

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLEDGE

Organisational Culture as a Predictor of Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Benue State Civil Servants

Dr. Judith Ayangeawam Mase

Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria

Abstract:

This study examined organisational culture as a predictor of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) among Benue State civil servants. The study employed the cross-sectional survey method. Participants for the study were 420 civil servants systematically and randomly selected from 23 Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs) in the state. They were 285(67.9%) males, 127(30.2%) females, and 8(1.9%) respondents who failed to indicate their sex, with the mean age of 41.95 years and (SD=9.597). Instruments for data collection included the Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) Questionnaire and the Organisational Culture Questionnaire (OCQ). Multiple regression was used to test the hypothesis. Results revealed a significant joint influence of organisational culture factors in the prediction of CWB. Independently, power oriented and role culture were significant predictors of CWB while achievement and support cultures were not. It was concluded that organisational culture is a significant factor in the prediction of CWB and its dimensions among the Benue State civil servants. It was therefore recommended that the Government and management of public organisations should strengthen their organisational culture such as making policies that will ensure strict adherence to the rules and regulations of the organisation.

Keywords: Counterproductive work behaviour, organisational culture, Benue State, Civil servants

1. Introduction

There has been renewed interest among researchers on the concept of Counterproductive Work Behaviours (CWBs) in recent times. Levy and Tziner (2011) linked the renewed interest to the observed negative consequences of counterproductive work behaviours and their persistence in the workplace. Spector (2011) looks at the term counterproductive work behaviour as a volitional behaviour that harms or intends to harm organisations or people in organisations. Chang and Smithikrai (2010) on their part define counterproductive workplace behaviour as a class of behaviour that acts against the interests of the organisation, which individuals, usually, consciously choose to engage in. CWB is an aggregated set of behaviours, and not just a single type once in a while behaviour. Fleeson and Nettle (2009) assert that, aggregated behaviours are more consistent across time and situations compared to single behaviours, and they can be predicted more reliably by personality and situational variables.

Gruys and Saccett (2003) classified these behaviours into eleven main dimensions: Theft and other related behaviours; destruction of property; misuse of information; misuse of time and resources; unsafe behaviour; poor attendance; poor quality work; alcohol use; drug use; inappropriate verbal actions; and inappropriate physical actions. Seçer and Seçer (2007) declared that such unfavourable behaviours may hamper job performance of the employee. According to Bukhari and Ali (2009), CWB is very dangerous for the organisation as employees who engage in it tend to play a role which altogether reverses the organisation's progression.

Counterproductive work behaviours are prevalent among employees in many organisations but much of it apparently goes unnoticed, unreported, or both (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). Atkinson et al. (2000) suggests that there might be a possibility that organisations will not report counterproductive work behaviour to protect the reputation of the organisation concerned. Nevertheless, the regularity and widespread occurrences of counterproductive work behaviours receive public attention through the frequency of media reports which are often based on reliable sources. These include cases involving dishonesty, bribery and poor work attitude (Utusan 2010).

Hitherto, researches in industrial/organisational psychology focused mainly on positive behaviours in organisation while neglecting the negative behaviour. Infact, Ansari, Shokoofeh and Shirin (2013), stated that for years, research in industrial/organisational mindset has focused on determining relationships between personal features such as: behaviour, values, abilities, skills, past encounters, and character traits; and suitable workplace behaviours such as: inspiration, pro-social actions, and productivity. Studying only positive behavior may help in achieving organisational goals at the expense of employees' wellbeing as their interest may not necessarily be represented, which may give rise to CWB. Monnastes (2010) also maintained that, while it is essential to know the aspects that give rise to a successful working relationship between a person and an organisation, it is also essential to understand the aspects that may give rise to unwanted actions, such as deviant work behaviours, also referred to as CWB. It is therefore, imperative to conduct a study on counterproductive work behaviour among the civil servants in Benue State.

Galperin and Bennett (2006) asserted that CWB is on the increase especially in the public sectors. Presently, the activities of CWB are prevalent among civil servants in the Nigeria as well as Benue State civil service. Ogbodo, Jimoh, and Onochie (2012), reported that the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) uncovered many employees in the civil service that looted their organisations thereby rendering such organisations ineffective. In Benue State civil service, Ikhilae (2015) reported that a lot fraud has been found among public servants amounting to billions of Naira.

Some researchers like Biron (2010) are of the view that counterproductive behaviours are likely to be caused by both individual and organisational factors. The present study focuses on organisational culture as possible antecedent of CWBs. Martins and Martins (2003) gave a general definition of organisational culture as a system of shared meaning held by members, distinguishing the organisation from other organisations. Arnold (2005) indicates that organisational culture is the distinctive norms, beliefs, principles and ways of behaving that combine to give each organisation its distinct character. These two definitions suggest that organisational culture distinguishes one organisation from another. By implication, it means each organisational culture is unique to that organisation. Therefore, organisational culture is to an organisation what personality is to an individual (Johnson, 1990).

According to Wagner (1995), organisational culture has a strong influence on employees' behaviour and attitudes and it is crucial to understanding organisational behaviour. Organisational culture is very important to both the organisation and its employees. In the view of Flynn and Chatman (2001), like all social mechanisms, an organisation's culture performs certain social functions, some of them intended and some of them unintended. Like organisational structure, organisational culture is difficult to observe, measure or map. In some cases, organisational culture supports or reinforces structure, in others it conflicts with structure, in yet other situations, culture acts as a functional alternative to reducing behavioural variability in organisations. It is contended that organisational culture acts as a system of social control and can influence employees' attitudes and behaviours through the values and beliefs operating in a company.

Furthermore, Eric and MacIntosha (2010) have shown that organisational culture holds the organisation together and encourages employees not only to perform well but also to feel committed to the organisation. They argue that, although organisational culture is implicit in organisational activities, researchers have proved that organisational culture does affect performance and efficiency. They asserted that organisational culture has been a direct influence on employee positive behaviour such as staff satisfaction and commitment. Against this background, the present study focuses on organisational culture as a predictor of counter productive work behaviour among civil servants in Benue State.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Counterproductive Work Behaviour

The history and progression of counterproductive work behaviour is credited to the work of Taylor, a scholar of scientific management who assessed employee soldiering around 1911 up till the work of Hollinger and Clark (1982) who were the first researchers to make a significant breakthrough in understanding CWB. They established two categories of employee deviance: (i) property deviance, which include behaviours such as theft and damage to property and (ii) production deviance, which includes behaviours relating to not being on the job as scheduled (absence, tardiness) and behaviours that detract from production while on the job (drug and alcohol use, slow or sloppy work). Robinson and Bennett (1995) extended this typology into a useful framework. Following a multidimensional scaling analysis, a CWB typology emerged that varies along two dimensions: organisational/interpersonal directed behaviour and serious/minor counter-productivity. The resulting four quadrants are: production deviance (organisational/minor), property deviance (organisational/serious), political deviance (interpersonal/minor), and personal aggression (interpersonal/serious).

While Hollinger and Clark's (1983) model mainly focused on behaviours intended to harm the organisation, Robinson and Bennett (1995) found that CWBs can be directed at individuals as well, which in turn negatively impacts the organisation. This interpersonal dimension of CWB includes aggressive or abusive acts that harm supervisors, subordinates, peers, and customers.

Counterproductive workplace behaviour (CWB) is known by various names. Synonyms used in the literature for counterproductive work behaviours include antisocial behaviours (Giacalone, Riordon, & Rosenfeld, 1997), deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), destructive behaviours (Murphy, 1993; Warren, 2003), misbehaviours (Southey, 2010), and bad behaviours (Griffin & Lopez, 2005). These are broad terms that represent a host of specific negative workplace behaviours including absenteeism, lateness, theft, sabotage, substance use, hostility, obstructionism, verbal aggression, and sexual harassment. According to Marcus *et al.* (2013), the content overlap between measures of workplace deviance and counterproductive work behaviour seems almost perfect, and hence, both terms are used interchangeably.

Over the years, various researchers have studied a similar set of behaviours, though they have used different terminologies depending on their theoretical focus, which include: organisational delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), organisation-motivated aggression (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), organisational retaliatory behaviours (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996), workplace deviance, (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), revenge (Bies & Tripp, 1998), and antisocial behaviour in organisations (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997). Earlier studies by Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, and Kessler (2006), named such negative acts to include direct aggression, theft, purposely failing to follow instructions or to perform work incorrectly, in the interest of violating significant organisational norms.

