. Again, the frequency of the harassment mattered much more than the severity of the harassment when it came to how detrimental it was towards individuals CWBs. This data can help to explain and address certain tendencies that might arise within the proposed study regarding perceived gender discrimination. By understanding that frequency trumps severity, the measures of the proposed study can reflect that finding by placing emphasis on frequency of discriminatory acts. This is also in line with research on perceived gender discrimination, and is reflected in the measures I incorporate into my own study (Nye, Brummel, & Drasgow, 2009)

Although there is a clear difference between sexual harassment and perceived gender discrimination, several forms of perceived gender discrimination do exist. A study regarding the different effects of subtle and overt forms of discrimination in the workplace defined subtle perceived gender discrimination as “actions that are ambiguous in intent to harm, difficult to detect and low in intensity” (Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2013), where as overt discrimination is defined as “blatant antipathy” in regards to stereotypes, (Cortina, 2008). The ambiguous nature of perceived gender discrimination can cause individuals to feel powerless. They might wonder if actions such as pay cuts or demotions are due to actual company wide issues, their gender, or both. Despite the hypothesis that subtle discrimination is more damaging, the study found that subtle discrimination and overt discrimination did not test significantly different in regards to adverse effects. It is suggested that this trend in data might be due to the ambiguity of subtle discrimination, and the individual’s tendency to blame themselves for subtle discrimination in the first place. My study will encompass all forms of perceived gender discrimination, however the difficulties illuminated in the aforementioned study regarding the ambiguous nature of perceived gender discrimination are important to take note of when going forward with my own research. The ambiguity of perceived gender discrimination is difficult to measure, because it is never clearly defined, is challenging to prove, and is specific to each individual.

HYPOTHESIS

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between perceived gender discrimination on counterproductive work behaviors within the workplace. It will also investigate through correlational measures if perceived gender discrimination contributes to a perceived loss of control, which in turn is associated with CWBs. The Stressor-Emotion Model theorized by Spector and Fox (2005) states that CWBs occur in response to stressful situations or events that take place within the workplace. If perceived gender discrimination stimulates stress-related feelings within the individual, it is hypothesized that the individual will respond by exhibiting CWBs in an attempt to regain their perception of control. The following two statements are thus hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1: There exists a positive correlation between perceived gender discrimination and a perceived lack of control.

Hypothesis 2: There exists a positive correlation between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs.

To test each link of the chain I will also test that:

Hypothesis 3: There exists a positive correlation between perceived lack of control and CWBs.

There is also research that perceived gender discrimination leads to job turnover and a lack of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is defined as an individual's feeling of personal responsibility to the company, beyond what their job title requires of them. Mueller (2006) found that preferential job treatment based on one's gender led employees to experience low organizational commitment, as well as intentions to quit and higher turnover rates. This study confirmed that a negative mindset put in place by perceived gender discrimination can lead

to a lack of commitment, but the proposed study will explore if those attitudes are facilitated by perceived loss of control. Because perceived gender discrimination might contribute to a feeling that one's control is lost, it hypothesized that an increase in CWBs will occur and by committing those negative behaviors, a sense of control is restored. It is also hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4: There exists a positive correlation between the perceived loss of control and individuals' organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

METHOD

Participants

Ninety-seven participants were recruited via the snowball sampling method to answer the online survey generated by the Qualtrics survey system. After sending out email invitations to several different individuals to distribute, ninety-seven responses were recorded. The majority of the participants were female ($n=68$, 72.3%) and a majority self identified as Caucasian ($n=78$, 83%). The vast majority of the participants held either a college degree or higher, ($n=87$, 92.6%). The ages ranged from twenty-two to seventy-four, with an average age of 39.30 years. The participants worked an average of 41.56 hours weekly, and most participants had been working for their current company between two and five years ($n=41$, 43.6%).

Measures

Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist. Participants responded to the 10-item version of the CWB-C checklist (Spector 2006), which evaluates the frequency that an individual engages in counterproductive work behaviors. The questionnaire asks the participant to rate the frequency they perform behaviors like workplace incivility, withdrawal, sabotage and bullying. The items are listed on a 5-item scale (1=Never, 5=Everyday).

