

Perceived Organisational Justice and Climate on Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Public Employees

Rofhiwa Madzivhandila, Sunday Samson Babalola* and Khathutshelo Khashane

Department of Human Resource Management & Labour Relations, School of Management Science, University of Venda, Thohoyandou, 0950, South Africa

Abstract: Employee work activities that are more than expectations are the panacea for organisational success, in today's dynamic workplace. In achieving this set goal, organisations need to be seen, by employees as taking care of their welfare, as employees are significant resources of an organisation. This study investigated perceived organisational justice and climate on counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) among public employees. A quantitative research design was used, with self-administered questionnaires for the collection of data. Three hundred and seventy-seven employees from public service organisations participated in the study. The participants were made up of 183 (50.3%) females, with a mean of 35.41 years of age, and 7.42 years of working experience. Results revealed that organisational justice and CWB were statistically significant ($F(1, 359) = 11.53, p < 0.05$). It was also found that organisational climate and CWB were statistically significant ($F(1, 359) = 18.94, p < 0.05$). The findings were discussed in line with the literature, as well as outlining their implications for management and suggesting appropriate recommendation. Specifically, the study suggested the creation of an enabling environment that will ensure that employees are well treated; this will encourage employees to take calculated risks with the aim of advancing the organisational objectives, promote employee citizenship behaviour as well as reduce dysfunctional behaviour.

Keywords: Organisational climate, organisational justice, counterproductive work behaviour, public employees.

INTRODUCTION

Qualified and experienced labour workforce should be a desirable asset that any organisation will aim to recruit to complement other organisational assets. As employees with experience, skills, expertise are capable of providing greater benefit for organisations (Acquaah and Tukamushaba, 2009). Organisations require several resources to meet its set goals, however, human capital is one of the significant resources. Organisations need to manage their human resource effectively in order to grow and gain a sustainable competitive advantage. A significant feature of human resource management is to ensure that perceived organisational climate and organisational justice do not lead to counterproductive work behaviour (CWB).

Every organisation expects its employees to conduct themselves in a professional and acceptable manner when interacting with and influencing others. Workplace behaviours are patterns of actions and interactions of organisational members which affect organisation effectiveness, directly or indirectly (BusinessDictionary.com, 2017). CWB as a form of deviant or negative behaviour is described as voluntary behaviour displayed by employees with the aim of inflict harm or protest against the organisation,

co-workers and customers in order to please one's personal interests which violate the organisational ethical codes and conducts. This type of behaviour, therefore, can violate and threaten the well-being of the organisation and its members (Dirican and Erdil, 2016). It is, thus, harmful and has a negative impact on the organisation and its members.

To gain competitive advantage and survive in the global work environment, organisations need to take cognisance of employee-oriented work outcomes and their influencing factors, (Kanten and Ulker, 2013), as employees are perceived as the best assets of organisations. These researchers argue that organisational climate is one of main factors which have influence on employees' behaviour. Organisational climate is an important work environment which affects different aspects of work, such as - individual and organisational outcomes, intention to leave, effectiveness of individual practice, job satisfaction, work attitude, organisational productivity, team innovativeness, organisational commitment, job exhausting, company productivity, employee engagement, growth of the company, withdrawal behaviours as well as employees' psychological well-being (Acykgo-Gunsel, 2011; Bahrami *et al.*, 2013; Putter, 2010).

Workplace climate impacts on employee's incentive, potential attitude and behaviour that in turn affect organisational productivity. Organisational climate is,

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Human Resource Management & Labour Relations, School of Management Science, University of Venda, Thohoyandou, 0950, South Africa; Tel: +27159628258; E-mail: sunday.babalola@univen.ac.za

therefore, considered as a crucial aspect of organisational life due to its effects and relations to regulatory activities. It affects the performance of employees who are an organisation's 'engine and the life wire' for continuity (Al-Saudi, 2012; Kanten and Ulker, 2013). In other words, the way organisational climate dimensions are handled and rewarded, determines employees' workplace behaviour.

