

# The Impact of Occupational Stress on Job Satisfaction and Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Horia D. Pitariu<sup>1</sup>

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Science,  
Babeş-Bolyai University

Andrea Budean

Danis Consulting, Romania

## Abstract

*The present economical challenges increase the level of demand and pressure on people in their workplaces, eventually affecting the efficiency of organizations. Given the relationship between job strain and individual and organizational outcomes (Robertson, 2009), the present context places an even higher importance on understanding and dealing correctly with these issues. The research at hand examines the predictive value of different occupational sources of pressure on job satisfaction and counterproductive work behaviour, using an occupational sample in the financial services field. The participants were asked to complete two questionnaires: OSI-90 (Cooper, Sloan & Williams, 1996) and Workplace Deviance Scale (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). The results indicate that stressors related to the organizational climate, the work relationships, organizational hassles and workload predict counterproductive work behaviour. Furthermore, job satisfaction was positively related to the high quality of the work relationship and low levels of tension in the organizational climate and hassles, while the level of satisfaction with the organization was associated with the work-family balance and the organizational climate. Implications for developing programs that help employees effectively cope with these sources of stress as well as recommendations for developing healthier organizations are discussed.*

**Keywords:** occupational stress, counterproductive work behaviour, job satisfaction

## Résumé

*Turbulences que connaît l'économie d'aujourd'hui ont accru les exigences et les pressions qui s'exercent sur les individus au travail, en influant finalement sur l'efficacité des organisations. Étant donnée la relation entre le stress au travail et la performance individuelle et organisationnelle (Robertson, 2009), le contexte actuel attire davantage l'attention sur l'importance d'une compréhension et sur l'approche correcte des problèmes de stress au travail. La présente étude examine la valeur prédictive des différentes sources de pression au travail sur la satisfaction au travail et à l'organisation, et le comportement contre-productif sur un groupe d'employés dans le secteur bancaire. Les participants ont rempli deux questionnaires: OSI-90 (Cooper, Sloan & Williams, 1996) et l'échelle de la Deviance en milieu de travail (Bennett et Robinson, 2000). Les résultats confirment que le stress causé par le climat organisationnel tendue, les relations pauvres, les harcèlements quotidiens et le chargement du travail étaient des prédicteurs des comportements de travail contre-productifs. Satisfaction au travail était positivement associée à la qualité de la relation et de faibles niveaux de tension au sein de l'organisation, tandis que la satisfaction de l'organisation a été associée à l'équilibre travail - vie personnelle et le climat organisationnel. L'étude conclut en soulignant l'importance de développer des programmes pour enseigner aux employés comment traiter efficacement ces sources de stress et de souligner l'importance de développer des organisations saines.*

**Mots-clés:** stress professionnel, comportements de travail contre-productifs, satisfaction au travail.

---

<sup>1</sup> Adresa de corespondență: horia\_pitariu@yahoo.com

## Rezumat

*Turbulențele cu care se confruntă economia în prezent au dus la creșterea solicitărilor și a presiunilor care acționează asupra indivizilor la locul de muncă, influențând în cele din urmă eficiența organizațiilor. Dată fiind relația dintre stresul ocupațional și performanțele individuale și organizaționale (Robertson, 2009), contextual actual atrage și mai mult atenția asupra importanței înțelegerii și abordării corecte a problematicii stresului ocupațional. Studiul de față investighează valoarea predictivă a diferitelor surse de presiune de la locul de muncă asupra satisfacției cu munca și cu organizația și asupra comportamentului contraproductiv, pe un lot de angajați din mediul bancar. Participanții au completat două chestionare: OSI-90 (Cooper, Sloan & Williams, 1996) și Workplace Deviance Scale (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Rezultatele susțin că stresul determinat de climatul organizațional tensionat, relațiile deficitare, tracasările zilnice și încărcarea muncii prezic implicarea în comportamente contraproductive. Satisfacția cu munca a fost asociată pozitiv cu relațiile de calitate și cu nivele reduse ale tensiunilor în cadrul organizației, în timp ce satisfacția cu organizația a fost asociată cu echilibrul dintre viața profesională și cea personală și climatul organizațional. Studiul concluzionează prin sublinierea importanței dezvoltării de programe care să învețe angajații cum să facă față în mod eficient acestor surse de stress, cât și prin sublinierea importanței dezvoltării de organizații sănătoase.*

