

THE IMPACT OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT ON COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS – AN EMPIRICAL STUDY IN INDIAN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECTOR

Manu Melwin Joy(1), Assistant professor
Ilahia School of Management Studies
Ilahia College of Engineering and Technology
Muvattupuzha, India.
(Email - manu_melwinjoy@yahoo.com)

Balu V G (2), Assitant professor
Ilahia School of Management Studies
Ilahia College of Engineering and Technology
Muvattupuzha, India.
(Email - balugopinadhv@gmail.com)

Abstract—There has been an increasing interest among researcher over the construct counterproductive work behaviors because of its high level of financial implication for the organization and its highly disruptive nature. Counterproductive work behaviors consist of acts that are detrimental for the proper functioning of the organization. They consist of acts targeted towards both individuals and organizations which include physical and verbal aggression, sabotage, theft and withdrawal. Counterproductive work behaviors have been studied from different viewpoints, using different terminologies to refer to a fragmented overlapping set of detrimental behaviors. Researchers who have studied these various related variables have taken the help of different theories like human aggression theory and retaliation theory to give varying emphasis to emotions. Therefore, organizations are taking conscious effort to limit the harmful effects of these undesirable behaviors. There is ample conceptual support to the argument that perceived organizational support has an relevant inverse relationship with counterproductive work behaviors. This research investigates the impact that perceived organizational support has on counterproductive work behaviors in a group of 300 white collar software professionals. Results were deduced by applying multiple regression analysis with the aid of SPSS software. Results showed statistically significant relationship between perceived organizational support and counterproductive work behaviors as a whole. Further analysis found that there is a significant negative relationship between perceived organizational support and production and property dimension of counterproductive work behaviors

Keywords- Perceived organizational support, Counterproductive work behaviors, Software industry.

Introduction

With the spiralling levels of competition, employee behaviors have emerged as one of the greatest concern for employers (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). To be specific, it includes what

individuals say and do at their work environment (Robbins & Coutler, 2002; Sims, 2002; Hiriyappa, 2008). Normally, these behaviors are divided into those that are helpful for the firm and those that are detrimental. The former contributes positively towards firm performance whereas the later is harmful (Spector & Fox, 2002). Researchers have labelled these dysfunctional behaviors as workplace violence (Barling, Dupre & Kelloway, 2009), deviance (Hollinger, 1986), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), revenge (Bies, Tripp & Kramer, 1997), bullying (Hoel, Rayner & Cooper, 1999), emotional insensitivity (Keashly, 1998) and revenge (Bies & Tripp, 2005). A detailed study of these labels shows that all are counterproductive in nature and hence can be brought under the umbrella term of counterproductive work behaviors (CWB).

Spector et al., (2006) defined counterproductive work behaviors as the acts that go against the goals and objectives of organization. It is the bundle of various behaviors that are against the expected behaviors and can harm the employees, firm and its stakeholders such as clients, colleagues, customers and managers (Sackett, 2002) and can cause serious threat to the stability of the organization (Martinko et al.,2002). It can also be defined as a set of negative behaviors that are detrimental to the organization by disturbing its operational activates or assets or by hurting employees in such as way that that will overcome their efficiency (Galperin, 2002). Apart from personality traits like narcissism, agreeableness and

dissatisfaction, other factors such as vague job description, insecurity in the employment, dearth of internal career opportunities, unjust appraisal system, lack of motivation, abusive manager and company contempt serves as stimulus of counterproductive work behaviors. Normally, these behaviors are occurring at the interpersonal level (verbal abuse, refusing to cooperate and physical assault) and organizational level (absenteeism, misuse of the employer's assets and withdrawal). Even though there are plenty of studies conducted to capture the different perspectives of CWB, no attempt has been made to find out the behaviors outcomes of these dysfunctional acts. Therefore, the present research tries to find out the relationship between these behaviors and perceived organizational support.

Literature review

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB)

Many authors have classified counterproductive behaviors using different criterion. Where Mangione & Quinn introduced the concepts of property and production deviance, Wheeler classified them into serious and non serious organizational rule breaking. Hollinger & Clark (1983) developed on the framework of property and production deviance and Redeker (1989) published a set of punishable offenses in organizational setting. Finally, Robinson & Bennett (1995) introduced a typology of counterproductive behaviors including the interpersonal perspective. The framework consists of the following two dimensions: (1) Minor Vs Serious – Describes the severity of the deviant behaviors and (2) Interpersonal Vs Organizational – Represents the target of the deviant behavior. By combining these two aspects, counterproductive behavior can be grouped into four such as production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression.

- **Production deviance** – These consists of behaviors that break the formally stipulated norms describing the minimal quality and quantity of work to be achieved. These include behaviors such as tardiness, leaving early, availing long breaks and substance abuse at work place. Withholding input explains the

incidence where a person gives less than full effort on a work related task.