Many researchers define counterproductive work behaviour in different ways. According to O'Boyle Jr. (2010), counterproductive work behaviour is a collection of deliberate behaviours that harm the organisation or its members. Chang and Smithikrai (2010) defined counterproductive work behaviour as a class of behaviours that act against the interests of the organisation which individuals, usually, consciously choose to engage in. They explained counterproductive work behaviour as voluntary or purposeful behaviours

that function against the passions of the organisation. Gruys and Sackett (2003) on their part defined counterproductive work behaviour as any intentional behaviour on the part of an organisational member viewed by the organisation as contrary to its legitimate interests. To Spector and Fox (2002), CWB refers to behaviour by employees that harms an organisation or its members (such as other employees, customers, suppliers etc.) and includes acts such as theft, sabotage, verbal abuse, withholding of effort, lying, refusing to cooperate, and physical assault (Penney & Spector, 2005).

A few criteria have been proposed for labeling or defining work behaviours as counterproductive. First, the behaviours should be intentional and volitional (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Behaviours that lead to negative consequences but are accidental are not considered counterproductive. Secondly, although the behaviours are potentially harmful, they need not actually lead to any harm (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Thirdly, the behaviour could be directed at either the organization, for example, poor attendance and misuse of time and resources, or at other individuals within the workplace for example, inappropriate verbal actions (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Fourthly, the perpetrators of these counterproductive work behaviours should typically be organisational members. This is because unwanted behaviours from outsiders can be quite harmful, lead to negative consequences and tend to be a source of concern for organisations and their employees. Moreover, these behaviours from outsiders are sometimes harder to control than those perpetrated by organisational members. In addition, organisations are primarily concerned with controlling the behaviours of their employees (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). Fifth, the behaviours should be contrary to the legitimate interest of the organisation (Sackett, 2002). Employees may engage in behaviours that are contrary to the interest of the organisation and yet, these behaviours may not be deviant or wrong.

Counterproductive work behaviours violate organisational norms, are detrimental to the interests of the organisation, and hinder the attainment of organisational goals. They are voluntary behaviours that lead to negative relational outcomes in other members, such as increased frustration, humiliation, and aggression (Ayoko, Callan, & Hartel, 2003), which in turn may have a moderating effect on job performance (Aube, Rousseau, Mama, and Morin, 2009). They can also lead to negative organisational outcomes such as time wasting, sabotage, and vandalism (Lanyon & Goldstein, 2004). One of the main harmful outcomes of counterproductive work behaviours is the economic threat it poses to organisations (Appelbaum, Deguire, & Lay, 2005; Bennett & Robinson, 2003). Hollinger and Clark (1982) maintained that such acts reduce the efficiency and job performance of its members and basically threaten the health and wellbeing of the organisations and its members.

There are also psychological reactions to CWB which include feelings of depression and anxiety (Bjorkvist, Osterman & Hjelt-Back, 1994), psychosocial problems (Kaukiainen, Salmivalli, Bjorkvist & Osterman, 2001); emotional exhaustion (O'Brien & Vandello, 2005; Tepper, 2000); life dissatisfaction (Tepper, 2000); and decrements in emotional well-being (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2000). Self-esteem, and self-confidence (Price, 1995) are other psychological strains related to CWB. Work-related psychological reactions are job dissatisfaction, work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict (Tepper, 2000), and decrements in job-related affect (Schat & Kelloway, 2003), normative commitment, and affective commitment (Tepper, 2000). Physical reactions include physical symptoms (Kaukiainen, Salmivalli, Bjorkvist & Osterman, 2001) and decrements in psychosomatic well-being (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2002; Schat & Kelloway, 2003).

According to Hoel, Einarsen and Cooper (2003), even though CWBs are more difficult to quantify, the negative psychological impact of workplace deviance can translate into reduced employee morale, higher rates of absenteeism and turnover, and lower productivity. Such losses to organisation and negative emotions to individuals will affect organisational performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Harper, 1990). From the foregoing, it is clear that CWB is an aggregated set of behaviours, rather than single type behaviour. Sackett and DeVore (2001) have suggested that CWB be summed up as a hierarchical model. This model suggests that CWB be looked at as an overall counterproductive construct, with other suggested dimensionality being organized underneath this. Based on this, different researchers classified them in various groups based on different views.

Gruys and Sackett (2003) grouped these behaviours into eleven broad dimensions with the negative acts that comprised them. These are: (i) Theft and related behaviour e.g. helping another person or advising them on how to take company property or merchandise; take cash or property belonging to the company; misuse of business expense account, taking cash or property belonging to a co-worker; taking office supplies from the company; taking petty cash from the company; taking cash or property belonging to a customer; give away goods or services for free; providing goods or services at less than the price established by the company; misuse of employee discount privileges. (ii) Destruction of property e.g. defacing, damaging, or destroying property belonging to a coworker; defacing, damaging, or destroying property, belonging to a customer; defacing, damaging, or destroying property, equipment, or product belonging to the company; deliberately sabotaging the production of product in the company. (iii) Misuse of information e.g. destroying or falsification of company records or documents; discuss confidential matters with unauthorised personnel within or outside the organisation; intentionally failing to give a supervisor or co-worker necessary information; providing the organisation with false information to obtain a job, lying to employer or supervisor to cover up a mistake. (iv) Misuse of time and resources e.g. conducting personal business during work time; spending time on the internet for reasons not related to work; taking a long lunch or coffee break without approval; wasting time on the job; wasting company resources; use of company resources you are not authorised to use; making personal long distance calls at work; mail personal packages at work; making personal photocopies at work; use email for personal purposes; play computer games during work time; and work unnecessary overtime. (v) Unsafe behaviour e.g. endangering yourself by not following safety procedures; endangering coworker by not following safety procedures; endangering customer by not following safety procedures; failing to read the manual outlining safety procedures. (vi) Poor attendance e.g. being absent from work without a legitimate excuse; intentionally coming to work late; using sick leave when not really sick; leaving work early without permission; missing work without calling in. (vii) Poor quality work e.g. intentionally performing your job below acceptable standards; intentionally doing work badly or incorrectly; intentionally doing slow or sloppy work. (viii) Alcohol use e.g.

coming to work under the influence of alcohol; having your performance affected due to a hangover from alcohol; engaging in alcohol consumption on the job. (ix) Drug use e.g. engaging in drug use on the job, coming to work under the influence of drugs, possessing or selling drugs on company property, and having your performance affected due to a hangover from drugs. (x) Inappropriate verbal action e.g. arguing or fighting with a co-worker; yelling or shouting on the job; verbally abusing a customer; verbally abusing a co-worker; verbally abusing a supervisor; using sexually explicit language in the workplace; arguing or fighting with a supervisor; arguing or fighting with a customer. (xi) Inappropriate physical action e.g. physically attacking a co-worker; physically attacking a customer; physically attacking a supervisor; making unwanted sexual advances toward a subordinate; making unwanted sexual advances toward a co-worker; making unwanted sexual advances toward a customer.

Despite the costs and prevalence of counterproductive behaviours in organisations, the information related to deviance in workplace is limited. The negative behaviours earlier mentioned above are only a tip of an iceberg because counterproductive work behaviours are often not heard about until they either result in serious losses that can be directly observed, or the behaviour is so severe that it reaches court. In reality, we will never truly know the extent to counterproductive work behaviour. So, the abnormal nature of these behaviours makes the studying and identifying their predictions crucial.

2.2. Organisational Culture

The concept of organisational culture first emerged in the 1970s and 1980s (Hofstede 1981), and soon became one of the most influential but also most controversial concepts in management research and practice. Although psychologists have been using the concepts of "group norms" and "climate" for a long time, the concept of "organisational culture" has been explicitly used only in the last few decades. Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) maintained that a culture is not something an organisation has, it is something an organisation is. To them, every organisation has its own definition. Some examples are: "Company Style", "The way we do things around here", and "Company Philosophy". Trefry (2006) on his part stated that organisational culture has been one of the most influential concepts and biggest management buzzwords of the last several decades. This concept emerges from the fields of Anthropology and Sociology and became a major topic of organisational research in the 1980s (Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985).

