ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AS A MEDIATOR OF COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE
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ABSTRACT
Organizational commitment and organizational culture are well researched variable in the I/O psychology. Counterproductive work behavior is a new term recently introduced into psychological sciences. The counterproductive behavior is one of the determining factors of organizational performance. This study was designed with an objective to find out the mediation effect of organizational commitment in between organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior. There were 141 participants from various branches of two governmental organizations (73 from organization 1 and 68 from organization 2) selected by means of simple random sampling. Self administered instruments such as Counterproductive Work Behavior Indicator (CWB), Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) and Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) along with the Personal Data Sheet were administered to participants at their work place. Results indicate that there exist a significant positive relationship between organizational culture and organizational commitment, organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior and organizational commitment and counterproductive work behavior. The result of mediation analysis indicated that organizational commitment mediates the relationship between organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior.
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INTRODUCTION
Organizations are in the midst of a revolutionary transformation. Industrial age competition is shifting to information age competition. During the industrial age, from 1850 to 1975, organizations succeeded by how well they could capture the benefits from economies of scale and scope. Technology mattered, but, ultimately success accrued to companies that could embed the new technology into physical assets that offered efficient, mass production of standard products.
Many service organizations, especially those in the education, utility, transportation, communication, financial and health care industries, existed for decades in comfortable, noncompetitive environments. The information age environment for both manufacturing and service organizations requires new capabilities for competitive success. The ability of an organization to mobilize and exploit its intangible or invisible assets has become far more decisive than investing and managing physical, tangible assets.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment is highly valuable employee variable in organizational studies. This is because a highly committed employee will identify with the goals and values of the organization, has a stronger desire to belong to the organization and is willing to display greater organizational citizenship behaviour i.e., a willingness to go over and beyond their required job duties. And if human resources are said to be an organization’s greatest assets, then committed human resources should be regarded as an organization’s competitive advantage.

Meyer & Allen (1991) have proposed a three-component model, defined in terms of desire (the employee wants to remain with the organization and support its goals and vision), need (the employee needs to remain with the organization and support its goals and vision for identifiable reasons), and obligation (the employee must stay with the organization and support its goals and vision). These psychological components are also described as affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Affective commitment is the emotional attachment of employees to the organization and the resultant identification with the organization. Employees exhibiting affective commitment feel they want to remain employed with the current organization. It is the loyalty to the firm (Wallace, 1997). The major antecedents of affective commitment are organizational structure characteristics, personal characteristics, and work experiences. Personal characteristics comprises of demographic components (age, sex, education, time in the job), personal dispositions (desire for achievements, independent contribution, work ethic and livelihood), and environmental considerations (compatibility of what one brings to the job with the requirements of the job, or person-environment alignment).

Normative commitment is commitment based upon values. Rather than an emotional tie to the organization, employees feel an obligation to remain with the organization (Suliman & Iles, 2000). Normative commitment is associated with organization that exhibit established cultures. Those cultures foster a moral commitment to the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) describe normative commitment as that which results from “internalization of normative pressures”. This is achieved through “familial or cultural socialization” preceding joining the organization or through “organizational socialization” after joining the organization.

Continuance commitment differs from previous two as it is need based. It describes an employee’s perceived internalized need to remain with an organization as opposed to an external, organizational requirement (Berkhoff, 1997). The employee needs particular rewards (pay, benefits) and quitting may elicit untenable negative outcomes. The most common antecedents of need-based commitment is side-bet investments and alternatives. Side-bet can be described in terms of a mental cost-benefit analysis (Wallace, 1997). If the cost of leaving an organization and all that one has personally invested exceeds the benefit of remaining with that organization, organizational commitment improves. In this case, commitment and remaining with the
organization is a cost-avoidance maneuver on the part of employee, rather than emotional binding or goal and value congruence.

There are a variety of reasons why much of what we propose to discuss as counterproductive is seldom acknowledged. It starts with basic point concerning the perception of behavior. Despite the complexity of behavior itself, not to mention the complexity of the processes involved in recognizing it, the perception of people behaving typically involves simplification. Physiologically, perceptions are patterns of light and color falling on the retina of the eye. The brain is receiving and processing millions of impressions per minute in the normal day. From these impressions, complex behavioral events are being actively constructed and identified by observers. Some of them are being selected, simplified and stored away for later reference, reportage and other use. In this set of processes, observations are routinely resolved into reportable events. This is to note the all-important point that all accounts of behavior are precisely that-constructions and accounts. Hence what is represented as organizational behavior is really a highly packaged and organized set of observations.