- **Property deviance** – It can be described as those occasions where individuals tamper the tangible assets of the organization without authority. These include damaging equipments, accepting kickbacks, sharing confidential information, making intentional errors, wasting expense accounts and stealing from the country. Furthermore, they can have an negative effect on productivity since work cannot be performed until the equipment is replaced.
- **Political deviance** – These include behaviors such as involvement in social interactions that puts other employees at a political disadvantage. These consist of acts such as workplace incivility, exhibiting favoritism, gossiping about colleagues and competing in an unhealthy fashion. All these acts, even though small in size, can lead to a chain of events leading to a very grave incident.
- **Personal Aggression** – These consists of behaving in an aggressive fashion towards other employees which include sexual harassment, rape, verbal abuse, physical and psychological assaults, thefts from colleagues and endangering reputation of co-workers. Individual who have been the targets of aggression by colleagues have more physical and emotional health issues and are less loyal to their firms.

Research Methodology

Software professional with an experience of more than two years in the respective firm served as participants of the present study. An email questionnaire was forwarded to 300 employees working in 10 firms operating in the top techpark in Kerala. Data related to counterproductive work behaviors was collected using the tool developed by Robinson and Bennett. Information regarding perceived organizational support was collected using the questionnaire introduced by Eisenberger et al., (1986). Questionnaires were collected and distributed within a month's time spanning from August 2015 to

November 2015. With the help of SPSS software, multiple regression analysis was carried out for analyzing the collected data.

Data Analysis

Impact of perceived organizational support on production deviance dimension counterproductive work behaviors

Multiple regression analysis was used to find out the negative impact that perceived organizational support has on production deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

H₁ – Perceived organizational support has a strong negative impact on production deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

The null hypothesis that perceived organizational support has no negative impact on production deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors was statistically tested.

Table 1 Multiple regression analysis results for relationship between perceived organizational support and production deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors

Variable	Beta value	Std Error	P value	Average Full Collinearity VIF	R ²
POS	0.421	0.039	0.001*	1.654	0.482

(* indicates items significant at 5% significance level)

It is evident from the analysis that perceived organizational support has a strong negative impact on production deviance dimension counterproductive work behaviors with a beta value of 0.421 and R² value of 0.482. All the values obtained from the analysis support the hypothesis that perceived organizational support has a negative impact on production deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors of employees working in software industry. Hence H₁ is accepted.

Impact of perceived organizational support on property deviance dimension counterproductive work behaviors

Multiple regression analysis was used to find out the negative impact that perceived organizational support has on property deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

H₂ – Perceived organizational support has a strong negative impact on property deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

The null hypothesis that perceived organizational support has no negative impact on property deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors was statistically tested.

Table 2 Multiple regression analysis results for relationship between perceived organizational support and property deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors

Variable	Beta value	Std Error	P value	Average Full Collinearity VIF	R ²
POS	0.457	0.045	0.003*	1.543	0.411

(* indicates items significant at 5% significance level)

It is evident from the analysis that perceived organizational support has a strong negative impact on property deviance dimension counterproductive work behaviors with a beta value of 0.457 and R² value of 0.411. All the values obtained from the analysis support the hypothesis that perceived organizational support has a negative impact on production deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors of employees working in software industry. Hence H₂ is accepted.

Impact of perceived organizational support on political deviance dimension counterproductive work behaviors

Multiple regression analysis was used to find out the negative impact that perceived organizational support has on political deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

H₃ – Perceived organizational support has a strong negative impact on political deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

The null hypothesis that perceived organizational support has no negative impact on political deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors was statistically tested.

Table 3 Multiple regression analysis results for relationship between perceived organizational support and political deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors

Variable	Beta value	Std Error	P value	Average Full Collinearity VIF	R ²
POS	0.238	0.034	0.075	1.215	0.196

(* indicates items significant at 5% significance level)

It is evident from the analysis that perceived organizational support has no strong negative impact on political deviance dimension counterproductive work behaviors with a beta value of 0.238 and R² value of 0.196. All the values obtained from the analysis support the hypothesis that perceived organizational support has no negative impact on political deviance dimension of counterproductive work behaviors of employees working in software industry. Hence H₃ is rejected.

Impact of perceived organizational support on personal aggression dimension counterproductive work behaviors

Multiple regression analysis was used to find out the negative impact that perceived organizational support has on personal aggression dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

H₄ – Perceived organizational support has a strong negative impact on personal aggression dimension of counterproductive work behaviors.

The null hypothesis that perceived organizational support has no negative impact on personal aggression dimension of counterproductive work behaviors was statistically tested.