**Cuvinte cheie:** stres ocupațional, comportament contraproductiv în muncă, satisfacția cu muncă

## Introduction

The workplace has changed in numerous ways in the past decades and many of these changes have important implications for work stress and the design of interventions to reduce employee stress. The work world today is different in many respects than it was in the 1960s and 1970s when a great deal of groundbreaking work stress research took place (Jex & Yankelevich, 2008), all the existent differences highlighting the importance of continuing investigations in this field and developing what is already known.

In addition to the changes determined by the increased permeability of role boundaries, the growth of the service sector and globalization the present economical challenges increase the level of demand and pressure on people in their workplaces, eventually affecting the efficiency of organizations. Given the relationship between job strain and individual and organizational outcomes (Robertson, 2009), the present economical and social context places an even higher importance on understanding and dealing correctly with these issues. Surprisingly, in spite of all the arguments supporting the importance of understanding occupational stress, the research on the consequences of occupational stress at a personal and organizational level have been scarce in Eastern European countries, with the exception of some cross-cultural studies (Spector et al., 2005, 2007). The studies on

occupational stress in Romania are also reduced in number, although stress takes many forms, some of them quite atypical (Pitariu, 1998). For example, a study conducted in a research institute during a restructuring process revealed a significant increase in anxiety levels, a high turnover rate and an increase in the consumption of alcohol within female researchers (Pitariu, 1998).

The current study aims examining the predictive value of different occupational sources of pressure on personal health, job satisfaction and counterproductive work behaviour, using a Romanian cohort, working in the financial services.

The article will briefly discuss the major concepts involved in the study (occupational stress, job satisfaction and counterproductive behavior); the relationships between these variables are analyzed and the international and managerial implications are discussed in the end.

### *Occupational stress in the economic crisis context*

In the broadest sense (Behr, 1995; Jex & Yankelevich, 2008), work stress represents the study of the impact of jobs and organizational conditions on the health and well-being of employees. Today, it is acknowledged that occupational stress is a result of a transaction between the individual and the environment and both stressors and strain are part of and must be understood in the context of the process (Cooper, Dewe &

Driscoll, 2001). Consequently, the majority of work stress researchers investigate the relationship between stressful jobs and organizational conditions (termed 'stressors') and employees' reactions to these conditions (termed 'strains').

Individuals experience stress in almost all the areas of their lives: work, family, society, and dealing with the diverse demands and multiple tasks can be very stressful (Aneshensel, 1986; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; apud. Iwasaki, MacKaz, & Ristock, 2004). Work constitutes one of the fundamental aspects of a person's life, providing both financial support and a means of significantly contributing to the wealth of the society. The occupational role of a person represents an essential component of one's identity, thus providing value and an emotional state of well-being (D'Amato & Zijlstra, 2003). Profession as a source of identity, purpose, belongingness and income can easily become a source of stress (Băban, 1998). Occupational stress is one of the multiple problems of the modern society, with direct consequences on the professional activity of those affected and on their health (Pitariu, 2004).

Occupational stress and its dynamic cannot be understood without taking in account the context organizations and their employees face. In present Romania is numbered through the countries affected by the global economical crisis. A report realized by Oxford Analytica (2009) regarding the global recession mentioned the fact that our country registered significant decreases due to the economical crisis. The negative effects are preponderant in the market of goods, the banking industry, transportation and trading, spreading rapidly in the other fields of economy. Employees experience work overload due to the restructuring and personnel reducing strategies, as well as concern regarding their job security. Stressed employees lead to a diminishment of work productivity and quality.

