

Work Engagement and Organisational Climate as Determinants of Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Civil Servants in Akwa Ibom State

Usen Essien Inyang*, Hannah Etim Archibong.

Graduate Students, Department of Psychology, University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria

*Correspondence Author

Abstract: Counterproductive work behaviours (CWBs) have detrimental effects on organisations. The cross-sectional study examined work engagement and organisational climate as determinants of counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants in Akwa Ibom State. Two hundred and eight (208) participants made up of 119 males and 89 females were conveniently selected from State Ministry of Education and Finance, Idongesit Nkanga Secretariat and Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Trade/Investment, Federal Secretariat, Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. Their ages ranged between 22 and 54 years and their mean age was 37.67 years. The study utilized a 2x2 factorial design. The Work Engagement Scale, Organisational Climate Scale and Counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist (CWB-C) were the instruments used for data collection. A 2 x 2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed for data analysis. Results revealed that work engagement was a significant determiner of counterproductive work behaviour [$F = (1,208) 8.27; P < .05$]. Results also revealed that organisational climate was a significant determiner of counterproductive work behaviour [$F = (1,208) 64.64; P < .05$]. Result further revealed that there was no combined interaction influence of work engagement and organisational climate on counterproductive work behaviour [$F = (1, 208), 1.86; P > .05$]. It was recommended that organisations should set up teams that will train leaders on the best possible way to keep the work space positive and safe for everyone as it will help reduce counterproductive work behaviour among workers.

Keywords: Counterproductive Work-Behaviour, Work Engagement, Organisational Climate.

I. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Counterproductive work behaviour is any intentional unacceptable behaviour that has the potential to have negative consequences to an organisation and the staff members within that organisation. It is also the employee's behaviour that goes against the legitimate interest of an organisation (Dalal, 2005). Counterproductive work behaviours refer to actions by employees that go against the goals and aims of their employers (Dalal, 2005). Duffy (2009) identified several aspects of counterproductive work behaviours which include absenteeism, abuse against others, bullying, incivility, lateness, and sabotage. CWB is not necessarily malicious but it is always conscious – it doesn't include accidental or unconscious behaviours or incidents.

CWBs are "active and volitional acts engaged in by individuals, as opposed to accidental or unintentional actions (Connelly, 2015). CWBs, therefore do not include acts that lack volition, such as the inability to successfully complete a task, nor do CWBs include involvement in an accident, although purposeful avoidance of the safety rules that may have led to the accident would represent a CWB.

Counterproductive work behaviours (CWBs) have detrimental effects on organizations. The effects of CWB include failure to meet organisational goal, poor turnover, and poor interpersonal relationship at work. As a result of CWBs, organisations might suffer from a variety of interpersonal problems, including favoritism that leaves some employees out in the cold, backstabbing that sabotages careers, routine complaining that increases negativity and rumour spreading that lowers morale (Sackett, Berry, Wiemann & Laczko, 2016). These behaviours risk workplace safety as well as violate laws. Within organisations today, counterproductive work behaviour is a huge issue which can have severe consequences. At least 30% of all organisations are believed to fail due to counterproductive work behaviours (Sackett, *et al.*, 2016). All it takes is one employee engaging in serious counterproductive work behaviour that has detrimental effects on the organisation.

Counterproductive work behaviours can harm organisations, employees and clients. It has been proposed that a person-by-environment interaction can be utilized to explain a variety of counterproductive work behaviour. For instance, an employee who is high on tendency to experience anger is more likely to respond to a stressful incident at work e.g being treated rudely by a supervisor with CWBs (Bowling & Gruys, 2010).

A potential variable that can determine counterproductive work behaviour is work engagement. Work engagement is a positive, fulfilling, affective-motivational state of work-related well-being that can be seen as the antidote of job burnout (Pflanz & Ogle, 2006). Engaged employees have high levels of energy, and are enthusiastically involved in their work. Most scholars agree that engagement includes an energy dimension and an

identification dimension (Pflanz & Ogle, 2006). Thus, engagement is characterized by a high level of vigor and strong identification with one's work. When engaged, employees feel compelled to strive towards a challenging goal (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008). Work engagement goes beyond responding to the immediate situation. Employees accept a personal commitment to attaining these goals. Further, work engagement reflects the personal energy employees bring to their work.

