# Impact of Employees Spirit at work and Work related quality of life on their Tendency of Counterproductive Work Behaviour

**\*Prof. Rishipal , \*\*Yangerinla**

\*Head & Professor, AIBAS, Amity University, Haryana.

\*\*PG Student, AIBAS, Amity University, Haryana.

## ABSTRACT

*Present research is an investigation to find out the degree of tendency of Work related Quality of Life, Counterproductive Work Behavior and Spirit at Work among employees and also the interrelationship between these variables. For conducting the research a sample of 136 subjects was taken from the population of employees working in different organizations, situated at Delhi and NCR region. Data was collected by using questionnaire method for all the three variables and analyzed statistically for results and findings. Findings reveal that the mean score of sample for the disposition of Work Related Quality of life was higher than the standard mean, for the tendency of Counterproductive Work Behavior, the mean of sample was lower than the standard mean and for the tendency of Spirit at Work again the sample mean was higher than the standard mean score. When relationship between these variables was tested by using Carl Pearson Correlation method, the relationship between Work Related Quality of Life and Spirit at work was found positive but not significant, whereas, the relationship between the variable of Counterproductive Work Behavior and Spirit at Work was found negative and non-significant. The relationship between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Work related Quality of Life was found negative and non-significant.*

**Keyword:** Spirit at work, Counterproductive work behavior and Work related quality of life.

## 1.INTRODUCTION

Frequent change in technology, target based mass production and highly challenging work environment is affecting not only the productivity and effectiveness of employees but also their wellbeing and personal life. Besides this, in the present day volatile work environment, employees are experiencing work related stress as a consequence of continuous pressure for updating the skills and knowledge in urge of creating quality production and services. To enhance and maintain the productivity of employees is considered as one of the biggest challenge for modern management. There could be various factors, both emerging from environment and employee, which can affect the efficiency and effectiveness of work force. These factors of work place may be social, physical, cultural, psychological and economic in nature but while working simultaneously in synchronization creates such a dynamic environment which may or may not be conducive and supportive to the organization in the achievement of its goals. All these factors have impact on the psychological dispositions of an employee and consequently individual undergoes temperamental changes. Research studies have amply proved that temperamental issues have both direct and indirect impact on the organizational productivity. Present study is an effort to understand the impact of psycho-environmental factors on the employee productivity. Study will investigate the relationship between the employees tendencies and workplace factors of Spirit at work, Work related quality of life among and Counterproductive Work Behaviour.

**Spirit at Work**
Spirit/ Spirituality has been variously defined as, "an animating life force, an energy that inspires one toward certain ends or purposes that go beyond self" (Mcknight, 1984); "the basic feeling of being connected with one's complete self, others and the entire universe" in a common purpose (Mitroff & Denton, 1999); and "a continuing search for meaning and purpose in life; an appreciation for the depth of life; the expanse of the universe, and natural forces which operate; a personal belief system" (Myers, 1999).
Spirit at Work involves deep feelings of wellbeing and a confidence that one's work is a vital contribution, is being given meaning and providing fulfillment, beyond self, through work (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2004; Milliman, Czaplewski, and Ferguson, 2003; Mitroff and Denton, 1999; Sheep, 2004). The relationship between spirituality and wellbeing is well recognized (George, Larson, Koenig, and McCullough, 2000; Paloutzian, Emmons, and Keortge, 2003), researches have supported that the experience of spirit at work results in more fulfilling lives for employees and productive outcomes for organizations (Fairholm, 1997; Kinjerski, 2004; Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2006; Milliman, et al., 2003; Milliman, Ferguson, Trickett and Condemi, 1999; Mitroff and

# International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAIEM)
**Web Site: www.ijaiem.org Email: editor@ijaiem.org**
**Volume 5, Issue 9, September  2016**                                    **ISSN 2319 - 4847**

Denton, 1999; Moxley, 2000). As a remedy to nonparticipation and nonattarction at work, spirit at work has become an issue of great interest for both the employees and employers.

## Work Related Quality of Life (WRQoL)
Work Related Quality of life may be understood as condition and quality of an individual's work life with respect to the personal and organizational objectives within the given set of organizational conditions and practices. Or it may also be understood as, quality of work life helps employees' to perceive that they are compensated properly, their work environment is safe and pleasurable, feeling relatively satisfied and have opportunity to grow and develop as human beings.