Table 4 Multiple regression analysis results for relationship between perceived organizational support and personal aggression dimension of counterproductive work behaviors

Variable	Beta value	Std Error	P value	Average Full Collinearity VIF	R ²
POS	0.289	0.029	0.065	1.235	0.156

(* indicates items significant at 5% significance level)

It is evident from the analysis that perceived organizational support has no strong negative impact on personal aggression dimension counterproductive work behaviors with a beta value of 0.289 and R² value of 0.156. All the values obtained from the analysis support the hypothesis that perceived

organizational support has no negative impact on personal aggression dimension of counterproductive work behaviors of employees working in software industry. Hence H₄ is rejected.

Findings and Discussion

The above results shows that perceived organizational support is having a strong negative relationship with counterproductive work behaviors as a whole. Separate analysis has shown that perceived organization support is having a strong negative relationship with production deviance and property deviance dimensions of counterproductive behaviors exhibited by employees working in software industry. Perceived organizational support showed no negative impact on political deviance and personal aggression dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors. Therefore, the proposed relationship between dependent and independent variables were well supported by data analysis. Therefore, the primary assumption put forward by the researcher stating that there is a strong negative impact that perceived organizational support has on counterproductive work behaviors as a whole has been proved statistically.

There is enough support in the literature stating the positive effects of POS on organizational efficiency. Eisenberger et al., (1986) argued that POS is an antecedent of organizational commitment. Apart from this, several researchers found that POS is positively related to job satisfaction (Aquino & Griffeth, 1999; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Many studies have proved that POS mediate the positive connection between work experiences such as organizational reward, perceived justice and managerial support and affective commitment. Therefore, it can be deduced that individuals can determine the positive nature of certain job experiences and then sum those experiences to establish perceived organizational support, which then brings about positive organizational outcomes such as affective commitment and decreases the probability of negative firm outcomes such as counterproductive work behaviors.

Conclusion

To sum up, this research has made a major contribution to the organizational behavior literature. By connecting perceived organizational support and four dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors, this research merges that gap existing in the literature and provides a firm theoretical framework on how organizations can bring down incidences of dysfunctional employee acts such as counterproductive work behaviors through enhancement of perceived organizational support. The findings of the effect of perceived organizational support on all types of counterproductive work behaviors demonstrate the importance of research on the two constructs and the necessity for organizations to lend proper support to their employees.

References

- 1) Aquino, K., & Griffith, R.W. (1999). An exploration of the antecedents and consequences of perceived organizational support: A longitudinal study. Unpublished manuscript, University of Delaware and Georgia State University.
- 2) Barling, J., Dupré, K., & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Predicting workplace violence and aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 671–692.
- 3) Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18–36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1997). *Managing workplace*.
- 4) Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2005). The study of revenge in the workplace: Conceptual, ideological, and empirical issues. In P. E. Spector & S. Fox (Eds.), *Counter-productive work behavior: Investigation of actors and targets* (pp. 65–105). Washington, DC: APA Books.
- 5) Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.
- 6) Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- 7) Galperin, B.L., (2002). Determinants of deviance in the workplace: an empirical examination in Canada and Mexico [unpublished doctoral dissertation], Concordia University, Montreal.
- 8) Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R., (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 30-42.
- 9) Hiriyappa, B. (2008). *Organizational Behavior*, New Age International PVT Ltd, India.
- 10) Hoel, H., Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). Workplace bullying. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.195-230). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- 11) Hollinger, R. C. (1986). Acts against the workplace: Social bonding and employee deviance. *Deviant Behavior*, 7, 53–75.
- 12) Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls of employee deviance, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 333–343.
- 13) Keashly, L. (1998). Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1(1), 85 - 117.
- 14) Martinko, M.J., Gundlach, M.J. and Douglas, S.C. (2002). Toward and Integrative Theory of Counterproductive Workplace Behavior: A causal reasoning perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 36–50.
- 15) Robbins, P. S., Coulter, K. M. (2002). *Management*, 1st Ed, Prentice Hall Canada.
- 16) Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38,555–572.
- 17) Sackett, P. R. (2002). The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 10(1-2), 01-11.
- 18) Shore, L.M., & Tetrick, L.E. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 637-643.
- 19) Sims, R. R. (2002). *Managing organizational Behavior*, 1st Ed. Greenwood Publishing Group USA.

- 20) Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434–443.
- 21) Spector, P.E. and Fox, S. (2002) An Emotion-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior (CWB) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Human Resources Management Review*, 12, 269–292.
- 22) Spector, P. E., Fox, S., & Domagalski, T. (2006). Emotions, violence and counterproductive work behavior. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace violence* (pp. 29–46). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Author's profile

1st author and corresponding author

Manu Melwin Joy

Assistant Professor

Ilahia School of Management Studies

Ilahia College of Engineering and Technology

Muvattupuzha, Kerala, India.

Mobile Number – 9744551114

E-mail ID – manu_melwinjoy@yahoo.com

2nd Co-author

Balu V G

Assistant Professor

Ilahia School of Management Studies

Ilahia College of Engineering and Technology

Muvattupuzha, Kerala, India.

Mobile Number – 9605177222

E-mail ID – balugopinadhv@gmail.com