Studies have shown that work engagement is a determinant of counterproductive work behaviours. For example, Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti and Xanthopoulou (2007) reported that engaged workers had better coping strategies with stress eliciting stimuli compared to the poor coping strategies reported with workers that are less engaged and as a result engage less in CWBs. Also, Isen (2009) reported that work engagement is a significant predictor of counterproductive work behaviour among health workers. According to him, when workers are engaged with their work, they tend to enjoy everything about the work such that they tend to engage in behaviour that promote productivity. Isen (2000) also found a significant relationship between work engagement and counterproductive work behaviour.

Another variable of interest is organisational climate. The climate or the culture of an organisation maybe considered as the value system of an organisation. It is determined by values of the top management or leadership of the company (Hunter, Bedell & Mumford, 2007). Organisational climate can also be defined as set of perceptions, feelings and attitudes which employees have about the significant factors of the company. These reflect the established norms, value and belief systems of the company's climate and culture which in turn affects the employee's behaviour positively or negatively (Connelly, 2015). There are six types of organisational climate as posited by Halpin & Croft (1963), these include; open climate which entails the climate that people generally work well with each other. Autonomous climate is a climate where the employees have control over their objectives, the plan of action, self-governance and initiative. Generally, the morale of such people tends to be higher as they are independent in thinking, thus problem solving becomes better. Another type of organisational climate is controlled climate, in this environment, less independence is given to the individuals and more control is implied. Familiar climate is friendly and more socially oriented. Social connectivity and needs of the people are mainly considered in this type of organisational climate. Paternal climate is also a type of organisational climate where the employees are not motivated as the top management acts paternally, thus the behaviour of employees maybe insincere as well. Closed climate entails that there is neither concern for high achievement nor any social connectivity. As a result, employees may not work well together and top management maybe ineffective in its decisions and management of the people. The organisational

climate makes a critical link between the organisation's leaders and the organisation itself. Organisational climate serves as a measure of individual perceptions or feelings about the organisation, thus influencing the behaviour of employees including counterproductive work behaviours (Sosik & Dinger, 2007).

Despite efforts made by researchers and other stakeholders in industries to curb the counterproductive work behaviour of employees so that productivity may be improved, counterproductive work behaviour seems to remain a problem in the work space. Hence the present study which seeks to add to the relatively few indigenous literatures in the area and suggest other ways CWBs can be managed if not completely eliminated.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the study;

1. To what extent will work engagement determine counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants in Akwa Ibom State?
2. To what degree will organisational climate determine counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants?

Objective of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to examine work engagement and organisational climate as determinants of counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants in Akwa Ibom State. Specifically, the study will examine

1. Whether work engagement as a determinant of counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants in Akwa Ibom State.
2. The extent organisational climate will determine counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants in Akwa Ibom State.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be beneficial to organisational heads as it will provide knowledge on how counterproductive work behaviour can be curbed which will lead to improved organisational turnover, productivity and work performance. The findings will also stimulate the interest of researchers to probe into related areas and provide more insight on the causes, effects and management strategies of counterproductive work behaviour. The findings of the study will be relevant to students as it will serve as reference material for future research. The findings of this study will equally enlighten policy makers to formulate policies that will aid in curbing CWB specifically among civil servants.

Research Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that;

1. Civil servants who are less engaged in their work will report higher counterproductive work behaviour than those who are highly engaged in their work.
2. Civil servants in organisations with negative climate will engage more in counterproductive work behaviour than those organizations with positive climate.

II. METHODOLOGY

Design: The study was a cross section study that adopted a 2 x 2 factorial design. This is because there were two independent variables in the study with two levels each, analysed to establish their influence on the dependent variable.

Study Setting: The study was conducted at State Ministry of Education, and Finance, Idongesit Nkanga Secretariat and Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Trade/Investment, Federal Secretariat, Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State.

Participants: Two hundred and eight (208) participants made up of 119 males and 89 females were randomly selected from State Ministry of Education and Finance, Idongesit Nkanga Secretariat and Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Trade/Investment, Federal Secretariat, Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. Their ages ranged between 22 and 54 years and their mean age was 37.67 years.

Sampling Technique

A multi-stage sampling technique was used in the study. Simple random sampling was deployed to select the ministries. All the state and federal ministries in Akwa Ibom State were written on folder papers and a volunteer was asked to select two each from the group of state and federal ministries. The selected four were now samples for the study. Convenience sampling technique was used to select the actual participants for the study.