An employees' WRQoL is influenced by their experiences from work, interaction with other employees and also by the direct and indirect factors which can shape their experiences as a result of organizational policies and programmes. Particularly, WRQoL is influenced by job satisfaction and also by the factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well- being. (Danna & Griffin, 1999) The purpose of value based process of WRQoL is to enhance productivity and effectiveness of organization and better quality of life at work for employees (The American Society of Training and Development).

According to the works of Mayo, it is only when the workers or employees feel that their needs and wants are fulfilled as a result of their work, example, like they are well compensated and secure in their job without fear of being fired on short notice. Employees also feel that when they will perform better only then they shall be awarded better salary and other benefits. There is also the role of the healthy work environment like effective interaction and teamwork between coworkers and finally when they feel that they have good superiors, it is only then the workers or employees can perform to their best of their potential.

## Counterproductive Work Behavior
Any of the acts of employees which are negatively and destructively affecting the working of organization and consequently hampering the to achieve its goals is called as Counterproductive work behavior. It may also be understood as the set of actions or deeds of the employees which are going against the productivity, effectiveness and efficiency of the organization are called as counterproductive work behaviour. Counterproductive work behavior may be any of the intentional or unintentional undesirable behavior that can bring negative consequences to the organization and its human resource, these behaviors may include the acts of theft, posing sick when actually individual is not sick, involvement in fraud, violence, sexual harassment, use of drugs and alcohol at workplace, and inappropriate use of the organizational property.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE
The study was conducted to understand the impact of employees spirit at work and work related quality of life on their tendency of counterproductive work behaviour whether spirit at Work is a moderator among Work Related Quality of Life  and Counterproductive Work Behavior and also to find the relationship between spirit at Work and Work Related Quality of Life  and also between Spirit at Work and Counterproductive Work Behavior. Before conduction of this study a comprehensive literature survey was conducted to update the present status of knowledge. A brief description of the literature survey is presented hereunder:

## Spirit at Work
Wagner, J. I. J. and Gregory, D. M. (2014). A cross- sectional mixed- method survey explored and measured relationships between spirit at work concepts, experience, education, practice context, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among registered nurses. Spirit at work concepts of engaging work and mystical experience accounted for moderate to large amounts of model variance for both home care and surgical nurses, while significant positive relationships between spirit at work concepts, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were also reported. Researchers concluded that spirit at work contributes to improved job satisfaction and organizational commitment while being sensitive to registered nurse experience across clinical contexts.

According to Pawar, B. S. (2009) individual spirituality controls the effect of spirit at work. Researcher examined the effects of three spirits of workplace - meaning in work, community at work, and positive organizational purpose and individual spirituality on three work attitudes- job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. Researcher also examined the interactive effects of all three workplace spirituality aspects and individual spirituality on the selected three work attitudes. The study reveals considerable support for the hypothesized relationships between workplace spirituality aspects and work attitudes but not for the hypothesized relationships between individual spirituality and work attitudes.

By Kenjerski V., Skrypnek B. J., (2008) the effectiveness of spirit at work program in long-term care was evxamined by using a pretest-posttest, quasi-experimental design. These findings provide enough support for that the increased spirit at work, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational culture can lead to the reduction in turnover

## International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAIEM)
### Web Site: www.ijaiem.org Email: editor@ijaiem.org
**Volume 5, Issue 9, September  2016**                                    **ISSN 2319 - 4847**

and absenteeism. The study further proposes that practice of spirit at work is a relatively economical way to enhance the work satisfaction among employees which can increase the commitment towards organization and ultimately improve the quality of resident care.

**Work Related Quality of Life**
The research of Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, D.R. (2013) revealed that sufficiency of resources is better correlated with the quality of work life in teaching staffs in comparison to the training and development of the employees, whereas, it is poorly correlated incase of non teaching staffs but compensation and rewards are better correlated in comparison to work environment with quality of work life.

According to Subhashini, S. & Ramani, C. S. (2013) there are number of factors which determine the meaning of Quality of Work Life, among them one is work environment. Study attempts to evaluate the quality of work life, level of satisfaction of employees on present level of QWL. The finding revealed that the areas where the factories need to concentrate to bring about better quality of work life and thereby satisfied women work force.