Turbulence in today's economy is causing organizations and employees alike to contend with workplace stress. The most common workplace stressors investigated have been role stressors, workload, interpersonal conflict and lack of personal control (Jex & Yankelevich, 2008), while less studies focused on organizational constraints, yet this has also been found to be an important stressor (Spector et al., 1988; Spector & Jex, 1998). All these stressors are associated with

maladaptive psychological, physical and behavioral responses in employees. Negative consequences of stress have important organizational implications as the combination of uncertainty and change often creates tension within employees (stress) that ultimately affects their perceptions, judgements and interpersonal relationships in the workplace (Marks & Mirvis, 1997). One of the most common and important attitudinal consequence of work stress is the decrease of job satisfaction, while at the behavioural level is the occurrence of counterproductive work behaviour.

#### *Job satisfaction and stress*

Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which a worker feels positively or negatively about his or her job (Locke, 1976). There is broad support in the research literature for the relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction (Leong et al, 1996), high levels of work stress being associated with low levels of job satisfaction.

#### *Counterproductive work behaviour and stress*

Counterproductive work behaviours (CWB) are intentional acts of employees that harm or intend to harm the organization and its stakeholders (Spector & Fox, 2005). CWB is a term that overlaps with a number of related but distinct constructs. It is frequently associated with workplace aggression, retaliation, revenge, violation of organizational norms and so on. The growing body of evidence suggests that dysfunctional behaviour is both prevalent and costly.

Robinson and Bennett (1995) distinguish between interpersonally (CWB-I) directed and organizationally (CWB-O) directed workplace deviance. This distinction was also observed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) and Gruys and Sackett (2003), while additional dimensions have not been widely replicated.

Several studies (Storms & Spector, 1987; Chen & Spector, 1992; Miles, Borman, Spector & Fox, 2002; Penney & Spector, 2002, Dalal, 2005; Lau, Au & Ho, 2003; Burke-Lee & Spector, 2006) have focused on identifying the antecedents of CWB in organizations. In terms of individual predictors, much of the focus has been on personality traits like locus of control (Fox & Spector, 1999) or responsibility and risk-taking (Ashton, 1998) and on attitudes. Studies conducted by Judge et al. (2006) and Duffy et al. (1998) reveal that a lack of job

satisfaction correlates with counterproductive behaviour. Bolin & Heatherly (2001) found that four attitude variables: theft approval, company contempt, intention to quit and dissatisfaction predicted various forms of workplace deviance. Despite the significant role of individual differences in predicting workplace deviance and counterproductive work behaviour, many researchers have focused on the role of contextual factors in explaining these behaviours, because situational factors such as job stressors (Fox et al., 2001) may serve as provocations for workplace deviance and counterproductive work behaviour (Robinson, 2008).

The purpose of this research is to identify the principal components of occupational stress that could lead to counterproductive behaviours and dissatisfaction with the job itself or the organization. These aspects are particularized for the current economical crisis and its implications for organizations, in which the contextual factors act with a higher intensity.

*Hypothesis 1a/b:* A high level of occupational stress will predict the occurrence of interpersonally/organizationally directed counterproductive behaviours.

*Hypothesis 2a/b:* A high level of occupational stress will determine a low level of satisfaction with the job itself/with the organization.

## **Method**

### **Sample**

The sample consisted of 281 employees from three organizations in Romania, activating in the financial services area. The average age in the sample was 31,02 (s.d. = 11,80) years old; 39 (13,88%) were males and 242 (86,12%) were females.

### **Instruments**

The instruments used in the research were self-report scales that measured the stressors encountered at work and their effects (Occupational Stress Indicator – 2, Cooper, Sloan & Williams, 1996) and counterproductive behaviour (Interpersonal and Organizational Deviance Scale, Bennett & Robinson, 2000). The OSI-2 scales structure is the following: Sources of Pressure (8 scales), Type A Behaviour (2 scales), Locus of Control (1 scale), Coping (2 scales), Job Satisfaction (2 scales), Mental Health (3 scales), Physical

Health (2 scales). The workplace deviance instrument consists of two scales: Interpersonal Deviance and Organizational Deviance. All the scales were translated from English into Romanian and pre-tested in a pilot study to ensure the clarity of the items and instructions.