In Management Studies, perception of fairness and justice has been used to elucidate workers' reactions to authorities (Azar and Darvish, 2011; Babalola and Alarape, 2017). Employee behavioural outcomes are affected by organisational justice factors of - procedural, distributive and interactional (Colquitt *et al.*, 2001; Priesemuth *et al.*, 2013). Organisational justice focuses on perception of fairness, as it provides explanations, for example, on why employees react against inequitable outcomes and interactions (Alsalem and Alhaiyani, 2007; Bakhshi *et al.*, 2009). It further suggests that employee behaviour is better examined by assessing the perception of overall justice instead of how it can lead to employee CWB (Cropanzano, 1993; Ghosh *et al.*, 2014). It is also deal with the way employees view the treatment they received in the cause of performing their work activities, as such perceptions often influence other work-related variables (Tessema *et al.*, 2014). Research on organisational justice further indicates that employees who believe that they were treated fairly are favourably disposed towards their organisations and engage in pro-social behaviours on behalf of their employers. According to Rana and Rastogi (2015), when an organisation is perceived to be fair, employees' reaction tends to be positive and they are willing to work effectively and not get involved in negative behaviours, such as increase in employee turnover and CWB.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social exchange theory is seen as a framework for a better understanding of the factor relationship of perceived organisational justice, organisational climate and CWB (Chernyak-Hai and Tziner, 2014). Social exchange theory explains that as employees render their services to the organisation, they also expect rewards from the specific organisation - an exchange relationship. The theory suggests that humans' social decisions are based on perceptions of the costs and benefits that can be gained by such actions taken (Chernyak-Hai and Tziner, 2014). In an organisational context, the theory is useful in understanding workplace behaviour (Chernyak-Hai and Tziner, 2014;

Huang, *et al.*, 2016). An employee's response often depends on the way the organisation has treated such employee (Mearns *et al.*, 2010). In addition, the theory claims that social relationships are based on trust and kindness which are shared between employees and the organisation (Blau 1964; Chernyak-Hai and Tziner, 2014). One consequence of organisation not meeting these commitments (trust and kindness), is employees being less satisfied with their jobs. To Homans (1958), exchange of activity, whether tangible or intangible, that are rewarding or costly, is described as social exchange theory. Wan and Antonucci (2016) believe that social behaviours and interactions among individuals are the result of an exchange process. To these authors, the pursuit of rewards and benefits, and the avoidance of costs and punishment is generated by the relationship between individuals (Wan and Antonucci, 2016). The social exchange theory further hypothesises that relationships are moulded through the use of subjective cost-benefit analysis and a comparison of alternatives (Chernyak-Hai and Tziner, 2014; Homans, 1958).

Literature on organisational justice has been the result of two overlapping models of distributive justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice is perceived fairness of managerial decisions in terms of distribution of pay and promotions based on the task performance (Tessema *et al.*, 2014). For example, if an organisation is only paying supervisors a bonus from projects that were completed in conjunction with their co-workers, those co-workers may perceive the action as distributive justice. According to Cochran (2014), when distributive justice is negatively perceived, individuals react counterproductively by acting aggressively towards what appears as the cause of the injustice (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). Distributive justice, therefore, is the result of perceptions of fairness in the distribution of resources between people (Greenberg and Baron, 2003; Rana and Rastogi, 2015).

Beyond distribution and procedural justice, employees also evaluate if they are treated fairly by others, such as colleagues and supervisors, in terms of respect and dignity (Crow *et al.*, 2012). Organisational justice's third dimension - interactional justice - is the quality of interpersonal processes and treatment of individuals. Crawshaw *et al.* (2013) describe this third dimension as the interpersonal-fairness exchanges that occur at work, in relations to treatment received. Crawshaw *et al.*, (2013) further state that this dimension is used to decide the outcomes of those

fairness processes. Ran and Rastogi (2015) observe that the perception about supervisors as being supportive and respectful of subordinates' dignities in their interactional process, help to improve perceived interactional justice and trust in supervisors. It can, therefore, be assumed that interactional justice focuses on the treatment employees receive from their supervisor(s) (Martinez-Tur *et al.*, 2014). Interactional justice is the human side of organisational practice related to communication aspects between the source and recipient of justice.