The study of Gayathiri, R. & Dr. Ramakrishnan, L.(2013) has find out that the trends such as changing organizational structure, interdisciplinary collaboration, increased knowledge, advancement of technology, new health problems and health care policy have a part to play to ensure quality of life for nurses that can provide satisfaction and enhance job performance.

According to S. Jerome (2013) the quality of Work Life involves various aspects of work environment, which helps the HRD of an organization efficiently. Finding revealed that the quality of work life is a major factor for the workers' for effective performance.

Kanten, S., Sadullah, O. (2012) in their study find out that Quality of work life is viewed as an significant factor of quality of life. Quality of work life is one of the basic element for the organizational performance and this factor affects employee motivation at work. (Gupta and Sharma, 2011:80).

**Counterproductive Work Behavior**
Jensen, J.M., & Patel, P. C.(2011), Predicting counterproductive work behavior from the interaction of personality traits. The interaction of conscientiousness and agreeableness, agreeableness and emotional stability and conscientiousness and agreeableness suggest employees perform the least counterproductive work behavior when they are high on both traits (in the respective trait pairings), but low levels on either trait relate to increased counterproductive work behavior, and at levels comparable to individuals low on both trait. Research on personality and counterproductive work behavior would benefit from an interactive approach as it allows for greater prediction which is important in light of the organizational and interpersonal consequences of employee misbehavior.

Rishipal & Chand, P.K. (2012) Research study was conducted to enquire the relationship between Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) and Locus of control (LOC) among Government, Semi-government and Private sector organization's junior, middle and senior level managers. On comparison of all the three groups of managers taken from Government organizations i.e. Junior Manager (JM), Middle Level Manager (MM) & Senior Manager (SM), the tendency of CWB among JM was found higher, where as it was comparatively low among MM &SM. Similar, comparison for different groups of managers i.e. JM, MM & SM under the Semi-government category revealed that means values for CWB was higher among SM and lower for JM & MM. Comparison of means values for all the three groups of managers from Private sector organizations i.e. JM, MM & SM have shown higher tendency of CWB among JM and lower among MM &SM. There was no significant difference in the means values of LOC among groups of managers like JM, MM & SM taken from Government organizations. There was no significant difference in the mean values of LOC among various groups of managers such as JM, MM & SM chosen from Semi-government organizations. The means values of LOC among Private sector organization's managers have shown significant difference in the means values of SM in comparison to JM & MM. The Correlations between CWB & LOC among various groups of managers like JM, MM & SM taken from Government organizations were positive but non-significant. The correlations between CWB & LOC among different groups of managers like MM & SM chosen from Semi-government organizations were positive but non-significant. But, the correlation was negative and non significant for JM of Semigovernment organizations. The correlations between CWB & LOC among groups of managers like MM & SM for Private sector organizations were positive and non-significant but it was negative and non-significant in the case of JM.

Spector, P. E., (2010). The workplace literature relating personality to counter productive work behavior is integrated with complimentary literatures from other disciplines including developmental and social psychology. The literature is reviewed showing how both broad- based personality dimensions reflected in integrity tests and measures of the five factor model, and specific personality traits relate to counterproductive work behavior. A model is developed showing how different personality variables shown to relate to aggression and/or might affect different steps in the process linking behavior to precipitating environmental conditions or events. Specifically hostile attribution bias and narcissism are most relevant to appraisal and attribution, negative affectivity and trait anger connect to negative emotions, and

Locus of control and self- control are thought to play a counterproductive work behavior inhibiting role. Distinctions among reactive, proactive, and relational aggression are extended to counter productive work behavior.

Spector, P. E., Fox S., Domagalski, T. (2005). Negative emotion plays an important role in much counterproductive work behavior and violence at work, particularly acts committed by clients, customers, and employees. Work stressors can trigger anger, anxiety, and other emotions that under some circumstances might lead to counterproductive work behavior and violence. Personality serves an important function as well, as the interplay of individual differences and the work environment combine to induce emotion and produce behavior. Violence at work and milder form of Counterproductive work behavior are a major problem for employees and their employers. Both reduce employee effectiveness, which has detrimental effects on organizational functioning. They also have adverse effects on employee health and well- being, particularly when employees have to endure both physical and verbal abuse. Policies and practices that can reduce counterproductive work behavior and violence will go a long way toward enhancing the well-being of both employees and organizations.