The origin of organisational culture from a national culture point of view is based, among others, on the work of Deal and Kennedy (1982). According to this view organisational culture is seen as being central to organisational success rather than factors such as structure, strategy or politics. As a result the attention shifted away from national cultures and focused more on organisational culture. They argued that culture is the single most important factor accounting for success or failure in organisations and identified four key dimensions of culture: (i) Values– the beliefs that lie at the heart of the corporate culture; (ii) Heroes– the people who embody values; (iii) Rites and rituals– routines of interaction that have strong symbolic qualities; and (iv) The culture network– the informal communication system or hidden hierarchy of power in the organisation.

A basic and formal definition of organisational culture offered by Schein (1992) is that it is a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. Harrison (1993) on his part defined organisational culture as the distinctive constellation of beliefs, values, work styles, and relationships that distinguish one organisation from another. Linking up with the above definitions, Schein (1985) also defines organisational culture as a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. This description highlights that organisational culture is created assumptions, which are accepted as a way of doing things and are passed on to new members of an organisation.

Lewis (2002) has stated that a universal definition of organisational culture has proven elusive. Trefry (2006) also noted that the problem of defining organisational culture derives from the fact that the concept of organisation is itself ambiguous. While there is no single widely accepted definition, there appears to be some agreement that every definition should place emphasis on a range of social phenomena, including a common pattern of values, beliefs, symbols, meanings, and assumptions held by organisational members (Aycan, Tang, & Wallach, 2000; Chow & Liu, 2009; Nwugwo & Loi, 2008; Ogbonna & Harris, 2002). Lewis (2002) therefore, considered organisational culture to be the shared values, beliefs, and assumptions that exist among employees within an organisation that help guide and coordinate behaviour. Brown (1998) as cited in Manetje and Martins (2009) defined organisational culture as the pattern of beliefs, values, and learned ways of coping with experience that have developed during the course of an organisation's history, and which tend to be manifested in its material arrangements and in the behaviours of its members. This suggests that organisational culture is articulated in the organisation in order to shape the way in which its members should behave.

Harrison (1993) defined organisational culture as the distinctive constellation of beliefs, values, work styles, and relationships that distinguish one organisation from another. In other words, organisational culture includes those qualities of the organisation that give it a particular climate or feel. He further stated that as a result the distinct qualities of an organisation may manifest through four dimensions, namely power, role, achievement and support.

2.2.1. Power Dimension

Describes an organisational culture that is based on inequality of access to resources. It has a single source of power from which rays of influence spread throughout the organisation. This means that power is centralized and organisational members are connected to the center by functional and specialist strings. Some of the features of this orientation include a strong and charismatic leader that rewards loyal followers. The leader acts unilaterally but in the best interest of the organisation (Harrison, 1993).

2.2.2. Role Dimension

This typology is concerned with job description and specialization. Very important is the fact that rules and procedures form the basis of job description and tend to prioritize the realization of goals with limited emphasis on the personnel who function in the organisation. Organisational life in role cultures is dominated by the use of privileges, rights, legality and legitimacy, with people having clearly delegated authorities in a highly defined structure. A weakness is that job functions are strictly defined with little room for innovation. Thus, deviation from the norm is discouraged and it is difficult to get changes approved (Harrison, 1993).

2.2.3. Achievement Dimension

An achievement type of organisational culture aligns employees with a common vision or purpose. The achievement orientation realises the organisation's common vision or purpose by using the organisation's mission to attract and release employees' personal energy in the pursuit of common goals, where the organisation's mission is used to focus the personal energy of the organisation's employees (Harrison and Stokes, 1992). Systems and structures are necessary in an achievement-oriented organisation, and are in place to serve the organisation's mission (Harmse, 2001; Harrison and Stokes, 1992). According to them these systems and structures are altered when alterations in the mission occur, and are therefore more flexible than the rules of law of the role orientation.

2.2.4. Support Dimension

The support organisational culture is based on mutual trust between the employee and the organisation. Employees working within a support-orientated organisational culture believe that they are valued as human beings, not just as contributors to a task (Harrison, 1993; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). An organisation that has a support culture has a warm and caring atmosphere, where the assumption is that a sense of belonging will create a sense of commitment to the organisation and therefore employees will contribute more within the organisation (Harmse, 2001; Harrison and Stokes, 1992).

The roles played by culture in organisations cannot be over emphasized. The main function of organisational culture is to define the way of doing things in order to give meaning to organisational life (Arnold, 2005). Making meaning is an issue of organisational culture, because organisational members need to benefit from the lessons of previous members. As a result, organisational members are able to profit from whatever trials and errors regarding knowledge others have been able to accumulate (Johnson, 1990). Organisational culture also determines organisational behaviour, by identifying principal goals; work methods; how members should interact and address each other; and how to conduct personal relationships (Harrison, 1993).

Schein (1995) maintained that generally and broadly, it has been agreed that the culture of the organisation offers a 'social glue' that provides distinctiveness, coherence, and a specific track to the organisations. Furnham and Gunter (1993) summarize the functions of organisational culture as internal integration and coordination. Other important functions of organizational culture are that (i) it determines the kind of people who will be attracted to the organisation and who will be successful in it; (ii) It also gives clear direction for the training and development of individuals by defining what is, and what is not important, and what skills the individual needs to do well in the organization; (iii) Culture also implies stability, patterning of behaviours, and reflects all aspects of group life. It recognizes that our working environments are extensions of ourselves and directs attention to symbolic significance. Members can identify the specifics of it from how information is communicated, feedback is given, performance is managed, and projects are co-ordinated within the organisation. It is reflected in the way the corporation or institution is structured; whether work is conducted cross-functionally or within silos, how the hierarchical levels are set up, and the types of job titles used.

Brown (1995) also identified a large number of functions that can be attributed to organisational culture. Some of the most significant functions are said to include: conflict reduction, coordination and control, motivation and competitive advantage. Greenberg and Baron (2003) however, have a differing view of the role of culture to that of Brown. They stated that culture plays several important roles within an organisation, such as: providing a sense of identity; generating organisational commitment, as well as commitment to the organisation's mission; and clarifies and reinforces standards of behaviour. They further stated that if organisations serve these three important roles, then it will be clear that culture is an important force that influences employee attitudes and behaviours within organisations. This will result in the employees being more committed to their organisation, and therefore they will deliver higher standards of service.

Although all organisations have cultures, some appear to have stronger, more deeply rooted cultures than others. A strong organisational culture refers to organisations in which beliefs and values are shared relatively consistently throughout an organisation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). According to Martins & Martins (2003), many proponents of organisational culture tended to assume that a strong, pervasive culture is beneficial to all organisations because it fosters motivation, commitment, identity, solidarity, and sameness, which, in turn, facilitates internal integration and coordination. Strong organisational cultures have a great influence on the behaviour of organisational members. In other words, a strong culture is a powerful lever for guiding behaviour. Brown (1998) also believes that strong organisational culture can enable an organisation to achieve high performance based on the reasons that a strong organisational culture facilitates goal alignment, leads to high levels of employee motivation, and is better able to learn from its past. The second prominent way a dysfunctional culture may sustain itself is through social pressures stemming from coworker behaviours. Individuals (especially recent entrants into an organisation) often scan their immediate environments for information regarding norms, values and general appropriate behaviour. Thus, others serve as role models. In a case of a dysfunctional culture, these negative role models may influence an individual's own deviant behaviour (MacLean, 2001). In one case noted by Eddleston, Kidder and Litzky (2002), senior bartenders taught new employees to ignore certain policies so that tips could be increased. Even if an organisation does not have a dysfunctional culture, deviant sub-cultures may still emerge among individuals. The sub-cultures may take precedence over formal organisational norms and values (Parilla, Hollinger, & Clark, 1988). As Litzky and colleagues (2006) suggest, groups with

deviant sub-cultures may provide adequate social support for deviant behaviours, while simultaneously helping members of the group avoid the stigmatization and guilt that often accompanies deviance. In fact, research suggests that even with other factors controlled, the deviant behaviour of a group is a significant predictor of an individual's deviancy (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). Not surprising, such a contagion effect has even been found with other antisocial behaviours, such as swearing (Baruch & Jenkins, 2007). A weak culture on the other hand, means the opposite of a strong culture. In other words, organisational members do not subscribe to the shared beliefs, values, and norms. O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) asserted that, organisational members in a weak culture find it difficult to identify with the organisation's core values and goals. They further stated that organisations which have cultures that are too strong can become resistant to change and will be slow to adapt to their environment. People may only notice their culture when the routine breaks down and they have to deal with something unexpected. Having a knowledge and understanding of the culture can help the members of a culture predict how the organisation may respond and deal with the unexpected event.