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Meyer and Allen's 6-item affective commitment scale was utilized in measuring the level of attachment an employee has to their organization (1997). The questionnaire asks participants to rate their responses on a 7-item scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree). This scale evaluates attitudes that the individual might have towards their company by asking questions that assess the participant's interest towards the

future of their particular organization. Questions were also used that gauge the employee's willingness to exceed on behalf of the company, or their individual pride within the organization.

Perceived Control. An integral part of this study is how a lack of perceived control could act as the possible antecedent as to why the CWBs are committed in response to perceived gender discrimination. To measure this, a three-item subscale by Ashford et al. (1989) was employed. Participants were asked to rate each statement to how greatly they agreed with it on a 5-item scale (1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree).

Perceived Gender Discrimination. To measure perceived gender discrimination that the individual may be exposed to, three different scales were employed. The first scale was a four-item questionnaire from Hang-Yue et al. (2006) and was measured on a 7-item scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree). These questions specifically addressed male and female counterparts and the participant's perception of the likelihood of male promotions or pay increases. This is the only scale to utilize the specific gender; men and women. One of the questions from the scale is "Men are promoted faster than women in the organization".

The next gender discrimination scale used was developed for military personnel, the Armed Forces Survey Workplace and Gender Relations (WGR, 2002). The 12-item questionnaire asked participants if various discriminatory situations they experience at work relate to their gender. Each response was rated on a 3-point scale, (1=No, or does not apply, 2=yes, but my gender was not a factor, 3=Yes, and my gender was a factor). Statements like "Held to a higher performance standard than others" or "rated lower than deserved" were asked to be rated.

The third measure of perceived gender discrimination I developed to assess specific situations of perceived gender discrimination. The 6-item questionnaire asked participants to rate

the frequency that they may have experienced a particular discriminatory event on a 5-item scale (1=Never, 5=Always). An example item is “Has an equally qualified individual of another gender ever receive a promotion over you?” By assessing more specific scenarios I intend to greater evaluate the more ambiguous situations. These specific questions were developed from anecdotal word of mouth experiences as well as personal experience.

Turnover Intentions. Lastly, to investigate a correlation between perceived discrimination and intentions to quit their job, participants were asked to rate how strongly they agreed with particular statements regarding their intended future within their current organization (Tepper et al., 2009). The three statements were rated on a 5-item scale (1=Strongly disagree, 2=Strongly agree).

Demographics. Each participants background characteristics were recorded via questions about race, gender, age and education history. They were also asked to record how many hours they worked weekly, if they held a management position and how their current position relates to their long-term career goals. By assessing this preliminary information, greater conclusions may be drawn when analyzing the data.

RESULTS

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

The main underlying hypothesis of the research was that perceived gender discrimination would positively correlate with counterproductive work behaviors. After conducting a bivariate correlation analysis, it was found that among the 93 responses to both the CWB scale (Spector 2006) and the WGR discrimination scale (2002) the two were significantly correlated at $r(93)=.37, p<.001$. Each of the three scales used to measure perceived gender discrimination correlated significantly with counterproductive behaviors. However, the specific situational items that I created correlated with counterproductive work behaviors, $r(93)=.34, p=.01$, with greater significance than the four item discrimination scale adopted from Hang-Yue, et al. (2006), $r(94)=.20, p<.05$. The main correlational relationships are listed in Table 1.

A multiple linear regression analysis was performed to evaluate the relationship between counterproductive behaviors, control and perceived gender discrimination when controlling for age, gender, weekly work hours and age. The overall model was significant, $F(6,83)=5.732, p<.00$, with an R^2 of .293. However, control was still not significantly correlated with the CWB scale, ($\beta=.001(94)=.008, p=ns$). The relationship between perceived gender discrimination was still significantly positively correlated with CWBs, ($\beta=.305(94)=3.081, p<.05$). The regression analysis is shown below in Table 2.

Table 1.