Rishipal (2012) Studied the managerial effectiveness and counterproductive work behaviour among the junior, middle and senior level managers. Results and findings exhibited that managers who are at junior level differ significantly in their mean managerial effectiveness from middle and senior level managers but middle level managers did not differ considerably in their mean managerial effectiveness from the managers at senior level. Managers at different levels such as junior, middle and senior differed significantly with each other in their mean counterproductive work behaviour. Multiple regressions and ß- value analysis for senior and middle level managers showed that the dimension of counterproductive work behaviuor was significantly influencing their managerial effectiveness in negative manner whereas in the case of junior managers, multiple regressions and ß-value confirmed no significant influencing value for counterproductive work behaviuor as predictor of managerial effectiveness.

## NEED FOR THE STUDY
The present study has established a relationship between the variables Spirit at Work, Quality of Work Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior. After an extensive study and literature survey, it was found that no such studies has been done so far, related to the topic of present research and therefore the study was initiated to understand Spirit at Work, Work Related Quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior among businessmen.

## OBJECTIVES
- To understand the relationship between Spirit at Work and Work Related Quality of Life,
- To find the relationship between Spirit at Work and Counterproductive work Behavior.
- To investigate the relationship between Work related quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior.

## HYPOTHESIS
- H1: There will be a significant relationship between Spirit at Work and Work Related Quality of Life
- H2: There will be a significant relationship between Spirit at Work and Counterproductive Work Behavior.
- H3: There will be a significant relationship between Work Related Quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior

# 2.RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research design
Present research was a descriptive type of study based on experimental research design. Research involved only one group of subjects. Population selected for study was the employees working in different organizations situated at Delhi and nearby NCR region. Non- probability sampling method based on purposive sampling was used to select thesample from population. A sample of 136 subjects was taken from the selected population. Data was collected by questionnaire method and subjects were tested by using the scales of Spirit at Work, Work- Related Quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior. For the analysis of collected data both the descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used by using SPSS software version 16.0

# 3.SCALES USED

### Spirit at Work
Spirit at Work Scale (SAWS) by Kinjerski & Berna J. Skrypnek (2006)
The Spirit at Work Scale includes 18 items that assess the extent to which one experiences spirit at work across four dimensions: engaging work (a belief that one is engaged in meaningful work), sense of community (a feeling of connectedness to others and common purpose), mystical experience (a positive state of energy and vitality, a sense of perfection at work), and spiritual connection (a sense of connection with something larger than self) (Cronbach's alpha

coefficient = 0.93). Items are rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 6 (completely agree). Reliability: The Cronbach alphas indicate very acceptable internal consistency reliabilities for the total scale ($\alpha$= .93) and the four subscales ($\alpha$'s from .86 to .91).

**Work- Related Quality of Life (WRQoL)**

Work- Related quality of Life by Simon Easton & Darren Van Laar (2012)

The Work Related Quality of Life Scale is a 23 item psychometric scale used to gauge the perceived quality of life of employees as measured through six psychosocial sub- factors which include: General Well- Being (GWB), Home-Work Interface (HWI), Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS), Control at Work (CAW), Working Conditions (WCS) and Stress at Work (SAW). A 24th item is usually included to provide an outcome variable for measuring the reliability and validity of the items. Reliability: The Test- Retest reliabilities of the overall WRQoL average and the individual factor subscales all showed a strong, significant, positive intra- class correlation between the test and the retest measures.

**Table 1:** Test- Retest reliabilities and intra- class correlation coefficients for WRQoL subfactors and overall **score.**

| Factor | R | ICC |
|--------|------|------|
| GWB | .773** | .772** |
| HWI | .785** | .781** |
| JCS | .888** | .887** |
| CAW | .823** | .817** |
| WCS | .831** | .833** |
| SAW | .794** | .792** |
| WRQoL | .874** | .874** |

Validity: WRQoL is a good measure of the broad definition of quality of working life, so the scores on the scale is correlated with scores on a job satisfaction scale and with a general well- being scale and unrelated to say, scores on attitude to recycling.