2.3. Organisational Culture and Counterproductive Work Behaviour

There are few studies that directly relate organisational culture to counterproductive work behaviour. Most other studies simply examine some elements or similar constructs such as climate and psychological contract violation. Kandula (2006) particularly notes that owing to organisational culture differences, same strategies do not yield same results for two organisations even in the same industry and same location. According to him a supportive and strong culture can stimulate an average employee to perform brilliantly whereas a negative and weak culture may demotivate an outstanding employee to underperform. Herscovis, *et al.* (2007) asserts that organisational constraints which refers to the extent to which conditions at work interfere with job tasks, has been shown to relate to CWB so that jobs with high constraints have employees who engage in CWB. Murphy, Shantz, Free and Branston (2011) carried out a study to examine the role of organisational culture in the perpetration of fraud. Their survey was administered to three groups of individuals these are those who: (i) witnessed fraud; (ii) investigated fraud, and (iii) perpetrated fraud within an organisation. They found that there is not only a separate predictor of fraud emanating from organisational culture –they label “instrumental values” –but elements of culture and organisational influence are also present in several motives and rationalizations. Results suggest that organisational culture should be explicitly woven into the fraud triangle.

A study by Shafie (2009) which the purpose was to examine and gain a better understanding of the drivers of counterproductive work behaviour in banking sector was done among 116 staff in Citibank, CIMB bank and Bank Islam in Penang. Data were gathered through questionnaires and was being analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 13. Throughout the statistical analysis – correlation analysis, it was found that there was a significant relationship between the two independent variables namely Ethical Work Climate and Moral Awareness with the dependent variables – Counterproductive Work Behaviour. Among the two independent variables, Ethical Work Climate is found to be the factor that contributes most to Counterproductive Work Behaviour in the sample studied in Banking Sector.

Eschleman, Bowling, Michel, and Burns (2014)'s study titled Perceived intent of supervisor as a moderator of the relationships between abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviours did not just focus on how these workers felt or whether they started to dislike their jobs more, but also looked at consequences that actually affected the bottom line of an organisation. The study included work data from 268 full-time employees selected from an online survey of more than 80,000 people. Their study found that employees who are verbally abused by supervisors, even if it is intended as motivational are still more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviours. To them motivational abuse such as when a coach berates players or a sergeant humiliates cadets is seen as a violation. The fallout from this abuse is not limited to the supervisor and employee as it can in fact affect an entire company if it leads to loss of work time or theft, Eschleman warned. Workers may see any kind of abuse as "a violation of how they expect to be treated," Eschleman said. "Yet the overall results of the study suggested that abuse will not lead to a more productive workplace. The researchers found that employees aim these counterproductive behaviours both at the supervisors and at the organisation as a whole.

Apau and Yobo (2014) investigated the impact of organisational culture on employee work behaviour on Ho Municipal Assembly, a Local Government Authority in Ghana. Using the mixed method approach, 93 employees completed questionnaires on organisational culture and employee behaviour. Eleven (11) senior management employees were also purposefully selected and interviewed. Results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson's correlation and content analysis approach. Findings revealed that no significant relationship existed between organisational culture and counterproductive work behaviour. The dominant organisational culture of the selected organisation was found to be power culture. This study concludes that enacting the appropriate organisational culture is indispensable to achieving desirable employee behaviours.

Qureshi, Rasli, and Zaman (2014) conducted a study titled a new trilogy to understand the relationship among organisational climate; workplace bullying and employee health in Pakistan. The objective of the study was to examine the relationship between organisational climates, workplace bullying and workers' health in selected higher education institutes of Pakistan. A proportionate random sample of 20 Universities comprising of 10 from public sector and 10 from private sector was selected for the study. The model of workplace bullying, organisational climate and worker's health was estimated by Structural Equation Modeling using AMOS software. The study found a negative relationship between organisational climate and bullying on one hand, while on the other hand, an increased workplace bullying affects employees' health negatively due to affected sleeping hours. Drug abuse was treated as a moderator between health and affected sleeping hours. The study suggested that organisations should control workplace bullying which may cause physical and psychological effects on employee's health.

Ernst's (2001) study of public organisations in the United States of America attributed the decline in employees' productive behaviours to the corporate cultures which were incongruent to the changing expectation of stakeholders and stressed that

organisational culture has the ability to improve corporate effectiveness. He contends that without considering the impact of organisational culture, organisational practices could be counterproductive because the two are interdependent, and a change in one will impact the other.

Semmer, Tschan, Meier, Facchin, and Jacobshagen (2010) uncovered an interesting predictor to CWB: illegitimate tasks. Illegitimate tasks are tasks that are assigned to employees that undermine their professional identities by the organisation. That is, employees have jobs and professions that involve a set of “normal” or “typical” tasks. This also implies that some tasks and/or duties should not be expected of certain employees (e.g., assigning a medical doctor to repair an air conditioner). According to them, the assignment of illegitimate tasks (either unreasonable or unnecessary tasks), can undermine employees’ professional (and perhaps social) identities, and possibly lead to CWB. As expected, they found that when employees perceive that they are assigned illegitimate tasks at work they are more likely to engage in CWBs targeted toward organisational members or the organisation itself. They stated clearly that managers should be careful when delegating tasks to certain employees. If employees view these work assignments as unreasonable or unnecessary given their profession, then they will be more likely to engage in CWBs. They further stated that since many supervisors are focused on the big picture (i.e., the overall goals of the organisational unit) they may simply be unaware that the employees that are assigned such tasks only managed to complete them. Clearly then, it is important to communicate to managers that employees do appraise tasks as being legitimate/illegitimate which can potentially lead to counterproductive behaviours.

Naicker (2008) investigated the preferred as well as the existing culture and employee commitment levels at a South African company. The research reviewed the various types of culture, how culture is created and ways in which culture can be sustained or changed. Ways to cultivate employee commitment and retain skilled employees were also closely explored in this research study. The key results of the research findings revealed that there was a strong achievement culture prevalent at the company, with a good mix of the other culture types like, role culture, power culture and support culture. The employees at Riverview Paper Mill also strongly preferred an achievement and support type, culture.

According to Jensen, Opland, and Ryan (2010), CWBs occur as a result of a perceived breach of the psychological contract by the employer or organisation. In their study, they examined the possibility of numerous types of CWBs occurring as the result of a perceived breach of the psychological contract or the employee’s inherent expectations about how the reciprocal relationship between employer and employee ought to be. They found that when employees are moved to retaliate to feeling a lost sense of their employers caring about them, they are most likely to engage in abuse behaviours, which include threatening and undermining one’s co-workers. This implies that CWB in organisations will be as a result of the employer or organisation’s failure to comply with the initial working conditions agreed upon with the employee. Furthermore, organisations that fail to reward their employees that exhibit organisation citizenship behaviour definitely will cause its employees to engage in CWB thereby reducing its productivity.

In a similar way a recent study by Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, Zagenczyk (2013) found that certain organisational characteristics are responsible for causing an increase in bad behaviour. The study found that abusive supervision by supervisors/managers is to be blamed. Abusive supervision occurs when managers belittle their employees or treat them badly. When this happens, employees have lower perception of organisational support- meaning employees do not feel that the organisation cares about them or values their contributions.

Another study by Mohammed, Shokoofeh, Shirin, and Hojjat (2013) investigated the effect of personality (conscientiousness, trait anger), job (skill variety, feedback) and organisational (distributive justice, organisational constraints) factors on counterproductive work behaviours (CWB), involved a total number of 185 employees (men and women) of Second Gas Transmission Operational Area in Iran. The research model estimated with structural equation modeling. Results of estimate indicated that there were significant positive relationships between perceived organisational constraints with total counterproductive behaviour and its dimensions. Furthermore it was indicated that perceived organisational constraints has the strongest effect on CWB.