Organisational climate is a shared perception of individual elements including - code of conduct, policies, procedures, customs and rewards (Permarupan *et al.*, 2013). The expected behaviours from employees and their expected rewards from the organisation are based on their shared perceptions. This is essential as motivated employees can be encouraged to conduct themselves in a productive manner that may result in - greater passion for organisation, higher productivity, and deeper engagement with customers (Permarupan *et al.*, 2013). Organisational context is characterised by a number of factors, such as leadership, structures, rewards, communication and culture which are deemed to be part of the general concept of organisational climate (Salari *et al.*, 2013). Organisational structure is the formal configuration of groups and individuals concerning the allocation of tasks, responsibilities and authority in the organisation (Greenberg, 2011). It is the manner in which power and responsibilities are allocated and how work is done amongst the individuals in the organisation (Maduenyi *et al.*, 2015). To Salas-Fumas *et al.* (2016), the structure controls the communication process, decision-making mechanism and the degree of social influences.

Organisational standards summarise the way in which business is conducted and govern what is considered as acceptable in the workplace. Standards measure the feelings of pressure to improve performance and the degree of pride that employees have, in doing a good job (Kanten and Ulker, 2013). Responsibility is the feeling of becoming responsible for one's own decisions, in other words, an individual being able to take responsibility for decisions taken. A sense of high responsibility signifies that employees feel encouraged to solve problems on their own (Kanten and Ulker, 2013). Employees who are valued by being given responsibilities and trust, usually feel motivated, resulting in reduced employee turnover and an increased employee retention (Liou and Cheng,

2010). Employees who feel un-recognised, un-trusted, are punished for minor mistakes, are subjected to strict checking of work done, would consider the work environment as an unfavourable organisational climate (Toka *et al.*, 2010).

In addition, organisational climate captures the qualities of the work environments and how they are experienced by people working in these specific organisational climates. It is a subjective concept vulnerable to direct manipulation by people with power (Bahrami *et al.*, 2013). It represents how employees feel about workplace atmosphere, therefore, it is essential that organisations provide conducive work environments that encourage a sense of belongingness, as employees are key organisational resources. Evidence from Kanten and Ulker (2013) study indicates that organisations' overall health can be measured through individual employee's perceptions of work environments. Similarly, Giles' (2010) study contend that individual observations serve as an aggregate data describing how an organisation performs and treats its employees.

CWB is a voluntary employee behaviour, which violates significant organisational norms and threatens the well-being of the organisation and its members (Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Sackett and DeVore, 2001). Such behaviour includes theft, withdrawal activities, interpersonal aggression, and poor attendance at work. This definition corresponds with other researchers' views. For instance, Fox *et al.* (2001), describe CWB as a volitional behaviour that poses a threat to effective organisational functioning. To Chand and Chand (2014), CWB is an individual deliberate or unintentional activity which is aimed at hampering the performance of self, others or an organisation. Lawal *et al.* (2019) described CWB as any behaviour that employees engage in that goes against or hinders organizational goals and negatively affects fellow employees; these behaviours vary according to some socio-demographic factors. This behaviour can cause an organisation or workplace to be unsafe and dangerous place, due to the unethical conducts of the employees.

CWB can be directed to individuals or an organisation. Interpersonal CWBs are work behaviours, which may involve actions, like - belittling others, playing pranks on others, acting rudely and physical aggression towards others (Kanten and Ulker, 2013). In this category are also minor normative violations - favouritism, gossip, coming to work late, leaving early,

taking excessive breaks not granted by the organisation, while serious violations include - verbal abuse, sabotaging assets or equipment and stealing.

According to Fox *et al.* (2001), injustice and organisational stressors were closely related to organisational CWB, while conflict and interpersonal stressors were more closely related to individual CWB. Organisational CWB is categorised into, property CWB and production CWB (Mikulay *et al.*, 2001), likewise individual CWB is categorised as, political deviance and personal aggression (Kozako *et al.*, 2013). In their study, Koopmans *et al.* (2013), indicate that CWB is a negative aspect of job performance, as it leads to significant negative impact for individuals and organisations. Researchers have identified that CWB is comprised of variety of acts such as absenteeism, rumour spreading, sabotage, verbal and physical abuse, stealing from co-workers and organisation, late coming to office, physical assault, and withholding of efforts (Bashir *et al.*, 2012; Bennett and Robinson, 2003; Chang and Smithkru, 2010; Coffin, 2003; Galperin, 2002; Sackett, 2002).