**Counterproductive Work Behavior (CBW)**

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CBW) by Paul E. Spector (1998)

Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) consists of acts that harm or are intended to harm organizations. They include acts directed toward both organizations and individuals, including aggression (physical and verbal), sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. The Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C) comes in two versions. The full 45-item was designed to be scored as either overall CWB (all items), or as two subscales (43 items) that are classified into CWB directed toward the organization versus people. The 32-item version produces 5 subscales of abuse (harmful and nasty behaviors that affect other people), production deviance (purposely doing the job incorrectly or allowing errors to occur), sabotage (destroying the physical environment), theft, and withdrawal (avoiding work through being absent or late). Responses are made on a 5-point frequency scale *Never*, *Once or twice*, *Once or twice per month*, *Once or twice per week*, *Every day*. For reliability Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated for two categories, and for five subscales of CWB-C. The test-retest reliability coefficient was measured by the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between the scores of two administrations.

*International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAIEM)*
**Web Site: www.ijaiem.org Email: editor@ijaiem.org**
**Volume 5, Issue 9, September 2016**                                              **ISSN 2319 - 4847**

## 4.RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

**Table 2:** Table showing descriptive statistics for Work Related Quality of Life, Counterproductive Work

|  | N | Range | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Standard error |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total WRQoL** | 136 | 48 | 58 | 106 | 79.78 | 2.181 | 13.089 |
| **Total CWB** | 136 | 59 | 32 | 91 | 40.97 | 2.008 | 12.049 |
| **Total SAW** | 136 | 76 | 29 | 105 | 77.81 | 2.529 | 15.177 |

**Behavior and Spirit at Work**
Table 2 shows the range of scores, minimum & maximum scores, mean score and standard deviation for Work Related Quality of Life (WRQoL), Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Spirit at Work (SAW).
For the organizational factor of Work Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) sample's minimum and maximum scores were 58 and 106 respectively, range of scores was 48. The mean score and Standard error were found to be 79.78 and 2.181 respectively. The standard deviation was 13.089. If the mean score of present sample (M= 79.78) is compared with the standard mean score (M= 3.45) then the sample's mean score is higher than the standard mean score. This shows that the sample's tendency for WRQoL was higher. The range of scores clearly shows that the data is highly dispersed which means there is poor consistency among scores of the subject and this has been verified by the higher degree of standard deviation (13.089) with respect to mean. The variation in tendency may be because of cultural and social difference among American and Indian.

For the organizational factor of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) samples, minimum score was 32, maximum score was 91 and range of scores was 48. The mean score and standard error score was 40.97 and 2.008 respectively. The standard deviation was 12.049. If the mean score of present sample (M= 40.97) is compared with the standard mean score of test (M= 59.29) then the sample's mean score is lower than the standard mean score. This shows that the sample's tendency for CWB was poor overall. The range of scores clearly shows that the data is highly dispersed which means there is poor consistency among scores of the subject and this has been verified by the standard deviation (12.049) with respect to mean.

For the organizational factor of Spirit at Work (SAW) sample's, minimum score was 29, maximum score is 105 and range of score was 76. The mean score and standard error score was 77.81 and 2.529 respectively. The standard deviation was 15.177. If the mean score of present sample (M= 77.81) is compared with the standard mean score of test (M= 65.91) then the sample's mean score is higher than the standard mean score. This shows that the sample's tendency for SAW was good overall. The range of scores clearly shows that the data is highly dispersed which there is poor consistency among scores of the subject and this has been verified by the standard deviation (15.177) with respect to mean.

**Table 3:** Table showing Correlation between Work Related Quality of Life and Spirit at Work

|  | TOTAL WRQoL | TOTAL SPIRIT AT WORK |
|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL WRQoL** |  |  |
| **Pearson Correlation** | 1 | 0.325 |
| $r2$ |  | 0.105 |
| **Adjusted $r2$** |  | 0.11 |
| **Sig. (2- tailed)** |  | 0.053 |
| **N** | 136 | 36 |
| **TOTAL SPIRIT AT WORK** |  |  |
| **Pearson Correlation** | 0.325 | 1 |
| $r2$ | 0.105 |  |
| **Adjusted $r2$** | 0.11 |  |
| **Sig. (2- tailed)** | 0.053 |  |
| **N** | 136 | 36 |

Table 3 shows the correlation score of Work Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) and Spirit at Work (SAW). The Pearson Correlation score was 0.325 at a p- value of 0.053. The tendency of correlation is positive but its degree is not significant. With the findings of this fact, the first hypothesis H1: there will be a significant and positive  relationship between Spirit at Work and Work Related Quality of Life was rejected and null hypothesis in this respect was accepted. According to the study by Ellis, R. B. (2012), a strong, moderate, statistical relationship was revealed between spirit at work, job satisfaction, organizational culture, and organizational commitment. The relationship between spirit at work and the organizational behaviors was stronger in the non- based organization. While one may anticipate the relationship to be stronger with the faith based organization, additional research is needed to determine if individual spirituality versus organizational spirituality is influencing the relationship.