2.4. Hypothesis

Organisational culture of different dimensions viz: power oriented, role, achievement, and support will independently and jointly predict counterproductive work behaviour significantly among the Benue State civil servants.

3. Method

3.1. Design

The study employed cross-sectional survey method to investigate personality factors as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour among Benue State civil servants as a subgroup within the entire Nigeria civil service population.

3.2. Participants

The participants for this study were 420 civil servants drawn from the population of 23,217 civil servants in the 80 Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) that comprised the entire Benue State Civil Service as at the time of this research.

3.3. Instruments

The instrument for the study was questionnaire which was divided into three parts; section A, B and C. Section A contained demographic data of the respondents which include the sex, age in years, tenure, grade level, and level of education. Section B is the Organisational Culture Questionnaire while Section C is the Counterproductive Work Behaviour Scale.

3.3.1. Organisational Culture Questionnaire

The researcher developed this scale with 63 items for the purpose of identifying and measuring organisational culture. Of the 63 items, only item 12 was negatively worded and reversed in scoring. It measured four aspects of organisational culture: power oriented; role; achievement; and support cultures. Items were measured on a five-point Likert format. It has 5 responses ranging from Disagree strongly=1, Disagree =2, Undecided=3, Agree =4, Agree strongly=5, with organisations with higher score on power oriented, role, and achievement cultures indicating high levels of employee engagement in CWB, but high score on support culture indicates low levels of employee engagement in CWB. The reliability coefficients for pilot and main study are .95 and .96 respectively. Also reliability coefficients for the subscales were .91 for Power oriented culture, .78 for Role culture, .84 for Achievement, and .88 for Support culture.

3.3.2. Counterproductive Work Behaviour Scale

Counterproductive work behaviour questionnaire is a standardized scale developed by Gruys and Sackett (2003) to measure counterproductive work behaviours of employee in organisations. It has 11 subscales and a total number of 66 items. It has 5 response option: No matter the circumstance, I would never engage in that behaviour = 1, I would not engage in that behaviour = 2, I would rarely engage in that behaviour = 3, In some circumstances, I would engage in that behaviour = 4, and In a wide variety of circumstances, I would engage in that behaviour = 5, with higher scores indicating high engagement in CWB. The reliability coefficients for pilot and main study are .97 and .90 respectively.

3.4. Data Analysis

Responses of participants to the questionnaire were coded and entered into the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. The standard multiple regression was used to test the independent and joint influence of personality traits (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism) on counterproductive work behaviours.

4. Results

DVs	R	R ²	F	df	P	β	t	P
Constant							33.84	.000
Power						-.180	-2.50	.01
Role	.302	.091	10.36	4,413	.001	-.219	-2.92	.01
Achievement						.051	0.61	.54
Support						.041	0.54	.59
Theft								
Constant							13.23	.000
Power						-.137	-1.88	.06
Role	.275	.076	8.47	4,413	.001	-.246	-3.25	.001
Achievement						.103	1.22	.22
Support						.010	0.13	.89
Destruction of property								
Constant							12.02	.00
Power						-.145	-1.99	.05
Role	.268	.072	7.97	4,413	.001	-.195	-2.58	.01
Achievement						.033	0.39	.70
Support						.031	0.40	.69
Misuse of Information								
Constant							12.49	.00
Power						-.214	-2.92	.004
Role	.255	.065	7.16	4,413	.001	-.176	-2.32	.02
Achievement						.111	1.31	.19
Support						.047	0.61	.55
Time and resource misuse								
Constant							15.20	.00
Power						-.150	-2.06	.04
Role						-.126	-1.67	.10
Achievement	.269	.072	8.03	4,413	.001	.006	0.07	.94
Support						-.025	-0.32	.75

Unsafe behaviour								
Constant							10.93	.00
Power							-1.44	-1.90 .06
Role							-.163	-2.03 .04
Achievement	.201	.040	4.28	4,409	.002		.037	0.42 .68
Support							.089	1.11 .27
Poor attendance								
Constant							13.54	.00
Power							-.120	-1.65 .10
Role	.278	.078	8.66	4,412	.001		-.187	-2.47 .01
Achievement							.059	0.70 .48
Support							-.053	-0.69 .49
Poor quality work								
Constant							12.45	.000
Power							-.125	-3.46 .001
Role	.276	.076	8.52	4,412	.001		-.093	-1.22 .22
Achievement							.045	0.53 .60
Support							.021	0.27 .79
Alcohol use								
Constant							9.28	.00
Power							-.128	-1.72 .09
Role	.174	.030	3.20	4,412	.01		-.130	-1.67 .10
Achievement							.084	0.97 .33
Support							.010	0.12 .90
Drug use								
Constant							10.52	.00
Power							-.178	-2.43 .02
Role	.251	.063	6.95	4,412	.001		-.205	-2.68 .01
Achievement							.099	1.16 .25
Support							.052	0.67 .50
Inappropriate verbal action								
Constant							85.93	.00
Power							-.065	-0.88 .38
Role	.211	.044	4.79	4,413	.001		-.177	-2.30 .02
Achievement							-.038	-0.44 .66
Support							.071	0.90 .37
Inappropriate physical action								
Constant							11.55	.00
Power							-.167	-2.28 .02
Role	.251	.063	6.92	4,412	.001		-.162	-2.12 .04
Achievement							.006	0.07 .95
Support							.071	0.91 .36

Table 1: Standard multiple regression showing the joint and independent prediction of organisational culture on overall CWB and its subscales among Benue State civil servants

The results in table 1 showed that organisational culture and its dimensions jointly predicted CWB significantly [R=.302, R²=.091; F (4,413) =10.36, p<.05]. The model accounted for 9.1% of the observed variance in employee CWB, thus, the hypothesis was confirmed. Independently, role and power oriented cultures were the most important predictors of CWB in the negative direction (β=-.219; t=-2.92; p<.05; β=-.180; t=-2.50; p<.05). They accounted for 21.9% and 18% of the observed variance in employee CWB respectively. However, achievement and support cultures were not independent significant predictors of CWB (β=.051; t=0.61; p >.05) and (β=.041; t=0.54; p >.05) respectively. This implies that the hypothesis was confirmed for role and power oriented cultures only, but not for achievement and support cultures.

The results further showed that power, role, achievement, and support cultures were significant predictors of theft [R= .275, R²=.076; F (4, 413) =8.47, p<.001] accounting for 7.6% of the observed variance in employee theft. Independently, role culture significantly predicted theft in the negative direction (β=-.246; t=-3.25; p<.05), explaining 24.6% of the observed variance in theft; power, achievement, and support were not significant predictors of theft (β=-.137; t=-1.88; p>.05; β=.103; t=-1.22; p>.05; and β=.010; t=0.13; p>.05) respectively. Results also showed that organisational culture dimensions jointly predicted destruction of property significantly [R=.268, R²=.072; F (4,413) =7.97, p<.05], accounting for 7.2% of the observed variance in employee's destruction of property.

Independently, role culture ($\beta=-.195$; $t=-2.58$; $p<.05$), and power oriented culture ($\beta=-.145$; $t=-1.99$; $p<.05$) were significant predictors of destruction of property in the negative direction; they explained about 19.5%, and 14.5% of the variances in employee's destruction of property respectively. However, achievement and support cultures were not significant predictors of destruction of property ($\beta=.033$; $t=0.39$; $p>.05$; and $\beta=.031$; $t=0.40$; $p>.05$) respectively.

Results further revealed that power, role, achievement, and support cultures jointly predicted misuse of information significantly [$R=.255$, $R^2=.065$; $F(4,413)=7.16$, $p<.05$] accounting for 6.5% of the observed variance in employees' misuse of information. Independently, power and role culture dimensions were significant predictors of misuse of information in the negative direction ($\beta=-.214$; $t=-2.92$; $p<.05$; $\beta=-.176$; $t=-2.32$; $p<.05$); they accounted for 21.4% and 17.6% of the observed variances. However, achievement and support were not significant predictors of this subscale ($\beta=.111$; $t=1.31$; $p>.05$); and ($\beta=.047$; $t=0.61$, $p>.05$) respectively. Result also indicated that organisational culture dimensions significantly predicted time and resource misuse significantly [$R=.269$, $R^2=.072$; $F(4,413)=8.03$, $p<.05$], accounting for 7.2% of the total variance in employee's time and resource misuse. Independently, only power oriented culture dimension was a significant predictor of time and resource misuse in the negative direction ($\beta=-.150$; $t=-2.06$; $p>.05$); it explained 15% of the total variance in this factor. Role, achievement and support were not significant predictors of time and resource misuse ($\beta=-.126$; $t=-1.67$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.006$; $t=0.07$, $p>.05$; $\beta=-.025$; $t=-0.32$, $p>.05$) respectively.