Many researchers have categorised perceived organisational justice as both an independent variable (Cochran, 2014; Ghosh *et al.*, 2014) and a dependent variable (Baakile, 2011; Tessema *et al.*, 2014). As an independent variable, they explain some of the outcomes as motivating employees and reducing turnover intention, whereas, as a dependent variable, it was found to be affected by a number of factors such as human resource policies and procedures, pay, employee educational level, gender, position and autonomy (Baakile, 2011; Tessema *et al.*, 2014). This study examined how the perceived organisational justice influence workplace behaviour, as an independent variable.

In addition, research indicates that employee expect employer/management to reward him/her in accordance with his/her work inputs (Cochran, 2014). When there is a failure to compensate accordingly, such employee adjusts his/her behaviour to minimize the discrepancy or unfairness; the outcome of which may lead to CWB. 'Cognitive-motivational-relational theory' proposed by Smith and Lazarus (1990) explains how the cognitive appraisals of perceived injustice in an organisation gives rise to a negative effect on the employees. A meta-analysed on the relationship between perceived organisational justice and CWB by Cochran (2014), revealed that perceived organisational justice was negatively related to dimensions of CWB

which corresponds with the findings of Chang (2015) and Chernyak-Hai and Tziner (2014).

A study conducted in South African showed that public employees are experiencing low morale due to lack of promotions and performance bonuses in their workplaces (Kaseke, 2011). There were also complaints about the inhumane way in which employees were being treated by their departments, thus, leading to workplace absenteeism (Kaseke, 2011). According to the study of Chenyark-Hai and Tziner (2014), organisational climate and organisational justice were suspected to be the core influences of employee's dysfunctional behaviour. Several research studies have been conducted about the effect of organisational climate on CWB (Kanten and Ulker, 2013; Qureshi *et al.*, 2014), and the effect of organisational justice on CWB (Cheng, 2014; Cochran, 2014; Nyarko *et al.*, 2014). Most of these studies were conducted in Asia and the Western countries (Kanten and Ulker, 2013; Qadeer and Jaffery, 2014; Qureshi *et al.*, 2014) with little or no study carried out in South Africa, especially, among public employees, thus, justifying the current study.

Research Objectives

The study assessed the impact of organisational climate and perceived organisational justice on CWB among public employees, with the aid of three specific objectives. These are:

- To examine the difference between favourable and unfavourable organisational climate on CWB;
- To investigate the differences between high and low perceived organisational justice on CWB; and
- To analyse the interactional effects of organisational climate and organisational justice on CWB.

Research Hypotheses

H1 There is a significant difference between favourable organisational climate and unfavourable organisational climate on CWB.

H2 There is a significant difference between low perception of organisational justice and high perception of organisational justice on CWB.

H3 Employees who score low on organisational justice and unfavourable organisational climate are significantly higher on CWB, than those that

score high on organisational justice and favourable organisational climate.

METHOD

Research Design

This study is a quantitative research which is relied on positivism as a measurable process in statistical analysis; with this which the investigator's role is restricted to collection and interpretation of data, objectively, (Pansiri, 2009). This was deemed an appropriate design due to the large number of public employees in South Africa. A cross-sectional research design was adopted because the study took place at a given single point of time; it was preferred over other designs because it is quicker and inexpensive (Leedy and Omrod, 2016). Another advantage of this design is that it can pave way for further studies through providing clues that may serve as relevant tools to guide further experimental studies (Leavy, 2017). The researcher, hence, used this method because it is quick, and it allowed for the collection of data from a large sample size, on the factors of organisational climate, perceived organisational justice and CWB of public employees in South Africa. Data was collected in a form of questionnaires completed by the participants.