Counterproductive work behavior has always been an issue for employers because of its widespread nature. Counterproductive work behaviors can take a variety of forms, from relatively minor acts of workplace theft to dramatic outbursts of workplace violence. Regardless of who they target or how severe they might be, Counterproductive work behaviors are always a negative phenomenon, and organizations have a vested interest in predicting the likelihood that employees (or applicants) might engage in these behaviors. Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are those actions undertaken by the employee that are detrimental to the overall work environment. The reasons for engaging in such behaviors and the means of expressing them differ from situation to situation, and as a result it can be difficult for organizations to pinpoint exactly what the causes of counterproductive work behaviors may be.

Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) is volitional behavior that harms or intends to harm organizations or people in organizations (Fox & Spector, 2005). The categories of behavior that comprise counterproductive work behavior are: abuse toward others (e.g., starting or continuing a damaging or harmful rumor at work; being nasty or rude to a client or customer); production deviance (e.g., purposely doing your work incorrectly; purposely working slowly when things need to get done); sabotage (e.g., purposely wasting your employer’s materials/supplies; purposely damaging a piece of equipment or property); theft (e.g., stealing something belonging to your employer; putting in to be paid for more hours than you work); and withdrawal (e.g., coming to work late without permission; staying home from work and saying you were sick when you weren’t). These are behaviors that are generally regarded as unethical and a threat to the well-being of organizations and their members.

Hollinger and Clark (1983) developed a broad list of counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), and provided a conceptual framework for interrelating these behaviors. They proposed counterproductive work behaviors that could be grouped into two broad categories. First, ‘property deviance’ involving misuse of employer assets (e.g., include theft, property damage, and misuse of discount privileges). The second is ‘production deviance’, involving violating norms about how work is to be accomplished. This includes not being on the job as scheduled (absence, tardiness, long breaks) and behaviors that detract from production when on the job (drug and alcohol use, intentionally slow or sloppy work).

Robinson and Bennett (1995) extended upon the Hollinger and Clark framework and included interpersonal counterproductive behaviors. They obtained a two-dimensional scaling,
with one dimension differentiating behavior toward the organization (Hollinger and Clark’s production and property deviance) from interpersonal behavior toward other organizational members (e.g., harassment, gossip, verbal abuse), and the other dimension representing a continuum from minor to serious offenses. Arraying behaviors in this two-dimensional space, Robinson and Bennett labeled the resulting four quadrants as property deviance (organizational-serious), production deviance (organizational-minor), personal aggression (interpersonal-serious, including behaviors such as harassment, and the theft from coworkers), and political deviance (interpersonal-minor, including behaviors such as favoritism, gossip, and blaming others for one’s mistakes).

Sackett and DeVore, (2001) have carefully parsed counterproductive work behavior. They propose a hierarchical explanation with a broad factor of counterproductive behavior at the top level, two less broad factors of organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance in the middle level, and individual counterproductive behaviors such as theft, absence, sabotage, and substance abuse at the lowest levels. Gruys and Sackett (2003) have further broken counterproductive work behaviors into as many as 66 distinct behaviors, collected into 11 general categories. Others have suggested alternative models of counterproductive work behavior. Vardi and Weiner (1996) distinguish among three types: behavior done for self-gain (e.g., theft), behavior for organizational gain (e.g., misstating profit or overbilling), and finally behavior that is destructive (e.g., sabotage, assault).

Counterproductive work behavior can be assessed with both self-reports and observer-reports (e.g., reports by coworkers or managers); however, a recent meta-analysis (Berry, Carpenter & Barratt, 2012) found that self-reports provide more reliable and valid assessments of counterproductive work behavior than observer reports. Self- and other-ratings of Counterproductive work behavior do tend to be highly correlated, but observer-ratings under-report the frequency of counterproductive work behavior, likely because counterproductive behaviors are intended by the perpetrators to be unobservable (Berry et al., 2012; Dalal, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2005). These findings are based on the assumption that individuals have more information about their own behaviors than do observers. Thus, although observer-reports may be less subject to socially-desirable responding, they necessarily rely on a source with incomplete information about the target’s behavior-only the target knows what counterproductive acts she or he has performed. The research findings above mentioned are adopted from studies conducted in Western culture. In India were individuals are reluctant to portray their real self in front of others and were counterproductive behaviors are expressed in protest form the investigator had to approach assessment procedure in a slightly different manner.

Organizational culture includes multiple layer (Schein, 1992) and aspects (that is, cognitive and symbolic) of an organizational context. Organizational culture is a socially constructed phenomenon influenced by historical and spatial boundaries and the concept of “shared” meaning that is central to understanding an organization’s culture. The most comprehensive definition offered by Schein (1992), who concludes that the culture of a group-the term group refers here to social units of all sizes- is defined as: (a) a pattern of shared basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore (e) is to be taught to new members as the (f) correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relations to these problems.
Schein (1992) suggests that culture works to glue people together, to create consistency in thinking, feeling and behaving. The content of culture becomes an inextricable part of the individual mindset, viz a process of socialization (or acculturation). The socialization process (which can be formal or informal) assumes a mechanism of indoctrination of specifications for behavior (appropriate rules and norms to follow) and of attitudes (to align them with those of the group).