Instrumentation: A Questionnaire was used for data collection. The questionnaire was divided into 4 sections. Section A contained demographic variables of participants such as gender, age and academic qualification. Section B was the Work Engagement Scale developed by Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá and Bakker (2002). Section C was the Counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist (CWB-C) developed by Spector, Bauer and Fox (2010) while Section D was the Organisational Climate Scale developed by Patterson, West, Shackleton, Dawson, Lawthom, Maitlis, Robinson and Wallace (2005).

Work Engagement Scale: This is a 9-Item scale developed to measure affective-motivational state of work-related well-being that can be seen as the antidote of job burnout. The scale is on a

four-point Likert format of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. Scores of 18.98 and above indicate high work engagement while scores lower than the norm indicates low work engagement. A Cronbach's alpha of .81 is reported for the scale, indicative a robust reliability.

Counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist (CWB-C): This is a 17-item scale designed to assess participants' intentional unacceptable behaviour that has the potential to have negative consequences to their organisation and colleagues. It is rated on a 5 point Likert format of 1-5. The items on the scale are directly scored with 1 = Never, 2 = Once or Twice, 3 = Once or Twice Per Month, 4 = Once or Twice Per Week, 5 = Everyday. The higher the scores, the higher the counterproductive work behaviour. Spector, Bauer, and Fox (2010) revealed a Cronbach alpha of .72.

The Organisational Climate Scale: This is a 17-item scale designed to measure organisational climate as perceived by an employee. The scale is rated on a 4-point scoring format of 1 to 4. 1 = Definitely false, 2 = Mostly false, 3 = Mostly true, 4 = Definitely true. All items on the scale are directly scored. This implies that a score of 1 is awarded to Definitely false, 2 to Mostly false, 3 to Mostly true and 4 to Definitely true. The norm of the instrument is 60. This implies that a score of 60 and above indicates positive organisational climate while a score lower than 60 indicates negative organisational climate. A Cronbach alpha of .94 is reported for the scale, indicative of a high reliability.

Procedure: On arrival at the selected ministries, A director in each of selected ministries was met and the purpose of the study explained. Permission was sought and obtained for copies of the questionnaires to be administered to staff of the ministries. The participants were met in their offices and addressed on the purpose of the study. Upon consent, they were instructed to read the questionnaire carefully and respond to it with sincerity as it was not a test so there were no wrong or right answers. Thereafter, 250 copies of the questionnaire were administered. 237 copies were retrieved. Subsequently, 208 were correctly filled and used for data analysis.

Statistics: A two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed in testing the hypotheses. The justification for using this statistical tool was that it enabled the establishment of the extent the independent variables of interest (work engagement and organisational climate) determined the dependent variable (counterproductive work behaviours).

III. RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Summary of harmonic mean showing Work Engagement and Organisational Climate as Determinants of Counterproductive Work Behaviour.

		Work Engagement		Total
Organ. Climate		High	Low	
CWB	Positive	x = 60.35 SD = 14.46	x = 57.66 SD = 12.70	65.09
	Negative	x = 77.11 SD = 10.98	x = 69.55 SD = 16.14	70.72
Total		59.16	73.72	68.21

Results presented in Table 1 above indicate that civil servants who were less engaged in their work had a higher mean score than those who were highly engaged in their work (X = 73.72 vs 59.16 respectively). This means that civil servants who were less engaged in their work reported higher counterproductive work behaviour than those who were highly engaged in their work. Results presented in Table 1 above also reveal that civil servants in organisations with negative climate had a higher mean score than those in organisations with positive climate (X = 70.72 vs 65.09 respectively). This implies that civil servants in organisations with negative climate reported higher level of counterproductive work behaviour than those organisations with positive climate.

Table 2: Summary of a 2 X 2 ANOVA showing Work Engagement and Organisational Climate as Determinants of Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Engagement	1532.010	1	1532.010	8.276	<.05
Organisational Climate	11965.451	1	11965.451	64.640	<.05
A * B	345.391	1	345.391	1.866	>.05
Total	1228586.00	209			
Corrected Total	60606.382	208			

A means Work Engagement, B means Organisational Climate

Results presented in table 2 above indicate that work engagement was a significant determiner of counterproductive work behaviour [F = (1,208) 8.27; P<.05]. Furthermore, civil servants who were less engaged in their work had a higher mean score than those who were highly engaged in their work (X = 73.72 vs 59.16 respectively). This means that civil servants who were less engaged in their work reported higher counterproductive work behaviour than those who were highly engaged in their work. Therefore, the first hypothesis which stated that civil servants who are less engaged in their work will report higher counterproductive work behaviour than those who are highly engaged in their work was confirmed.