Population and Sampling

A population is a full set of an entity from which a sample is taken (Welman *et al.*, 2005), while a 'target population' is a collection of people that share common characteristics of interest (Bryman, 2001). Public employees in a selected Public Department in Gauteng Province, South Africa, were the target population of this study. The researcher used multiple sampling techniques. Probability sampling procedure, in particular, random sampling was utilised, thus, all elements in the population stood an equivalent chance to be included in the sample (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). The population were in different geographical locations within the District Municipality, thus, anywhere a government department exists as a sector, thus, each public employee, in the selected sectors, had a chance of being selected to be part of the study. A sample size is a significant feature of any research study when making interpretations about a certain population (Creswell, 2014). For most studies, a general rule when determining the sample size, is that, the larger the better (Awang, 2012). For better research results, Babbie (2013) also stated that the larger sample sizes are better. Large sample sizes have a

small margin of error and they present accurate calculations in statistics (Creswell, 2014; Mitchell and Jolley, 2010). The data analysis methods used determine the required sample size. Confirmatory factor analysis was used and Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) recommend that a sample size of at least 150 is needed when using this analytical method. For this research study to obtain accurate results, the sample of 377 participants was used.

Measuring Instruments

Questionnaires were used to gather data from the selected sample. In this study, the questionnaire comprised of four sections: the demographic information (such as gender, educational qualifications, age and working experience); organisational climate scale; organisational justice scale; and lastly, CWB scale.

Using the *Organisational Climate Scale*, participants' responses were measured using a 22-item questionnaire adopted from studies conducted by Giles (2010) and Heyart (2011) and recently used by Kantan and Ulker (2013). All variables of organisational climate (reward, warmth, support and commitment, structure, risk and conflict, and standards) were covered in this section of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Four items were used to measure reward with the Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.82$; *warmth* was also measured with four items with the Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.71$; *support* and *commitment* with a Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.73$ were measured using four items. *Structure* on the other hand was measured using three items with a Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.66$. *Risk* and *conflict* were measured using four items with the Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.55$. Lastly, *standards* with the Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.62$ was measured using three items. However, item number 4, 11, 12, 13 and 14 were reversed on the scale. On the matter of Cronbach alpha values, research showed that 0.90 and above shows *excellent reliability*, $\alpha = 0.70$ to 0.90 show *high reliability*, $\alpha = 0.50$ to 0.70 shows *moderate reliability* while $\alpha = 0.50$ and below shows *low reliability* (Hinton *et al.*, 2004; 2011) while according to Hulin *et al.* (2001), values higher than $\alpha = 0.95$ are not necessarily good, but might be an indication of redundancy.

Perceived Organisational Justice Scale was adopted using a 14-item questionnaire adopted from Cheng (2014); this instrument had previously been used by Kang (2007). Participants were asked to

respond to the questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Four items were used to measure distributive justice and Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.90$ were expected. Five items with the expected Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.90$ were used to measure *procedural justice*. And lastly, interactional justice was measured with five items with the Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.90$.

A *Counterproductive Work Behaviour Scale* comprising of a checklist, formed the questionnaire adopted from Fox *et al.* (2001) and it was also used to assess CWB towards employees and organisation; this checklist has been recently used by Spector *et al.* (2010). This section of the questionnaire consisted of 10 items whereby participants were requested to respond on a five- Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*everyday*), however, this 10-item checklist was modified into indirect questions to avoid bias from the respondents. The Cronbach's alpha for this section was $\alpha = 0.71$.

Data Analysis

The researcher used IBM-SPSS version 25 to analyse data from this study. With this SPSS software, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse data and the results are presented in the form of descriptions and correlations. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to describe the collected data on participants' demographic information, perceived organisational justice and workplace behaviour, however, the researcher used inferential statistics to draw up conclusions on the data. Pearson Product Moment Correlation and 2 X 2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to inferentially analyse the findings.