### **Procedure**

The questionnaires were administered to small groups of participants, who were previously informed that the results would be subsequently used for research purposes. The confidentiality of the individual data was assured.

## **Results and discussions**

Table 1 presents the descriptive data and the correlations between the variables in the study. The results suggest moderate levels of perceived job pressure; the highest values corresponding to stress caused by poor relationships with the work colleagues and supervisors (m= 34.7, s.d.=6.56); lack of recognition (m=16.00, s.d.=3.51) and high responsibility (m=15.7, s.d.=3.71). Moderate values were obtained for both: satisfaction with the job itself (m=25.9, s.d.=4.44) and with the organization (m=23.18, s.d.=4.46). Regarding counterproductive behaviour, the results suggest a greater engagement in the organizationally oriented deviance (m=21.83, s.d.=8.01) compared to the interpersonally oriented (m=15.43, s.d.=16.48). The literature suggests that demographic characteristics might influence the extent to which strain, job satisfaction or counterproductive behaviour are experienced and reported. For our sample, gender did not exert a significant influence on the level of perceived stress, job satisfaction or the frequency of counterproductive behaviours, while age and tenure showed some significant relationships. The results of an ANOVA run on these data revealed that compared to the 18-22 years group, the older (40-60 years old) employees experience higher levels of stress associated with: work-family balance (F (5,275)= 6.66, p<.000); responsibility (F (5,275)= 4.16, p<.001); recognition (F(5,275)= 1.60, p<.015) and organizational climate (F (5,275)= 3.30, p<.006). Consistent with these results, we observed that employees with a tenure longer than 7 years experience a higher level of stress due to the work-family interference, compared with those with a lower tenure (F (4,276)= 4.22, p<.002).

**Table 1.** Intercorrelations, descriptive statistics and reliability of the variables in the study.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1) Workload	(.68)											
2) Relationships	.44**	(.77)										
3) Work-family balance	.47**	.47**	(.63)									
4) Managerial role	.37**	.32**	.26**	(.32)								
5) Personal responsibility	.45**	.32**	.51**	.42**	(.63)							
6) Hassles	.59**	.42**	.49**	.41**	.49**	(.51)						
7) Recognition		.56**	.38**	.17**	.19**	.18**	(.54)					
8) Organizational climate	.43**	.49**	.58**	.37**	.49**	.48**	.35**	(.49)				
9) The job itself	-.01	.01	-.02	-.10	-.08	-.20**	-.07	-.16**	(.85)			
10) The organization	-.09	-.14*	-.06	-.09	-.11*	-.17**	-.10	-.24**	.64**	(.82)		
11) CWB - I	.00	.00	.16**	.04	.07	.11*	.10	.18**	-.24**	-.22**	(.80)	
12) CWB - O	-.01	-.02	.10	.07	.12*	.14*	.05	.09	-.25**	-.16**	.53**	(.78)
13) Gender	-.12*	-.02	.06	-.03	-.02	-.04	-.02	-.05	.03	-.02	.01	.03
14) Age	.08	.09	-.25**	.16**	-.07	-.03	-.10	-.14*	.18**	.07	-.44**	-.34**
15) Tenure	-.22**	.07	.10	-.10	.03	.07	.12*	.03	-.11*	-.15**	.08	.10
Mean	22.1	34.70	21.68	14.16	15.70	13.50	16.00	13.77	25.90	23.18	15.43	21.83
Standard Deviation	5.61	6.56	5.70	3.29	3.71	3.41	3.56	3.51	4.44	4.46	6.48	8.01

\*\* p < 0.01, \* p < 0.05, N=281, Cronbach's Alpha is on the diagonal, in brackets

Spector (2007) asserts that age and job satisfaction are related, although the exact nature of the relationship is not clear, as some studies have found curvilinear, where others have found a linear relation. As it concerns counterproductive behaviour, Lau, Au & Ho's (2003) review of recent research indicated that age, gender and tenure may be associated with at least some of its forms of manifestation (lateness, theft, absenteeism). Our results suggest a strong relationship between age and counterproductive behaviour, suggesting that both forms: interpersonally and organizationally oriented decrease with age and an association between job satisfaction and tenure, suggesting that job satisfaction decreases with tenure. The younger employees (18-22 yrs) with a reduced tenure in organization experience a higher level of job satisfaction ( $F(5,275) = 3.28, p < .007$ ) compared to the 31-50 yrs old groups and a tenure longer than 7 years.