According to the study by Mirvis and Lawler (1984), the quality of work life was associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality life" as safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement.

Thus, spirit at work which realizes an inner life in people, finding meaning in the work and thereby embracing a purpose larger than them has no relationship with work related quality of life which concerns about the impact of work on people as well as on organizational effectiveness and the idea of participation in organizational problem solving and decision making.

# *International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAIEM)*
**Web Site: www.ijaiem.org Email: editor@ijaiem.org**

**Volume 5, Issue 9, September  2016**                                      **ISSN 2319 - 4847**

**Table 4:** Table showing Correlation between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Spirit at Work

|  | **TOTAL CWB** | **TOTAL SPIRIT AT WORK** |
|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL CWB** |  |  |
| **Pearson Correlation** | 1 | -0.086 |
| $r2$ |  | 0.007 |
| **Adjusted $r2$** |  | 0.01 |
| **Sig. (2- tailed)** |  | 0.617 |
| **N** | 136 | 36 |
| **TOTAL SPIRIT AT WORK** |  |  |
| **Pearson Correlation** | -0.086 | 1 |
| $r2$ | 0.007 |  |
| **Adjusted $r2$** | 0.01 |  |
| **Sig. (2- tailed)** | 0.617 |  |
| **N** | 136 | 36 |

Table 4 shows the correlation score of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Spirit at Work (SAW). The Pearson correlation score was -0.086 at a p- value is 0.617. The tendency of correlation is negative but its degree is not significant. With the findings of this fact, the second hypothesis H2: There will be a significant relationship between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Spirit at Work was rejected and null hypothesis in this respect was accepted.

According to Spector, P.E., Fox S., Domagalski, T. (2005), negative emotions plays an important role in much counterproductive work behavior and violence at work, particularly acts committed by clients, customers, and employees. Work stressor can trigger anger, anxiety, and other emotions that under some circumstances might lead to counterproductive work behavior and violence.

Policies and practices that can reduce counterproductive work behavior will go a long way towards enhancing the well-being of both employees and organization.

Spirit at work can also be one such factor which the employees can practice for the general enhancement and well-being of both the individual and the organization.

**Table 5:** Table showing correlation between Work Related Quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior

|  | TOTAL WRQoL | TOTAL CWB |
|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL CWB** |  |  |
| **Pearson Correlation** | 1 | -0.009 |
| $r2$ |  | 0.00 |
| Adjusted $r2$ |  | 0.00 |
| **Sig. (2- tailed)** |  | 0.958 |
| **N** | 136 | 36 |
| **TOTAL SPIRIT AT WORK** |  |  |
| **Pearson Correlation** | -0.009 | 1 |
| $r2$ | 0.00 |  |
| Adjusted $r2$ | 0.00 |  |
| **Sig. (2- tailed)** | 0.958 |  |
| **N** | 136 | 36 |

Table 5 shows the correlation score of Work Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). The Pearson correlation score is -0.009 at a p- value is 0.958. The tendency of correlation is negative but its degree is not significant. With the findings of this fact, the second hypothesis H3: There will be a significant relationship between Work Related Quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior was rejected and null hypothesis in this respect was accepted.

In comparison with the study conducted by Islam, M. B. (2012) An appropriate organization culture, compensation policy, career growth, and relative facilities can lead to a satisfied employee mindset which ensures the overall organization productivity and also the study by Spector, P. E., Fox S., Domagalski, T. (2005) Counterproductive work behavior and violence both reduce employee effectiveness, which has detrimental effects on organizational functioning. They also have adverse effects on employee health and well- being, particularly when employees have to endure both physical and verbal abuse. Policies and practices that can reduce counterproductive work behavior and violence will go a long way toward enhancing the well- being of both employees and organizations.
From this it is clear that when the factors that affects the physical, social, economic, psychological and cultural well-being of the individuals are framed for the benefit and welfare it will ultimately result in decrease counterproductive work behavior.