Correlational coefficient values between the three perceived gender discrimination scales and control, CWB, commitment and turnover scales

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	WGR	4-item	6-item	Control	CWB	Commitment	Turnover
WGR	1.26	.28							
4-Item	3.67	1.12	.368**						
6-Item	1.40	.62	.668*	.432**					
Control	4.48	1.64	-.248*	-.146	-.124				
CWB	1.62	.45	.377**	.202	.341**	.019			
Commitment	4.78	1.54	-.398**	-.202	-.134	.622**	-.027		
Turnover	2.68	1.97	.203	.070	.020	-.314**	-.035	-.627**	

Note. 'WGR' refers to the Armed Forces Survey Workplace and Gender Relations (WGR, 2002) measure of perceived gender discrimination. '4-item' refers to the Hang-Yue et al. (2006) measure of perceived gender discrimination. '6-item' refers to the situational measure of perceived gender discrimination created for this survey.

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 2.*Regression Analysis for Predicting Variables of Counterproductive Work Behaviors*

CWBs	B	SE	β
Constant	1.717**	.421	
Control	.000	.029	.001
WGR	.465*	.151	.305
Age	-.013*	.004	-.397
Hrs per week	-.004	.004	-.088
Yrs at Job	.175*	.054	.416
Gender	-.264*	.099	-.269

**Significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Control

To explain why perceived gender discrimination would result in an increased performance of CWBs, control was hypothesized to be a mediating variable. In my study, the control scale and WGR gender discrimination scale negatively correlated significantly at $r=-.248, p<.05$, but there was a non-significant correlation of $-.15 (p=ns)$ with the four item gender discrimination scale (Hang-Yue et al. 2006) as well as my own situational scale with a correlation of $-.124 (p=ns)$. Interestingly, there was no correlation between control and counterproductive behaviors.

A multiple linear regression analysis was then conducted to examine the relationship between control and perceived gender discrimination when controlling for age, gender and weekly work hours. The overall model was significant, $F(5,84)=5.935, p<.00$, with an R^2 of .261. Gender explained a significant amount of variance in regards to the feeling of control in the

workplace ($\beta = -.219(94) = -2.203, p < .05$). This suggests that men feel more in control in their work environment than women. Perceived gender discrimination was still significantly negatively correlated with control ($\beta = -.269(94) = -2.793, p < .05$).

Table 3.
Regression Analysis for Predicting Variables of Control

Control	B	SE	β
Constant	7.222**	1.406	
WGR	-1.542**	.552	-.269
Age	-.012*	.015	-.099
Hours Per Week	-.020	.017	-.112
Years Current Job	.753**	.191	.476
Gender	-.810*	.368	-.219

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Organizational Commitment and Turnover

Another bivariate correlation analysis was performed to analyze the relationships between organizational commitment and the various measures. There was a significant negative correlation between the organizational commitment scale (Meyer & Allen, 1997) and the WGR perceived gender discrimination scale, $r(93) = -.39, p < .001$. There was also a strong positive correlation between the organizational commitment scale and measure of control, $r(94) = .622, p < .001$. The commitment scale also negatively correlated with turnover intentions, $r(93) = -.627,$

$p < .001$. However, the commitment scale had no significant correlation with counterproductive work behaviors, $r = -.027$ ($p = ns$).

The turnover intention measure (Tepper et al., 2009) only correlated negatively with the control scale $r(93) = -.314$, $p < .01$ and commitment scale $r(93) = -.627$, $p < .001$. Turnover intentions did not correlate with any of the discrimination scales or the CWB scale.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the research was to study the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and counterproductive work behaviors, job turnover, and organizational commitment, with control as a potential mediator. Similar to Lindsay et al. (2015), which found that gender discrimination incited behavioral backlash, my study found a significant correlation between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs. Interestingly enough, control only correlated with the WGR perceived gender discrimination scale. According to my study, control did not play a significant part in mediating the response from perceived gender discrimination to retaliating with counterproductive work behaviors.