The results also confirm that some of the organizational stressors measured were strongly associated with the interpersonal and organizational counterproductive behaviour and both types of counterproductive behaviour

were negatively associated with the satisfaction with the job itself and with the organization.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, several sources of workplace pressure correlate with counterproductive behaviour. Out of the stressors investigated, three are significantly associated with CWB-I and only two of them with CWB-O. Stress generated by work-family balance, daily hassles and organizational climate correlate positively and significant with CWB-I, while personal responsibility and daily hassles correlate positively with CWB-O. It was rather unexpected that stress provoked by organizational factors (e.g. organizational climate) was associated with CWB-I and not with CWB-O. It might be that the employees feel that they can gain more control on the stressful situation by harming an individual target, than by harming the organization.

When it comes to satisfaction, the stress experienced at work tends to be associated to a greater extent to a decrease in the satisfaction with the organization than satisfaction with the job itself. Thus, relationships, personal responsibility, daily hassles and organizational climate are

negatively related to satisfaction with the organization. Daily hassles and organizational climate are also negatively associated with satisfaction with the job itself. Workload and recognition reached no significance in this study.

Research supports the link between job satisfaction and CWB (Chen & Spector, 1992; Duffy, Ganster & Shaw, 1998; Fox & Spector, 1999) and that correlations tend to be larger for CWB-O than CWB – I. Fox & Spector (1999) found correlations of -.45 and -.14 (non-significant) between overall job satisfaction and CWB-O and CWB-I. Dalal (2005) meta-analyzed 25 studies and concluded that the population correlation between job satisfaction and CWB total is -.37. Satisfaction with the job itself and with the organization may reflect attitudes towards job characteristics and tasks as well as towards organizational management and structure. Therefore the two job satisfaction facets relate to both, CWB-I and CWB-O, but as in the case of job stressors, the

relationship between satisfaction and CWB-I seems to be stronger than the relationship between satisfaction and CWB-O.

In order to further test the proposed hypotheses we regressed job satisfaction and counterproductive behaviour on the organizational stressors measured, the demographical variables being controlled. The results of the regression (Table 2) indicate that demographic variables being controlled, the sources of pressure do not predict the occurrence of CWB-I, but the pressure caused by the managerial role ( $\beta = .11$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and the daily hassles ( $\beta = .15$ ;  $p < .05$ ) predict CWB-O. Hypothesis 1 was only partially supported; the sources of pressure investigated were not related to CWB-I, after controlling the demographical variables. Managerial role and Daily hassles were positively related to CWB-O, the other sources of pressure not being associated to any form of CWB.

**Table 2.** CWB regressed on occupational stressors

	CWB – I			CWB – O		
	R <sup>2</sup>	Δ R <sup>2</sup>	β	R <sup>2</sup>	Δ R <sup>2</sup>	β
<b>Step 1</b>	.209**	.200**		.129**	.120**	
Age			-.46**			-.35**
<b>Step 2</b>	.234*	.200*		.166**	.132**	
Managerial role						.11*
Daily hassles						.15*

To further address Hypothesis 2, Satisfaction with the job itself and Satisfaction with the organization were regressed on

occupational stressors (Table 3), demographic variables being controlled.