It was further found that organisational culture and its dimensions jointly predicted unsafe behaviour significantly [$R=.201$, $R^2=.040$; $F(4,409)=4.28$, $p<.05$], accounting for 4% of the observed variance in employee's unsafe behaviour. Independently, only role culture dimension was a significant predictor of unsafe behaviour in the negative direction ($\beta=-.163$; $t=-2.03$; $p<.05$) while power, achievement and support cultures did not significantly predict unsafe behaviour ($\beta=-.144$; $t=-1.90$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.037$; $t=0.42$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.089$; $t=1.11$; $p>.05$) respectively. Results also indicated that organisational culture and its dimensions jointly predicted poor attendance significantly [$R=.278$, $R^2=.078$; $F(4,412)=8.66$, $p<.05$] accounting for 7.8% of the observed variance in poor attendance. Independently however, it was only role culture dimension that was an important significant predictor of this factor in the negative direction ($\beta=-.187$; $t=-2.47$; $p<.05$) while power, achievement and support dimensions were not significant predictors of unsafe behaviour ($\beta=-.120$; $t=-1.65$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.059$; $t=0.70$; $p>.05$; $\beta=-.053$; $t=-0.69$; $p>.05$) respectively.

Results from the table also showed that organisational culture and its dimensions jointly predicted poor quality work significantly [$R=.276$, $R^2=.076$; $F(4,412)=8.52$, $p<.05$] accounting for 7.6% of the total variance in employees' poor quality work. Independently, only power oriented culture dimension was a significant predictor of this factor in the negative direction ($\beta=-.252$; $t=-3.46$; $p<.05$) while role, achievement and support were not significant predictors of poor quality work ($\beta=-.093$; $t=-1.22$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.045$; $t=0.53$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.021$; $t=0.27$; $p>.05$) respectively. It was further revealed that organisational culture and its dimensions jointly predicted alcohol use significantly [$R=.174$, $R^2=.030$; $F(4,412)=3.20$, $p<.05$] accounting for 3% of the observed variance in employee's alcohol use. Independently however, none of the dimensions of organisational culture was a significant predictor of alcohol use ($\beta=-.128$; $t=-1.72$; $p>.05$; $\beta=-.130$; $t=-1.67$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.081$; $t=0.97$; $p>.05$; and $\beta=.010$; $t=0.12$; $p>.05$) respectively.

Results further revealed that organisational culture and its dimensions jointly predicted drug use significantly [$R=.251$, $R^2=.063$; $F(4,412)=6.95$, $p<.05$] accounting for 6.3% of the observed variance in employees' drug use. Independently, role and power culture dimensions were significant predictors of this factor but in the negative direction ($\beta=-.205$; $t=-2.68$; $p<.05$; $\beta=-.178$; $t=-2.43$; $p<.02$) while the achievement and support culture dimensions were not significant predictors of drug use ($\beta=.099$; $t=1.16$; $p>.05$; $\beta=.052$; $t=0.67$; $p>.05$) respectively. Also, it was found that organisational culture and its dimensions predicted inappropriate verbal action significantly [$R=.211$, $R^2=.044$; $F(4,413)=4.79$, $p<.05$] accounting for 4.4% of the total variance in inappropriate verbal action. Independently however, only role culture dimension significantly predicted inappropriate verbal action but in the negative direction ($\beta=-.177$; $t=-2.30$; $p<.05$) while power, achievement and support culture did not independently predict inappropriate verbal action significantly ($\beta=-.065$; $t=-0.88$; $p>.05$; $\beta=-.038$; $t=-0.44$; $p>.05$; and $\beta=.071$; $t=0.90$; $p>.05$) respectively. Finally, the results showed that organisational culture and its dimensions joint predicted inappropriate physical action significantly [$R=.251$, $R^2=.063$; $F(4,412)=6.92$, $p<.05$] accounting for 6.3% of the observed variance in employees' inappropriate physical action. Independently, power culture dimension was the most important significant predictor of this subscale but in the negative direction ($\beta=-.167$; $t=-2.28$; $p<.05$) while role culture dimension was the second most important significant predictor of this subscale but also in the negative direction ($\beta=-.162$; $t=-2.12$; $p<.05$). However, achievement and support culture dimensions did not significantly predict this factor ($\beta=.066$; $t=0.07$; $p>.05$; and $\beta=.071$; $t=0.91$; $p>.05$) respectively.

5. Discussion

The results from this study revealed that organisational culture jointly predicted CWB significantly. This finding implies that the more an organization is perceived as imbuing the cultures of power, role, achievement and support, the more likely its employees would engage in CWB. It further implies that the beliefs and values of Benue State civil service are not shared relatively and consistently to its members. The result of this present study supports the earlier findings by other scholars such as Hershcovis, *et al.* (2007) that jobs with high constraints have employees who engage in CWB. It also corroborate the findings of Shafie (2009) that organisation ethical work climate have a positive relationship with CWB, and also corroborate that of Murphy, Shantz, Free and Branston (2011) on organisational culture as a predictor of fraud, that there is not only a separate predictor of fraud emanating from organisational culture, but elements of culture and organisational influence are also present in several motives and rationalizations.

The present finding also corroborates the findings of Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, Zagenczyk (2013) that certain organisational characteristics are responsible for causing an increase in bad behaviour. They found abusive supervision by supervisors/managers to be blamed. Abusive supervision occurs when managers belittle their employees or treat them badly. When this happens, employees have lower perception of organisational support- meaning employees do not feel that the organisation cares about them or values their

contributions. It also agreed with the result of Eschleman, Bowling, Michel, and Burns (2014) that employees who are verbally abused by supervisors, even if it is intended as motivational are still more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviours. However, the result of the present study was inconsistent with that of Apau and Yobo (2014) which revealed no significant relationship between organisational culture and counterproductive work behaviour. It was also different from the findings of Mohammed, Shokoofeh, Shirin and Hojjat (2013) on the effect of personality and organisational constraints that there were significant positive relationships between perceived organisational constraints with total counterproductive behaviour and its dimensions.

Independently, power oriented culture significantly and negatively predicted overall CWB, destruction of property, misuse of information, time and resource misuse, poor quality work, drug use, and inappropriate physical action. Thus hypothesis two was confirmed only for the listed behaviours but not for theft, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, alcohol use, and inappropriate verbal action. This implies that the higher the organisation score on power oriented culture the lower the tendency of the employee to engage in CWB. It further implies that the organisation culture of Benue State civil service is developed by the top management with respect for diverse range of opinions, and ideas, of its employees. Its affairs like promotion, decisions as to reward and discipline of employee are all fairly taken by supervisors. This further implies that the organisation is rewarding its employees as at when due, and correcting them appropriately. This explains employees' low or minimal engagement in CWB. This finding is consistent with the findings of Ernst's (2001) that without considering the impact of organisational culture, organisational practices could be counterproductive because the two are interdependent, and a change in one will impact the other. The finding of the present study on inappropriate physical action corresponds with that of Qureshi, Rasli, and Zaman (2014) who found a negative relationship between organisational climate and bullying.

Role culture significantly and negatively predicted overall CWB, theft, destruction of property, misuse of information, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, drug use, inappropriate verbal action, and inappropriate physical action, therefore, hypothesis two was confirmed for the listed behaviours but not for time and resource misuse, poor quality work, and alcohol use. This result implies that the higher the organisation score on role culture the lower the tendency of the employees to engage in CWB. This result signifies that Benue State civil service organisation have clear vision, employees' tasks are well defined and are assigned according to their areas of specialization, goals are clear to the employees, as well as their capabilities being fully utilized. The employees are in turn well cared for by the organisation. These reduce the occurrences of CWB as indicated by the result. The finding of this study is consistent with that of Semmer, Tschann, Meier, Facchin, and Jacobshagen (2010) that when employees perceived they are assigned illegitimate tasks at work they are more likely to engage in CWBs targeted toward organisational members or the organisation itself.