In conclusion the alternative hypothesis that there will be significant relationship between  Spirit at Work, Work Related Quality of Life and Counterproductive Work Behavior among businessmen is rejected.
An individual may understand and seek work as a spiritual path and can be determined to contribute in a meaningful way but various factors like stress and burn out, obsessive and compulsive behaviors, disorganized work order, family pressures, etc. may result in failure of the individual to contribute the maximum possible and ultimately result in poor work related quality of life and ultimately be a victim of counterproductive work behavior for the organization.

## REFERENCES

[1]. Ashkanasy, N. M., & Ashton-James, C. E. (2005). Emotion in organizations: A neglected topic in I/O psychology, but with a bright future. International review of industrial and organizational psychology, 20, 221-268.

[2]. Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. Journal of management inquiry, 9(2), 134.

[3]. Chan, K. W., & Wyatt, T. A. (2007). Quality of work life: A study of employees in Shanghai, China. Asia Pacific Business Review, 13(4), 501-517.

[4]. Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., & Turan, N. (2013). Predicting counterproductive work behavior from guilt proneness. Journal of Business Ethics, 114(1), 45-53.

[5]. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Mueller, J. S. (2007). Does perceived unfairness exacerbate or mitigate interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors related to envy?. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(3), 666.

[6]. Czarnota-Bojarska, J. (2015). Counterproductive work behavior and job satisfaction: A surprisingly rocky relationship. Journal of Management & Organization, 21(04), 460-470.

[7]. Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. Journal of management, 25(3), 357-384.

[8]. Duchon, D., & Plowman, D. A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. The leadership quarterly, 16(5), 807-833.

[9]. Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2012). User manual of the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale: a measure of quality of working life. University of Portsmouth.

[10]. Efraty, D., & Sirgy, M. J. (1990). The effects of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioral responses. Social Indicators Research, 22(1), 31-47.

[11]. Fairholm, G. W. (1997). Capturing the heart of leadership: Spirituality and community in the new American workplace. Greenwood Publishing Group.

[12]. Flaherty, S., & Moss, S. A. (2007). The impact of personality and team context on the relationship between workplace injustice and counterproductive work behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology,37(11), 2549-2575.

[13]. Gayathiri, R. & Dr. Ramakrishnan, L.(2013). Quality of work life- linkage with job satisfaction and performance. International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2(1).

[14]. George, L. K., Larson, D. B., Koenig, H. G., & McCullough, M. E. (2000). Spirituality and health: What we know, what we need to know. Journal of social and clinical psychology, 19(1), 102.

[15]. Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K.M. and Shaw, J.D. (2002). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 63930, 510-531.

[16]. Gupta, M., & Sharma, P. (2011). Factor credentials boosting quality of work life of BSNL employees in Jammu region. Asia Pacific Journal of Research in Business Management, 2(1), 79-89.

[17]. Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1983). Theft by employees (Vol. 126). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

[18]. Indumathy, R. & Kamalraj, S. (2012). A study on Quality of Work Life among workers with special reference to Textile Industry in Tripur District. A Textile Hub. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(4).

[19]. Islam, M. B. (2012). Factors affecting quality of work life: an analysis on employees of private limited companies in Bangladesh. Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 12(18).

[20]. Islam, M. B. (2012). Factors affecting quality of work life: an analysis on employees of private limited companies in Bangladesh. Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 12(18).

[21]. Jensen, J. M., & Patel, P. C. (2011). Predicting counterproductive work behavior from the interaction of personality traits. Personality and Individual Differences, 51(4), 466-471.

[22]. Jerome, S. (2013). A Study on Quality of Work Life of Employees at Jeppiaar Cement Private Ltd: Perambalur. International Journal, 1(4).

[23]. 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(1), 126.

[24]. Kanten, S., & Sadullah, O. (2012). An empirical research on relationship quality of work life and work engagement. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 62, 360-366.

[25]. Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: a meta-analytic investigation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(1), 162.

[26]. Kinjerski, V. M., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2004). Defining spirit at work: Finding common ground. Journal of organizational change management, 17(1), 26-42.

[27]. Kinjerski, V., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2006). Measuring The Intangible: Development Of The Spirit At Work Scale. In Academy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 2006, No. 1, pp. A1-A6). Academy of Management

[28]. Kinjerski, V., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2006, August). Measuring The Intangible: Development Of The Spirit At Work Scale. InAcademy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 2006, No. 1, pp. A1-A6). Academy of Management.