Although the Shoss et al. (2015) study provided insight towards control as a mediator in the situation of CWBs, I employed a different measure (Ashford et al. 1989), which may not have been as effective in my specific study dealing with perceived gender discrimination. I hypothesize that because perceived discrimination is so ambiguous, it may be difficult to specifically illuminate its occurrence, let alone the feelings it may evoke like loss of control. Also, if perceived gender discrimination happens frequently and throughout one's life, perhaps it is difficult to dissociate it with what normal treatment in the workplace might consist of. Therefore, the individual may feel in control, despite being exposed to perceived gender discrimination. Or simply, the implementation of a more clear and concise measure of control would influence the correlation in a significant manner. The measure of control used in this study did not significantly correlate with most of the variables, meaning perhaps it was not the best fit for the purpose of studying perceived gender discrimination.

When the linear regression analysis was conducted, a correlation between perceived gender discrimination and control was significant, when controlling for age, work hours and gender. When the regression analysis was conducted, it also found that the male participants felt a significantly greater amount of control in their work environments than women did.

Job turnover and organizational commitment were both correlated with perceived gender discrimination. The implication is that when an individual is exposed to perceived gender discrimination within their work environment they may not feel connected enough to experience organizational commitment. With the disconnection between an individual and their company, the turnover rate is expected to increase, as they feel less of a commitment. I had hypothesized that a lack of control influenced by perceived gender discrimination would be the underlying cause behind low organizational commitment and turnover, and each variable was significantly correlated. My research suggests that control could be a significant mediator between organizational commitment and turnover within the relationship between an individual and their organization.

As a whole, the most effective discrimination scale was the 12-item WGR scale (2002), it seemed to correlate the strongest with each of the other four scales. My own perceived gender discrimination scale that I developed based on specific experiences held up comparatively to the other two well-established scales, especially when correlated with CWBs. The scale that I had originated delineated specific incidents of perceived gender discrimination that may be too ambiguous to recognize without being specifically identified in the measure.

Implications

Counterproductive behaviors can be extremely costly and knowing its antecedents can help organizations reduce such behaviors and in turn financial expenditures. Due to the significant correlation between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs, it would behoove workplace environments to analyze situations of reported and non-reported gender discrimination in attempts to limit costs and promote employee wellbeing. In turn, by implementing programs to reduce perceived gender discrimination, job turnover rates may lower and organizational commitment of employees might increase. The research implies that there would be positive outcomes both financially and emotionally when perceived gender discrimination is diminished.

Limitations and Future Research

The main limitations to my particular research would be the sample size and makeup. With only 97 participants, it is difficult to create a comprehensive sample of the workplace. Several pieces of the data were deemed only marginally significant but may have rendered greater meaning if more participants responded to the survey. Another notable limitation is that the sample consisted primarily of attorneys. Because the survey was administered via the snowball sampling method, it seemed to get confined floating from law firm to law firm. Most of the participants held very high levels of education, which made the sample skew towards educated professionals in the workplace. A more representative sample of perceived gender discrimination in the workforce would include more variance in occupations and education status. It would be interesting to analyze perceived gender discrimination and CWBs in female dominated fields like nursing in comparison to more male dominated fields. A closer look in regards to how an individual perceives gender discrimination in professional fields regarding non-professional careers might affect CWBs differently as well. Because my research suggests such a strong

correlation between perceived gender discrimination and CWBs, it would be worth exploring the different effects of various levels of education or careers have on CWBs when perceived gender discrimination is a factor.

APPENDIX: ITEMS IN EACH MEASURE

I. DEMOGRAPHIC MEASURES

1. What is your age? Please answer in years (e.g., 50).
2. Please indicate if you are:
 - * Male (1)
 - * Female (2)
3. What is your highest level of education?
 - * Some high school (1)
 - * High school (2)
 - * Some college (3)
 - * College (4)
 - * Master's degree (5)
 - * Doctorate or professional degree (6)
4. Please indicate your cultural or ethnic group:
 - * White (1)
 - * Black or African American (2)
 - * Hispanic or Latino (3)
 - * Asian/Pacific Islander (4)
 - * Native American or American Indian (5)
 - * Other (6)
5. How many hours per week do you work? Please respond in number of hours (for example, 40).
6. How long have you worked (in years):