Independently, achievement culture did not significantly predict CWB and all its subscales. This implies that CWB found in the organisation is predicted by other factors but not achievement culture. It further shows that Benue State civil service culture does not set very high standards for performance, do not over emphasized the realization of its goals, and the strong set of values and beliefs guiding the leaders are handed down to employees with caution to avoid fear of being unable to cope. This is true with the public service because it is not profit oriented, so the employee does not prioritize realization of goals compared to private organisations. The result of this finding was inconsistent with that of Naicker (2008), which revealed that there was a strong achievement culture prevalent at the company, with a good mix of the other culture types like, role culture, power culture and support culture and that the employees strongly preferred an achievement and support type cultures.

Support culture did not significantly predict CWB and all its subscales, thus the second part of hypothesis two was not confirmed for this subscale. This implies that if CWB is found in the organisation, it will be predicted by other factors but not support culture. It further implies that Benue State civil service organisational culture placed much emphasis on the employees in terms of recognition, that is: it constantly provide its employees with opportunities to learn new knowledge and skills; everyone is involved in open and robust discussion; the organisation recognizes and celebrates successes of team members; and warm relationship exist between supervisors and subordinates. These make the employees too to have low tendency for CWB. The finding of this study agrees with the findings of Kandula (2006) that a supportive and strong culture can stimulate an average employee to perform brilliantly whereas a negative and weak culture may demotivate an outstanding employee to underperform. It also corresponds with the findings of Jensen, Opland, and Ryan (2010) that when employees are moved to retaliate to feeling a lost sense of their employers caring about them, they are most likely to engage in abuse behaviours, which include threatening and undermining one's co-workers.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

It was concluded that organisational culture, especially its role and power oriented dimensions, is a significant factor in the prediction of CWB and its dimensions among the Benue State civil servants. It was therefore recommended that the Government and management of public organisations should strengthen their organisational culture such as making policies that will ensure strict adherence to the rules and regulations of the organisation.

7. References

- i. Ansari, M. E., Shokoofeh M. V. & Shirin, M. (2013), An analysis of factors affected on employees' counterproductive work behaviour: the moderating role of job burnout and engagement, *Journal of American Science*, 9(1), 350-359.
- ii. Apau, V. E. & Yobo, E. (2014). Does Organisational Culture Influence Employee Behaviour in Public Administration? Evidence from HO Municipal Assembly, Ghana. *The International Journal of Business & Management* 91(2) 12.
- iii. Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J. & Lay, M. (2005). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behaviour. *Corporate Governance*, 5(4), 43-55.
- iv. Arnold, J. (2005). *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behaviour in the Workplace*, 4thed. London: Prentice Hall Financial Times.

- v. Atkinson, R. L., Atkinson, R. C., Smith, E. E., Daryl, J. B. & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2000). *Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology* 13thed. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt College Publishers. 437.
- vi. Aubé, C., Rousseau, V., Mama, C. & Morin, E. (2009). Counterproductive behaviours and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24, 351-361.
- vii. Aycan, R., Tang, Y. T. & Wallach, E. J. (2000). Transformational leadership, job motivation, and employees' innovational behaviour. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6 (4),47-66.
- viii. Ayoko, O. B., Callan, V. J. & Hartel, C. E. J. (2003). Workplace conflict, bullying and counterproductive behaviours. *The International Journal of Organisational Analysis*, 11(4), 283-301.
- ix. Baron, R. A. & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression; Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Journal of Aggressive Behaviour*. 22, 161-173.
- x. Baruch, Y. & Jenkins, S. (2007). Swearing at work and permissive leadership culture: When anti-social becomes social and incivility is acceptable. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 28, 492-507.
- xi. Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
- xii. Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. (2003), The past, present and future of workplace deviance research, in Greenberg, J. (Ed.), *Organisational Behaviour: The State of the Science*, 2, 247-81.
- xiii. Bies, R. J. & Tripp, T. M. (1998). The many faces of revenge: The good, the bad, and the ugly. In R.W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organisations, Vol. 1: Violent behaviours in organisations. Vo 1. 23: 49-68*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- xiv. Biron, M., 2010. Negative reciprocity and the association between perceived organisational ethical values and organisational deviance, *Human Relations*, 63(6): 875-897.
- xv. Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K. & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Journal of Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- xvi. Brown, A. (1995). *Organisational Culture*. London: Pitman.
- xvii. Brown, A. (1998). *Organisational Culture*, 2ndedition. London: Financial Times Pitman Publishing.
- xviii. Bukhari, Z. U. & Ali, U. (2009). Relationship between organisational citizenship behaviour & counterproductive work behaviour in the geographical context of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(1), 85-92.
- xix. Chang, K. & Smithikrai C. (2010). Counterproductive behaviour at work: An investigation into reduction strategies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(8), 1272-1288.
- xx. Chow, F. & Liu, W. (2009). *Cultural diversity in organisations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- xxi. Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate Culture*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.and Hungarian comparisons with the NEO-PI-R". *Journal of Assessment*11 (3): 207–215.
- xxii. Dunlop, P. D. & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organisational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25, 67-80.
- xxiii. Eddleston, K. A., Kidder, D. L. & Litzky, B. E. (2002). Who's the boss? Contending with competing expectations from customers and management. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 85-95.
- xxiv. Eric, W. & MacIntosha, A. (2010). The influence of organisational culture on job satisfaction and intention to leave. *Doherty Sport Management Review*13, 106–117 available at Science Direct.
- xxv. Ernst, H. (2001). *Corporate Culture and Innovative Performance of a Firm*. *Management of Engineering and Technology*,2, 532 - 535.
- xxvi. Eschleman, K. J., Bowling, N. A., Michel, J. S., Gary N. & Burns, G. N. (2014). Perceived intent of supervisor as a moderator of the relationships between abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviours. *Work & Stress*, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/10/141008083704.htm>
- xxvii. Fleeson, W. & Nofhle, E. E. (2009). In favor of the synthetic resolution to the person-situation debate. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(2), 150-154.
- xxviii. Flynn, F. J. & Chatman, J. A. (2001). Strong cultures and innovation: Oxymoron or opportunity? In Cooper, C.L., Cartwright, S. & Earley, P.C. (Eds.). *International handbook of organisational culture and climate*, 263–287.
- xxix. Furnham, A. & Gunter, B. (1993). Corporate culture: definition, diagnosis and change. In Cooper, C. L., Robertson, I. T. (Eds). *International Review of Organisational Psychology*, John Wiley, Chichester, 8, 233-261.
- xxx. Galperin, B. L. & Burke, R. J. (2006). Uncovering the relationship between workaholism and workplace destructive and constructive deviance: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17, 331-347.
- xxxi. Giacalone, R. A. & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organisations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- xxxii. Giacalone, R. A., Riordan, C. A. & Rosenfeld, P. (1997). Employee sabotage: Toward a practitioner–scholar understanding. In Giacalone, R.A. & Greenberg, J. (Eds.). *Antisocial behaviour in organisations*, 109–129.
- xxxiii. Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behaviour in Organisations: Understanding and managing the human side of work*. Upper SaddleRiver: Pearson Education, Inc.
- xxxiv. Griffin, R. W. & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). "Bad behaviour" in organisations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31, 988-1005.
- xxxv. Gruys, M. L. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30-42.
- xxxvi. Harmse, L.M. (2001). *The influence of organisational culture on job satisfaction and organisational commitment*. Unpublished thesis for Bachelor of Commerce, Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth.
- xxxvii. Harper, D. (1990). Spotlight abuse-save profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79, 47-51.