Need and Significance of the study
Counterproductive work behaviors can have detrimental effects on an organization. This makes it important to take counterproductive behaviors into consideration when hiring new employees and when implementing human resource functions. There are many different factors that can lead to counterproductive work behaviors. They range from personal factors to the systems that are in place within the work environment, which include personality traits such as conscientiousness and self-control. They also include human resource functions such as incentive schemes and performance evaluation techniques.

There was a period when both managements and social scientists studiously overlook a good deal of organizational counterproductive work behavior. Although they know it is there, it is bracketed off as being somehow peripheral or inessential without any attempt to quantify or analyze its contribution to organizations. This perception brings home normative the consideration of organizational behavior actually is much of the time. Employees do not go out of their way to exhibit behavior that is not officially allowed. Hence there is substantial agreement that unless such behavior interferes with the purposes of the organization as construed by its representatives, or intrudes noticeably on the interests of constituent groups within the organization; it is likely to pass unnoticed. The presence of counterproductive work behavior affects the learning and growth of any organization, but its consequences will be visible only after a while. The organization can prevent the occurrence of counterproductive work behavior if it had a culture that can resist behavior which is contrary to its legitimate interest. Culture which ensures committed employees adds to this resistance. This study is an attempt to explore how far the variables organizational culture and organizational commitment can create such a resistance by finding the mediating effect of organization commitment in the relation between organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior.

Objective

1. To examine the mediating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship of organizational culture and counterproductive behavior.

Hypothesis

1. Organizational commitment mediates the relationship between organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior.
METHOD

Participants
This study constitutes participants from various branches of two governmental organizations. The participants were selected by means of simple random sampling. The total number of participants is 141, of which 73 were from Organization-1, and 68 from organization-2. Among the participants 48.3% were male and 52% female. Most of the participants were married (89.1%) and very few were single (10.86%). With regard to salary, 13.5% had salary up to 10000, 54.6% had in between 10000-20000, 24.1% in between 20000 and 30000, and 7.8% received above 30000. Of the sample, 65.21% held membership in union and 34.78% of participants did not connect themselves with any kind of union activities.

Instruments

1. Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI): Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) is a 39-item instrument developed by ……… which is designed to help and understand an organization’s culture and identify the ways to deal with culture-based problems. The Organizational Culture Inventory assesses the values and beliefs that help or hinder organizational performance in six vital dimensions. The Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess the reliability. The reliability coefficient of the organizational culture inventory is 0.802. The content validity score of organizational culture inventory is 0.945.

2. Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS): This scale was developed by Balachandran and Thomas (1994), to measures employees’ feelings, loyalty, involvement, interest and reaction towards the work. It consists of 39 statements of which 18 are positively worded and 21 are negatively worded. This scale has been developed on a sample of 300 industrial personnel’s. The organizational commitment scale has a test-retest reliability of 0.88 (N=75) and a split-half reliability coefficient of 0.90 (N=300). The Cronbach alpha for the 39 item was found to be 0.87. All these values show that the scale has high reliability. Further the author’s claims that, since the scale is developed by adapting items from existing popular scales and has included most of the employee related variables, the scale has got acceptable levels of content validity.

3. Counterproductive Work Behavior Indicator: This instrument was developed by the department of psychology, University of Calicut, consist of 30 items. To calculate the counter productive work behavior numerical weightage given by the subjects were calculated for each item. The total number of agree or yes multiplied with 12.5 constitute the total counterproductive work behavior. Again the total counterproductive work behavior is divided by the total number of items (30) to get the counterproductive work behavior Index.

Procedure
The Counterproductive Work Behavior Indicator (CWB), Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) and Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) along with the Personal Data Sheet were administered to participants in their work place. All the instruments are self-administered. However, investigator assisted those who have difficulty in understanding the items, or the mode of responding to the items. Instructions are clearly printed at the beginning of each instrument. After completing/responding the instruments, it was collected back and scored according to the
scoring key of each instrument. Then the data were fed into a spread sheet for further statistical analysis.

Results and Discussion
In order to test the hypothesis whether organizational commitment mediates the relation between counterproductive work behavior and organizational culture, mediation analysis was carried out. Before proceeding with analysis a brief note on mediation analysis follows.

Mediation is a hypothesized causal chain in which one variable affects a second variable that, in turn, affects a third variable. The intervening variable, M, is the mediator. It “mediates” the relationship between a predictor, X, and an outcome, Y. Graphically, mediation can be depicted in the following way:

\[ X \rightarrow a \rightarrow M \rightarrow b \rightarrow Y \]

Paths ‘a’ and ‘b’ are called direct effects. The meditational effect, in which X leads to Y through M, is called the indirect effect. The indirect effect represents the portion of the relationship between X and Y that is mediated by M.