For your current employer (1)

Under your current supervisor (2)

7. Is your job a supervisory or management position or does your job require you to formally supervise other employees?

* Yes (1)

* No (2)

8. Which best describes the nature of your employment contract?

* Temporary (1)

* Permanent (2)

* Other. If so, please explain: (3) _____

9. To what extent does your current job relate to your long-term career plans?

* Not at all (1)

* A little (2)

* Somewhat (3)

* Quite a bit (4)

* Very much (5)

II. COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS

10-Item Short Version of the Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C)

How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?	Never	Once or twice	Once or twice/month	Once or twice/week	Every day
1 . Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies	1	2	3	4	5
2. Complained about insignificant things at work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for	1	2	3	4	5
4. Came to work late without permission	1	2	3	4	5
5. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t	1	2	3	4	5
6. Insulted someone about their job performance	1	2	3	4	5
7. Made fun of someone’s personal life	1	2	3	4	5
8. Ignored someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
9. Started an argument with someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
10. Insulted or made fun of someone at work	1	2	3	4	5

Short form was first used in Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781-790. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019477>

CWB-C is copyright 2001 Paul E. Spector and Suzy Fox, All rights reserved.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE:

Listed below is the 6-question survey originally developed by Allen and Meyer (1997)

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with [Organization]
2. I really feel as if [Organization] 's problems are my own
3. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at [Organization]
4. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to [Organization]
5. [Organization] has a great deal of personal meaning for me
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to [Organization]

IV. PERCEIVED CONTROL

Ashford, Lee and Bobko (1989)

Participants will be asked to what extent they agree with these statements on a 5 level scale: (Strongly disagree, 1; disagree, 2; neither agree nor disagree, 3; agree, 4; strongly agree, 5).

- 1) I have enough power in this organization to control events that might affect my job.
- 2) In this organization, I can prevent negative things from affecting my work situation.
- 3) I understand this organization well enough to be able to control things that affect me

V. PERCEIVED GENDER DISCRIMINATION

1) The following four items are adopted from Hang-Yue. et al (2006) scale regarding workplace discrimination, also to be measured on a 5-item scale:

- 1) Men are promoted faster than women in the organization
- 2) My organization prefers to hire men
- 3) Men are more likely than women to receive a generous pay raise
- 4) Men are more likely than women to receive favorable performance evaluations'.

2) Gender Discrimination Scale (2002 WGR)

Adopted by Nye, Brummel, and Drasgow (2009)

The response options are 1 (no, or does not apply), 2 (yes, but your gender was NOT a factor), and 3 (yes, and your gender was a factor)

#54a-Rated lower than deserved

#54b-Last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments .

#54c-Held to a higher performance standard than others

#54d-Did not receive the same award as others in similar circumstances

Gender discrimination Assignment discrimination:

#54e-Your current assignment does not use job skills .

#54f-Your current assignment is not good for your career .

#54g-Did not receive tasks that would have prepared you for advancement

Gender discrimination Career discrimination

#54h-Did not have someone who advised you on career development .

#54i-Did not learn of opportunities that would have helped your career .

#54j-Unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities

#54k-Excluded from events important for career development and being informed

#54l-Didn't get a job you wanted for which you were qualified .

3) The situational questions that I developed to more accurately assess perceived gender discrimination:

Each will be measured on a 5-item scale measuring frequency:

(1; Never, 2; several times, 3; more than a few times 4; often, 5; every time)

- 1) Has an equally qualified individual of another sex ever received a promotion over you?
- 2) Have you ever been belittled on the basis of your sex?
- 3) Has your company ever punished you for a behavior condonable if done by a colleague of another sex?
- 4) Has a colleague of another sex ever received praise for doing something that you have also done, but was overlooked?
- 5) Have you ever been told that your success at work is due mainly to how attractive you are?
- 6) Do you feel like you have to work harder than a colleague of another sex to be recognized for the same accomplishment?

VI. INTENTIONS TO QUIT

Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009).