**Table 3.** Job satisfaction regressed on occupational stressors

	Job Satisfaction			Organizational Satisfaction		
	R <sup>2</sup>	Δ R <sup>2</sup>	β	R <sup>2</sup>	Δ R <sup>2</sup>	β
<b>Step 1</b>	.053**	.043**		.028*	.018*	
Age			.19**			-.15*
Tenure						
<b>Step 2</b>	.143*	.108*		.109**	.073**	
Daily hassles			-.26**			-.22**
Work-family balance			-.20**			-.26**
Organizational climate			-.15*			
Relationships			-.16*			

The work stressors were found to predict satisfaction with the job itself ( $R^2 = 0.10$ ,  $F(8, 280) = 3.95$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the level of

the satisfaction with the organization ( $R^2 = 0.08$ ,  $F(8, 280) = 3.01$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Specifically, our results indicate that daily hassles and

relationships relate negatively to job satisfaction, but not to organizational satisfaction, organizational satisfaction. Overall, Hypothesis 2 was supported, different job stressors being related negatively to satisfaction with the job itself and the organization.

## **Conclusions**

Our results indicate that high levels of occupational stress elicit interpersonal and organizational counterproductive work behaviours, and specific predictors are revealed for each of them. Another consequence of work stress is the decline of the satisfaction with the job itself and the organization.

Out of the stressors investigated, the daily hassles were evidenced as a significant predictor for both: counterproductive behaviour and dissatisfaction with the job or the organization. The economical turbulence affects organizations deeply, by raising the level of uncertainty, insecurity and provoking often radical changes. All these have direct consequences on employees' day to day responsibilities. The high level of ambiguity and difficulties faced by organizations determine malfunctions of business operations, and a great deal of intrusions and interruptions in worker's regular program. All these situations contribute to the development of a climate of tension and conflict, an unpleasant work environment, explicating why the organizational climate is the second important stressor reported by our respondents. A work environment characterized by conflict and ambiguity undermines the sense of control of the employees', thus fuelling counterproductivity and deviance (Lawrence & Robinson, 2007). Likewise, Penney & Spector (2002) found interpersonal conflict to be positively related to counterproductive work behaviour. Robinson (2008) suggests that the affect events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) can be very useful in understanding these relationships. The affect events theory asserts that the work environment and the specific work events in an individual's job create affective reactions, which in turn influence attitudes and behaviour. The economical crisis affected profoundly the financial sector in Romania, creating a negative working environment, thus influencing employees thinking and feelings about it. From

this point of view, the reduced job and organizational satisfaction (attitude) and the occurrence of counterproductive behaviour are completely justified. Social exchange theory coupled with the norm of reciprocity (Robinson, 2008) offers another theoretical perspective on how context can produce deviant behaviour. Specifically, employees reciprocate favourable work environments with productive behaviour and respond to unfavourable treatment at work with counterproductive behaviour. Consistent with this view, workplace deviance is negatively related to positive perceptions of one's work situation and perceived organizational support (Colbert et al., 2004).

These results clearly prove that certain job stressors are associated with the decrease of job satisfaction and job satisfaction is significantly and negatively associated with both forms of counterproductive behaviour. Considering the negative and harmful consequences of counterproductive behaviour, organizations would do well to consider how the treatment of employees can lead to counterproductive behaviour. They should also consider that counterproductive behaviour is often hidden or masked. Instituting fair procedures, reducing stress where possible and empowering employees can go a long way towards reducing counterproductive behaviour and enhancing the well being of both organizations and their stakeholders. Without providing a healthy work environment, other practices intended to reduce counterproductive behaviour might be useless.

## **Managerial implications**

Different studies prove clearly that organizations are more effective when their employees have higher level of psychological well-being and are fully engaged. Employees' well-being is linked to important individual outcomes, the ability of solving problems more effectively, a greater enthusiasm for change and the adoption a positive attitude towards it. In the actual conditions this set of characteristics is crucial for organization's success.

Many companies do whatever they can to get costs under control and they often act quickly by cutting employee hours, by reducing massively the number of employees concomitantly with increasing the attributions of the survivors and taking other steps that affect their work force. There are obvious dangers for companies that cut their work force

too hastily: fewer people doing more work and feeling more insecure in their jobs, trying to make some justice by engaging in counterproductive behaviour.