Mediation in its simplest form represents the addition of a third variable to this X → Y relation, whereby X causes the mediator, M, and M causes Y, so X→ M → Y. Mediation is only one of several relations that may be present when a third variable, Z (using Z to represent the third variable), is included in the analysis of a two-variable system. One possibility is that Z causes both X and Y, so that ignoring Z leads to incorrect inference about the relation of X and Y; this would be an example of a confounding variable. In another situation, Z may be related to X and/or Y, so that information about Z improves prediction of Y by X, but does not substantially alter the relation of X to Y when Z is included in the analysis; this is an example of a covariate. Z may also modify the relation of X to Y such that the relation of X to Y differs at different values of Z; this is an example of a moderator or interaction effect.

Thus to begin, it is essential to establish three conditions in order to determine whether mediate has occurred.

1. The independent variable predicts the dependent variable.
2. The independent variable predicts the mediator.
3. The mediator predicts the dependent variable.

In order to test whether these three conditions are met, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of these three relationships were obtained and presented in table 1.

Table 1
Mean, SD and Correlations of counterproductive work behavior, organizational culture, organizational commitment (N=141).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Counterproductive work behavior</th>
<th>Organizational culture</th>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive work behavior</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>140.98</td>
<td>139.00</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>143.25</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01
From table 1, it is clear that there exist a significant negative relationship between organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior ($r = -0.32$, $p < 0.01$) and between organizational commitment and counterproductive work behavior ($r = -0.38$, $p < 0.01$). And also there exists a significant positive relationship between organizational culture and organizational commitment ($r = 0.63$, $p < 0.01$). These correlational values indicate that the organizational culture is strongly embedded in an employee’s commitment towards the organization. Carmeli (2005) reported that that organizational culture that provides challenging jobs diminishes absenteeism and withdrawal from job and organization and supportive organizational culture influenced the relationship between commitment and satisfaction. (Yiing & Ahmad, 2009).

The correlation coefficients for each path, that is, the link between each of the variables, is statistically significant. These results indicate that, at the bivariate level, each of the conditions necessary to test for the possible role of mediator has been met.

In order to conduct the Sobel test for mediation, it is essential to compute the raw regression coefficient and the standard error for this regression coefficient for the association between the organizational culture and the organizational commitment (the mediator), and the association between the mediator and the counterproductive work behavior (the depending variable).

Table 2 and 3 gives the model summary and coefficients of regression analysis for the association between organizational culture and organizational commitment.

### Table 2
**Model summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>Std error of the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3
**Regression Coefficients of organizational culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 3, it can be seen that the raw regression coefficient for the association between organizational culture and organizational commitment is 0.55 with a standard error for this raw regression coefficient 0.06.
Table 4 and 5 computes the raw regression coefficient for the association between organizational commitment and counterproductive work behavior.

### Table 4
**Model summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>Std error of the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
**Regression Coefficients of organizational commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5, it can be seen that the raw regression coefficient for the association between organizational commitment and counterproductive work behavior is 0.04 with a standard error for this raw regression coefficient of 0.02.

Using the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and standard errors for the associations Sobel (1982) test was computed and the result were presented in Table 6.

### Table 6
**Sobel test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Sobel Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p<0.05\)

The test statistics for the Sobel test is 1.95 (Z’) with an associated p value of 0.05. The fact that the observed ‘p’ value is equal to the established alpha level of 0.05 indicates that the association between the independent variable and dependent variable (organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior) is significantly affected by the inclusion of the mediator (organizational commitment) in the model; in other words, there is evidence of mediation.

These results are consistent with some results discussed in literature, pointing that affective organizational commitment is a mediator of the process between perceived change efficacy and job satisfaction (Gomes, 2009). From the empirical point of view, this study proves the impact of organizational change on important organizational dimensions, such as affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction. These dimensions are strongly associated with
important outcomes for any organization, such as absenteeism (Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994), turnover intentions (Somers, 1995).

CONCLUSION
As previously stated, understanding the existence of counterproductive work behavior is a relevant issue for organizational behavior, notably in clarifying the established relation with important organizational variables such as organizational culture and organizational commitment. The purpose of this study was to clarify the relation between organizational culture, organizational commitment and counterproductive work behavior by proposing a meditational model for explaining the path between organizational culture and counterproductive work behavior. Organizational commitment acts as the mediator between the predictor organizational culture and the outcome, counterproductive work behavior. The main conclusion is that the extent to which members of an organization imbibes the organizational culture it can enhance the commitment thereby resisting the occurrence of counterproductive work behavior.
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