To measure intentions to quit, participants will be asked how strongly they agree with three different statements. The items read:

- 1) I plan on leaving this organization very soon
- 2) I expect to change jobs in the next few month
- 3) I will look to change jobs very soon

(1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree").

REFERENCES

- Antecol, H., Barcus, V. E., & Cobb-Clark, D. (2009). Gender-biased behavior at work: Exploring the relationship between sexual harassment and sex discrimination. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 30*, 782-792. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2009.06.009
- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., Bobko, P., Filipkowski, M., & Johnson, C. M. (2008). Job insecurity scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 28*(4), 218-237.
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982) A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations, 35*, 135-153.
- Cortina L. M. (2008) Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 33*(1), 55-75.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1980). Guidelines on discrimination on the basis of sex. Federal Register, 25: 29 CFR, part 1604.
- Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tramontano, C., Fontaine, R., Barbaranelli, C., & Farnese, M. (2015). An integrative approach to understanding counterproductive work behavior: The roles of stressors, negative emotions, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 130*, 131-144. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2209-5
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2006). The many roles of control in a stressor-emotion theory of counterproductive work behavior. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.) *Research in*

- occupational health and wellbeing: Employee health, coping and methodologies* (Vol. 5, pp. 171-201). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Gettinger, S. K. (2009). Sexual harassment: Implications for counterproductive work behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International: The Sciences and Engineering*, 69, 5818.
- Gutek, B. A., Cohen, A. G., & Tsui, A. (1996). Reactions to perceived sex discrimination. *Human Relations*, (6), 791.
- Hang-yue, N., Foley, S., & Loi, R. (2006). The effects of cultural types on perceptions of justice and gender inequity in the workplace. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(6), 983-998.
- Jeffrey K., Rodger W., & Peter W., (1998) A comparison of structural models representing turnover cognitions. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 53(2), 254.
- Jones, K.P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E.B., & Gray, A.L. (2016). Not so subtle: a meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, (6), 1588.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McKinney, K., & Maroules, N. (1991). Sexual harassment. *Sexual Coercion: A sourcebook on its nature, causes and prevention* (pp. 29-44). Lexington, MA, England: Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.

- Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 591-622. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00048.x
- Mueller, S.B. (2006) Affirmative action programs: Examining the influence of sex-based preferential treatment on nonbeneficiary job attitudes. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*, 1740.
- Ng, T. W. H., Lam, S. S. K., & Feldman, D. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: Do males and females differ? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 93*, 11-32. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.005
- Penney, L. M., Spector, P. E., Fox, S, Brursema, K., et al. (2006). Counterproductive work behavior checklist. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 446-460.
- Popovich, P. M., & Warren, M. A. (2010). The role of power in sexual harassment as a counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*, 45-53. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.05.003
- Porter, L. W., Smith, F. J., & Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational commitment questionnaire. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 12*, 269-292.
- Rader, Sipe, S., Larson, L., McKay, B.A., & Moss, J. (2016). Taking off the blinders: A comparative study of university students' changing perceptions of gender discrimination in

the workplace from 2006-2013. *Academy of management Learning & Education*, 15(2), 232-249.

Roth, P. L. 1., Purvis, K. L. 2., & Bobko, P. (2012). A meta-analysis of gender group differences for measures of job performance in field studies. *Journal of Management*, 38(2), 719-739.
doi:10.1177/0149206310374774

Sanchez, J. I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 704-719.

Shoss, M., Jundt, D., Kobler, A., & Reynolds, C., (2016). Doing bad to feel better? An investigation of within- and between-person perceptions of counterproductive work behavior as a coping tactic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(3), 571-587.
doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2573-9

Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2006). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 105–126). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 156-167.

Tantleff-Dunn, S., Barnes, R. D., Dunn, M. E., Loo, J. M. V., & Holman, W. I. B. (2016).

Commentary on physical appearance: Relationship between body image and perceptions of sexual harassment. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *18*(2), 269-282.

United States Department of Defense. (2002). *Sexual Harassment Survey* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://archive.defense.gov/news/Feb2004/d20040227shs1.pdf>