Although stress cannot be completely eliminated from organizations, managers and employees can learn to manage it. We argue for the importance of introducing stress management programs in organizations in order to try to reduce the level of stress experienced by employees and to simultaneously increase their level of well-being, by raising their level of psychological, emotional and physical comfort. These kind of programs are imperative especially for identifying employees prone to developing different occupational stress health problems (Grant & Langan-Fox, 2007). Although we acknowledge that the roots of the stress and counterproductive behaviour in organizations might be influenced by factors beyond organization's control, there are certain steps managers can take in dealing with these issues, along with developing and implementing secondary and tertiary interventions. Research suggests that organizational support in general (Wallace, Edwards, Arnold, Frazier & Finch, 2009), and supervisor's support in particular influences employees' well-being and the level of stress experienced (Etzion, 1984), job satisfaction (Brough & Pears, 2004), the work-family balance (Polemans et al., 2003; Thompson, Brough & Schmidt, 2006) and turnover (Brough & Frame, 2004).

A meta-analysis conducted by Gilboa, Shirom, Fried și Cooper (2008) on a sample of 35265 employees revealed negative correlations between each stressor measured (role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload, work-family conflict, job insecurity and situational constraints) and each type of job performance measurement. Given all these results, we recommend that managers ensure that employees are treated fairly, especially in a process of downsizing, and take good care of the survivors, as stress is clearly an important variable in explaining the processes and results of an organization (González-Morales, Peiró, Rodríguez & Greenglass, 2006). Literature on organizational change repeatedly emphasized the importance of involving employees in the process of change, the importance of a thorough communication, a sensitive management of perceptions and of continuous employee engagement screening. Companies with committed employees are

more likely to do well during tough times. Managers should take in account not only the likely effectiveness of their actions but also their probable impact on employee well-being and commitment.

## References

- Ashton, M.C. (1998). Personality and job performance: The importance of narrow traits. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 19, 289-303.
- Băban, A. (2003). *Stress și personalitate*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujană.
- Behr, T.A. (1995). *Psychological Stress in the Workplace*, London: Routledge.
- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 3, 349-360.
- Bolin, A., & Heatherly, L. (2001). Predictors of employee deviance: The relationship between bad attitudes and bad behaviour. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15, 3, 405-418.
- Brough, P., & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction, work well-being and turnover intentions: The role of social support and police organizational variables. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33, 8-16.
- Burke-Lee, V., & Spector, P.E. (2006). The social stressors-counterproductive work behaviors link: Are conflicts with supervisors and coworkers the same? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 145-156.
- 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 Organizational Psychology*, 65, 177-184.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L.A., & Barrick, M.R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599-609.
- Cooper, C.L., Dewe, P.J., & O'Driscoll, M. (2001). *Stress and Work Organizations: a review and critique of theory, research and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cooper, C.L., Sloan, S.J., & Williams, S. (1988), *Occupational Stress Indicator*, NFER-Nelson, Windsor.
- D'Amato, A., & Zijlstra, F. R. H. (2003). *Occupational stress: A review of the literature*