[29].Kinjerski, V., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2008). The Promise of Spirit at WorkIncreasing Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment and Reducing Turnover and Absenteeism in Long-Term Care. Journal of Gerontological Nursing, 34(10), 17-25.

[30].Konz, G. N., & Ryan, F. X. (1999). Maintaining an organizational spirituality: No easy task. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12(3), 200-210.

[31].Krishnakumar, S., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The "what","why" and "how" of spirituality in the workplace. Journal of managerial psychology, 17(3), 153-164.

[32].Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. Springer publishing company.

[33].Lips-Wiersma, M., & Mills, C. (2002). Coming out of the closet: Negotiating spiritual expression in the workplace. Journal of Managerial Psychology,17(3), 183-202.

[34].McKnight, R. (1984). Spirituality in the workplace. Transforming work: A collection of organizational transformation readings, 138-153.

[35].Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A. J., & Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. Journal of organizational change management, 16(4), 426-447.

[36].Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D., & Condemi, B. (1999). Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of a spiritual values-based model. Journal of organizational change management, 12(3), 221-233.

[37].Mirvis, P. H., & Lawler, E. E. (1984). Accounting for the quality of work life.Journal of Organizational Behavior, 5(3), 197-212.

[38].Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace.MIT Sloan Management Review, 40(4), 83.

[39].Moxley, R. S. (2000). Leadership and spirit: Breathing new vitality and energy into individuals and organizations. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

[40].Myers, M. (1999). Investigating information systems with ethnographic research. Communications of the AIS, 2(4es), 1.

[41].Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. R. (2013). Review of Literature on Quality of Work life. International Journal for Quality Research, 7(2), 201-214.

[42].Paloutzian, R. F., Emmons, R. A., & Keortge, S. G. (2003). Spiritual well-being, spiritual intelligence, and healthy workplace policy. Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance, 123-136.

[43].PE Spector (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 (4), 356

[44].Rishipal (2012). Managerial Effectiveness and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: A Comparison at Different Managerial Level, International Journal of Research in commerce and Management, 3(10), 74-78.

[45].Rishipal, Awasthi, S (2015). Employee Development: A Tool to Check Counter Productive Work Behaviour, International Journal of in Management, Economics and Commerce. 5 (2), 28-37.

[46].Rishipal, Chand, P. (2012). Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) and Locus of Control (LOC) among Managers, International Journal of Research in commerce and Management, 2(12), 94-97

[47].Rishipal, Jain, N. (2013). Employee Obsolescence and Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Employees of Government Organizations and Departments. European Journal of Business and Management, 5(27), 82-86.

[48].Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10(1-2), 117-125.

[49].Shankar Pawar, B. (2009). Individual spirituality, workplace spirituality and work attitudes: An empirical test of direct and interaction effects. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 30(8), 759-777.

[50].Sheep, M. L. (2004, August). Nailing Down Gossamer: A Valid Measure Of The Person-Organization Fit Of Workplace Spirituality. In Academy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 2004, No. 1, pp. B1-B6). Academy of Management.

[51].Spector, P. E. (2010). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An integration of perspectives. Human Resource Management Review, 21(4), 342-352.

[52].Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior.

[53].Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2005). Emotions, Violence, and Counterproductive Work Behavior., Kelloway, EK, Barling. J. ve Jr. Hurrell, JJ (Eds), Handbook of Workplace Violence, Sage Publications.

[54].Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2005). Emotions, Violence, and Counterproductive Work Behavior., Kelloway, EK, Barling. J. ve Jr. Hurrell, JJ (Eds), Handbook of Workplace Violence, Sage Publications.

[55].Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2005). Emotions, Violence, and Counterproductive Work Behavior., Kelloway, EK, Barling. J. ve Jr. Hurrell, JJ (Eds), Handbook of Workplace Violence, Sage Publications.

[56].Subhashini, S., & Gopal, C. R. (2013). Quality Of Work Life Among Women Employees Working In Garment Factories In Coimbatore District. Asia Pacific Journal of Research Vol: I Issue XII.

[57]. Tischler, L., Biberman, J., & McKeage, R. (2002). Linking emotional intelligence, spirituality and workplace performance: Definitions, models and ideas for research. Journal of Managerial psychology, 17(3), 203-218.

[58]. Wagner, J. I., & Gregory, D. M. (2014). Spirit at Work (SAW) Fostering a Healthy RN Workplace. Western journal of nursing research, 0193945914521304.