Result in table 2 also reveals that organisational climate was a significant determiner of counterproductive work behaviour [F = (1,208) 64.64; P<.05]. This significance was revealed in the significances in mean score where civil servants in organisations with negative climate had a higher mean score than those in organizations with positive climate (x = 70.72 vs 65.09 respectively). This implies that civil servants in organisations with negative climate reported higher level of counterproductive work behaviour than those in organisations with positive climate. Hence, the hypothesis earlier stated that civil servants in organisations with negative climate will engage more in counterproductive work behaviour than those organisations with positive climate was confirmed.

Result also reveal that there was no combined interaction influence of work engagement and organisational climate on counterproductive work behaviour [F= (1, 208), 1.86; P>.05]. This means that work engagement and organisational climate did not jointly determine counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants in Akwa Ibom State.

IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study examined work engagement and organisational climate as determinants of counterproductive work behaviours among civil Servants in Akwa Ibom State. The findings revealed that work engagement is a significant determinant of counterproductive work behaviours. This finding is consistent with the findings of Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti and Xanthopoulou (2007) who reported that work engagement predicted counterproductive work behaviours. This finding is also consistent with Isen (2009) who reported that high work engagement resulted in with less counterproductive work behaviours among workers. This finding is also in-line with the findings of Isen (2000) also found a significant relationship between work engagement and counterproductive work behaviours. It seems true because when workers are highly engaged in their work, they tend to seek the advancement of the organisation they are working. As a result, they may not engage in behaviours that are counterproductive. The study also revealed that organisational climate is a significant determinant of counterproductive work behaviours. This finding is consistent with the findings of Sosik and Dinger (2007) who reported that organisational climate had a significant influence on counterproductive work behaviours. This finding is also consistent with Connelly (2015) who reported that workers who are in friendly work environment reported less counterproductive work behaviours compared to workers in hostile work environment.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that work engagement is a significant determiner of counterproductive work behaviour among civil servants. It was also concluded that organisational climate is a

significant determiner of counterproductive work behaviours among civil servants. It was further concluded that work engagement and organisational climate do not jointly determine counterproductive work behaviours among civil servants.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

From the findings of the study, it is recommended that organisations should set up teams that will train leaders and employees on the best possible way to keep the work space positive and safe for everyone. This will reduce CWBs as the study revealed. Employees need to be trained on work engagement and incentives should be provided for workers who demonstrate engagement at work. This training will develop in them the interest to get more engaged in their work and show less CWBs. Provision should also be made for employees to find personal achievement on their jobs, this will make them more fulfilled, and less prone to engage in counterproductive work behaviours.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274–284.
- [2] Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200.
- [3] Bowling, N. A., & Gruys, M. L. (2010). New perspectives in the study of counterproductive behaviour in organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 20 (1), 54–61.
- [4] Connelly, C. (2015). How perpetrators and targets construe knowledge hiding in organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24 (3), 479–489.
- [5] Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (6), 1241–1255.
- [6] Duffy, M. (2009). Preventing workplace mobbing and bullying with effective organizational consultation, policies, and legislation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. 61 (3), 242–262.
- [7] Halpin, K & Croft, H. J (1963). The motivation to work and produce among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology*, 18, 393–402.
- [8] Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). Climate for creativity: A quantitative review. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(1), 69-90.
- [9] Isen, A. M. (2000). Positive affect and decision making. In M. Lewis, & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 417-435) (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- [10] Isen, A. M. (2009). A role for neuropsychology in understanding the facilitating influence of positive affect on social behaviour and cognitive processes. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 503–518). Oxford University Press.
- [11] Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., Robinson, D. L., & Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: Links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26(4), 379–408.
- [12] Pflanz, S. E., & Ogle, A. D. (2006). Job Stress, Depression, Work Performance, and Perceptions of Supervisors in Military Personnel. *Military Medicine*, 171(9), 861–865.
- [13] Sackett, P., Berry, C., Wiemann, S. & Laczó, R (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behaviour: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance*, 19 (4), 441–64.
- [14] Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92.
- [15] Sosik, J. J. & Dinger, S.L. (2007). Relationships between leadership style and vision content: The moderating role of need for social approval, self-monitoring, and need for social power, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(2), 134-153.
- [16] Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 781-790.