- relating to mental health. University of Surrey.
- Dalal, R.S. (2005). Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 6, 1241-1255.
- Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C., & Shaw, J.D. (1998). Positive affectivity and negative outcomes: The role of tenure and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 950-959.
- Etzion, D. (1984). Moderating effect of social support on the stress-burnout relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 615-622.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 915-931.
- Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behaviour in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 59*, 291-309.
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demands stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology, 61*, 227-271.
- González-Morales, M. G., Peiró, J. M., Rodríguez, I., & Greenglass, E. R. (2006). Coping and distress in organizations: The role of gender in work. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*, 2, 228-248.
- Grant, S., & Lagan-Fox (2007). Personality and the occupational stressor-strain relationship: The role of the relationships between overload and strain. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*, 4, 306-315.
- Gruys, M.L., & Sackett, P.R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11*, 30-42.
- <http://english.hotnews.ro/stiri-business-5300011-oxford-analytica-romania-faces-imminent-economic-crisis.htm>
- Iwasaki, Y., Mackay, K. J., & Ristock, J. (2004). Gender-based analyses of stress among professional managers: An exploratory qualitative study. *International Journal of Stress Management, 11*, 56-79.
- Jex, S.M., & Yankelevich, M. (2008). Work Stress. In J. Barling & C.L. Cooper (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Volume 1: Micro Approaches (pp. 499-518). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 126-138.
- Lau, C.S.V., Au, W.T., & Ho, J.M.C (2003). A Qualitative and Quantitative Review of Antecedents of Counterproductive Behaviours in Organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*, 1, 73-99.
- Lawrence, T., & Robinson, S.L. (2007). Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management, 33*, 378-394.
- Leong, C.S., Furnham, A., Cary, L., & Cooper, C.L. (1996). The moderating effect of organizational commitment on the occupational stress outcome relationship. *Human Relations, 49*, 10, 1345-63.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Marks, M.L., & Mirvis, P.H. (1997). Resisting the merger syndrome: Dealing with stress. *Mergers and Acquisitions, 31*, 6, 21-27.
- Miles, D.E., Borman, W.E., Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviours: A Comparison of counterproductive work behaviour with organizational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 51-57.
- Penney, L.M., & Spector, P.E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 126-134.
- Pitariu, H. D. (2004). Stresul profesional la manageri: Corelative ale personalității în contextual situației de tranziție social-economică din România. În Opre, A. (Coord.): *Noi tendințe în psihologia personalității. Diagnoză, cercetare, aplicații*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura ASCR.
- Pitariu, H.D. (1998). Le stress professionne; chez les ingineurs dans les situation de transition sociopolitique. In M. Rousson, Thygessen Fischer (Eds.), *Psychologie du Travail et Transformation de la Société: Effet et Problems* (p. 468-479). Neuchatel: PAN.
- Pitariu, H.D. (1998). *Sociopolitical issues in stress research*. 24<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Applied Psychology, August, San Francisco.
- Poelmans, S., Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Allen, T. A., O'Driscoll, M., & Sanchez, J. I. (2003). A cross-national comparative study of work/family demands and resources. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 3*, 274-289.

- Robertson, I.T. (2009). Global economic crisis: A role for work and organizational psychology. *Human Resources Psychology, 7*, 10-13.
- Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555-572.
- Robinson, S.L. (2008). Dysfunctional workplace behaviour. In J. Barling & C.L. Cooper (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior. Volume 1: Micro Approaches* (p. 141-159). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- 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). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Spector, P.E., & Jex, S.M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3*, 356-367.
- Spector, P.E., Allen, T.D., Poelmans, S. A. Y., Lapierre, L.M., Cooper, C.L., O'Driscoll, M., Sanchez, J.I., Abarca, N., Alexandrova, M., Beham, B., Brough, P., Ferreira, P., Fraile, G., Chang-qin Lu, Luo Lu, Moreno-Velázquez, I., Pagon, M., Pitariu, H., Volodymyr Salamatov, ShimaS., Suarez Simoni, Al., Oi Ling Siu, Lingnan & Widerszal-Bazyl, M. (2007). Cross-national differences in relationships of work demands, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions with work-family conflict. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 805-835.
- Spector, P.E., Dwyer, D.J., & Jex, S.M. (1988). Relation of job stressors to affective, health and performance outcomes: A comparison of multiple data sources. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 11-19.
- Storms, P., & Spector, P.E. (1987). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioural reactions: The moderating effect of locus of control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60*, 227-234.
- Thompson, B. M., Brough, P. A., & Schmidt, H. (2006). Supervisor and subordinate work-family values: Does similarity make a difference? *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*, 1, 45-63.
- Wallace, J. C., Edwards, B. D., Arnold, T., Frazier, D. M., & Finch, M. L. (2009). Work stressors, role-based performance and the moderating influence of organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1, 254 - 262.



Organizational Diagnosis & Development  
 Brand Research  
 Academic & Institutional Evaluation  
 Organizational Simulation & Gaming

Focus on people and opportunities.  
 For reliable outcomes  
 contact@aphorme.ro; www.aphorme.ro