- xxxviii. Harrison, J. K. & Stokes, G. F. (1992). Antecedents to organisational commitment among Mexican employees of a U.S. firm in Mexico. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138 (5), 609-624.
- xxxix. Harrison, R. (1993). *Diagnosing organisational culture: Trainer's manual*. New York: Pfeiffer and Company.
- xl. Hershcovis, S. M., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupre, K. E., Inness, M., LeBlanc, M. M. & Sivanathan. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228-238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.228>.
- xli. Hoel, H., Einarsen S. & Cooper, C. (2003). Organisational effects of bullying. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., Cooper, C. (Eds.). *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives on research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- xlii. Hofstede, G. (1981). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 10(4), 15–41.
- xliii. Hogan J. & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 273–279.
- xliv. Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1982). Employee deviance: A response to the perceived quality of the work experience. *Work and Occupations*, 9 (1), 97-114.
- xlv. Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1983). 'Deterrence in the Workplace: Perceived Certainty, Perceived Severity, and Employee Theft.' *Social Forces* 62, 398–418
- xlvi. Jensen, J. M., Opland, R. A. & Ryan, A. M. (2010). Psychological contracts and counterproductive work behaviours: Employee responses to transactional and relational breach. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 555-568.
- xlvii. Johnson, G. (1990). 'Managing strategic change: the role of symbolic action', *British Journal of Management*, 1(1), 183–200.
- xlviii. Kandula, S. R. (2006). *Performance Management*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall
- xlix. Kaukiainen, A., Salmivalli, C., Bjorkqvist, K. & Osterman, K. (2001). Overt and covert aggression in work settings in relation to the subjective well-being of employees. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 27, 360-371
- l. Lanyon, R. I. & Goldstein, L. D. (2004). Validity and reliability of a pre-employment screening test: The Counterproductive Behaviour Index (CBI). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 533-553.
- li. Leblanc, M. M. & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 444-453.
- lii. Levy, T. & Tziner, A. (2011). When destructive deviance in the workplace becomes a liability: A decisional behavioural model. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 45 (1), 233–239.
- liii. Lewis, D. (2002). Five years on the organisational culture saga revisited. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 23, 280–287.
- liv. Litzky, B. E., Eddleston, K. A. & Kidder, D. L. (2006). The good, the bad, and the misguided: How managers inadvertently encourage deviant behaviours. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20, 91-103.
- lv. MacLean, T. L. (2001). Thick as thieves: A social embeddedness model of rule breaking in organisations. *Business and Society*, 40, 167-196.
- lvi. Manetje, O. & Martins, N. (2009). 'The Relationship Between Organisational Culture and Organisational Commitment', *Southern African Business Review*, 13(1), 87-111.
- lvii. Marcus, B. & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behaviour at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660.
- lviii. Marcus, B., Taylor, O. A., Hastings, S. E., Sturm, A., & Weigelt, O. (2013). The structure of counterproductive work behavior a review, a structural meta-analysis, and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, XX (X), 1-31.
- lix. Martins, N. & Martins, E. (2003). Organisational culture, In Robbins, S.P., Odendaal A. & Roodt, G. (eds). *Organisational Behaviour: Global and Southern African Perspectives*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.
- lx. Mohammed, E. A., Shokoofeh, M. V., Shirin, M. & Hojjat, A. (2013). Individual, job, and organisational predictors of counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(4), 78-86.
- lxi. Monnastes, S.N. (2010). Perceived Organizational support and counterproductive work behaviour: How personality moderates the relationship. Unpublished Master Dissertation. San José State University, California.
- lxii. Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole
- lxiii. Murphy, P. R., Shantz, E. M., Free, C., & Branston, C. (2011). Organisational culture as a predictor of fraud. <http://accounting.uwaterloo.ca/SAF/Documents/Murphy%20paper.12/11/2015>.
- lxiv. Naicker, N. (2008). *Organisational culture and employee commitment: a case study of Durban University of technology South Africa*
- lxv. Nwugwo, H. & Loi, R. (2008). Human resource flexibility, organisational culture and firm performance: An investigation of multinational firms in Hong Kong. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19 (2), 170-187.
- lxvi. O'Boyle, Jr. E. H. (2010). A test of the general CWB-OCB emotion model. A Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- lxvii. O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. (1996) Organisation-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21,225–253.
- lxviii. O'Brien, K. E. & Vandello, J. (2005). Development and validation of the workplace hostile attribution bias scale. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA.
- lxix. Ogbonna, E. & Harris, L. C. (2002). Leadership style, organisational culture and performance: Empirical evidence from UK Companies. *The International Journal Human Resource Management*, 11 (4), 766-788.
- lxx. O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A. & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). 'People and organisational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organisation fit., *Academy of Management Journal*, 34,487±516.
- lxxi. Ouchi, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1985). Organisational Culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 457 - 483
- lxxii. Pacanowsky, M. & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organisational communication as cultural performance. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 127-147.

- lxxiii. Parilla, P. F., Hollinger, R. C. & Clark, J. P. (1988). Organisational control of deviant behaviour: The case of employee theft. *Social Science Quarterly*, 69, 261-280.
- lxxiv. Penney, L. M. & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 26, 777-796.
- lxxv. Price S. L. (1995) Interpersonal Conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 285-297.
- lxxvi. Qureshi, M. I., Rashi, A.M.; Zaman, K. (2014). A New Trilogy to Understand the Relationship among Organisational Climate, Workplace Bullying and Employee Health [±]Malaysia. Open Access funded by Holy Spirit University of Kaslik. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214462514000176>.
- lxxvii. Robinson, S. & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 100-108.
- lxxviii. Robinson, S. L. & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: dimension, determination and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. *Trends in Organisation Behaviour*, 5, 1-30.
- lxxix. Robinson, S. L. & O'Leary-Kelly, A.M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behaviour of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 658-672.
- lxxx. Sackett, P. R. & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviours at work. In Anderson, N., Ones, D. S., Sinangil, H. K., & Viswesvaran, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organisational Psychology*, 1, 145-164. London, UK: Sage.
- lxxxi. Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviours: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 5-11.
- lxxxii. Schat, A. C. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). The effects of perceived control on the outcomes of workplace aggression and violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4, 386-402.
- lxxxiii. Schat, A. C. H. & Kelloway, E. K. (2003). Reducing the adverse consequences of workplace aggression and violence: The buffering effects of organisational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 110-122.
- lxxxiv. Schein, E. H. (1992), *Organisational Culture and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- lxxxv. Schein, E. H. (1995). *Career survival*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- lxxxvi. Schein, E. H. 1985. *Organisational Culture and Leadership: A Dynamic View*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- lxxxvii. Seğer, Ş. & Seğer, B. (2007). In Ersoy-Kart, M., Pişkin, M., Güldü, Ö. and Savcı, İ. (2013) "Counterproductive Work Behaviors in Relation to Narcissism, Machiavellianism and Psychopathy among University Staff" Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: PSY201-0541., II, 147-175.
- lxxxviii. Semmer, N. K., Tschann, F., Meier, L. L., Facchin, S., & Jacobshagen, N. (2010). Illegitimate tasks and counterproductive work behaviour. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59(1), 70-96.
- lxxxix. Shafie D. I. B. (2009). Factors affecting counterproductive work behaviour (CPWB): A case of banking sector. A project paper submitted to the College of Business in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Human Resource Management Universiti Utara Malaysia. http://etd.uum.edu.my/1652/2/1.Dalili_Izni_Binti_Shafie.pdf.
- xc. Shoss, M. K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S. L. D. & Zagenczyk T. J. (2013). Blaming the organisation for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organisational support and supervisor's organisational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 158-168.
- xc. Skarlicki, D. P. & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434-443.
- xcii. Southey, K. (2010). A typology of employee explanations of misbehaviour: An analysis of unfair dismissal cases. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52, 81-102.
- xciii. Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. (2002). Counterproductive work behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour: Are they opposite forms of active behaviour? *Applied Psychology: an International Review*, 59 (1), 21–39.
- xciv. Spector, P. E. (2011). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 342-352.
- xcv. Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L., Bruursema, K., Goh, A. & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviours created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68(3), 446-460.
- xcvi. Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 100–108.
- xcvii. Trefry, M. G. (2006). A Double-Edged Sword: Organisational Culture in Multicultural Organisations. *International Journal of Management*, 23(3), 2
- xcviii. Utusan (2010). Bekas peguam pecah amanah [Former lawyer breach of trust]. Utusan Online. <http://www.utusan.com.my>. Retrieved September 12.
- xcix. Wagner, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: effects on cooperation groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 152–172.
- c. Warren, D. E. (2003). Constructive and destructive deviance in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 622-632.