Data Collection Procedure and Ethical Consideration

Before the distribution of the questionnaires for the study, a pilot study was conducted with the aim of 'purifying' the contents of the items, thereby, rectifying and refine any possible inadequacies in the questionnaire (Saunders *et al.*, 2009; Sekaran and Bougie, 2016), since a reliable instrument helps with issues like, eliminating leading questions, cultural jargons, ambiguous statements and sensitive questions (Raman *et al.*, 2016; Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The questionnaires were distributed physically at the participants' workplaces. This method was very suitable for the study as it was easy to follow-up on the

questionnaire distribution, hence, ensuring a high response rate (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). This research adhered to ethical standard by ensuring confidentiality and anonymity of participants. Furthermore, departmental chief officers in charge, were issued with consent forms to invite their employees to participate in the study by completing the questionnaires given to them. Nobody was forced to get involved in the study as participation was voluntary, and they were also allowed to withdraw at any time, without any penalty. The questionnaire did not have provision for names or any personal identification of the participants, to ensure confidentiality.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

The biographical information gathered showed that there were 364 participants and they all answered all questions asked in the questionnaire; thus, no missing value was found. There were almost equal number of males and females, as males were 181 (49.7%) and females, 183 (50.3%) with the mean age of $\bar{x} = 35.41$ years (SD, 8.08), and the mean working experience of $\bar{x} = 7.42$ years (SD, 5.531).

Inferential Statistics

The Pearson-product correlation helps to check if there is a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. To access the alliance between the independent variables (organisational justice and organisational climate) and CWB, the Pearson product correlation analyses was performed. The correlations analysis between organisational climate and CWB was tested as shown in Table 1. The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between organisational climate and CWB ($r = -.33$; $p < 0.01$). The results tested also revealed that there is a negative significant relationship between organisational justice and CWB ($r = -.34$; $p < 0.01$).

Correlation analysis on Table 2 showed the relationship among dimensions of organisation justice, perceived organisational climate and CWB. The findings showed a negative significant relationship with distributive justice ($r = -.29$; $p < 0.01$) and dimensions of organisational climate (reward ($r = -.14$; $p < 0.01$), warmth ($r = -.19$; $p < 0.01$). Organisational support was found to have a very weak relationship and not significant with CWB ($r = -.09$; $p > 0.05$). Organisational standard with structure on the other hand was found

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Matrix between Independent and Dependent Variables in the Study

	\bar{x}	SD	N	OJ	OC	CWB	
OJ	43.14	10.80	364	1			
OC	65.62	8.84	364	.64 [*]	1		
CWB	19.76	9.61	364	-.34 [*]	-.33 [*]	1	

Note: * = $p < 0.01$ level; SD = Standard Deviation; N = Number of participants; OJ = Organisational Justice, OC = Organisational Climate, CWB = Counterproductive work behaviour.

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Matrix Between Dependent Variables and Subscales of Organisational Climate in the Study

	\bar{x}	SD	CWB	DJ	CR	CW	CS	CS&S
CWB	19.76	9.61	1					
DJ	16.85	4.26	-.29 [*]	1				
CR	10.51	2.46	-.14 [*]	.26 [*]	1			
CW	20.62	3.22	-.19 [*]	.30 [*]	.44 [*]	1		
CS	11.37	3.80	-.09	.07	-.04	-.14 [*]	1	
CS&S	23.10	5.28	-.31 [*]	.62 [*]	.22 [*]	.35 [*]	-.02	1

Note: * = $p < 0.01$ level; SD = Standard Deviation; N = Number of participants; CWB = Counterproductive Work Behaviour; DJ = Distributive Justice, CR = Climate Reward; CW = Climate Warmth; CS = Climate Support; CS&S = Climate Standard and Structure.

with moderate significant relationship with CWB ($r = -.31$; $p < 0.01$).

Table 3 showed the descriptive analysis indicating that participants in High organisational justice had higher mean score ($\bar{x} = 23.18$, $SD = 9.56$) than Lower organisational justice with mean score ($\bar{x} = 17.00$, $SD = 8.73$) on work outcome of CWB. It further revealed that participants with favourable organisational climate ($\bar{x} = 23.03$, $SD = 10.01$) scored higher on CWB than those with unfavourable organisational climate ($\bar{x} = 16.51$, $SD = 7.97$).

Table 4 shows factorial analysis of variance of the main and interaction effects of variables of

organisational justice and organisational climate on CWB. The main effect of organisational justice on CWB was statistically significant $F(1, 359) = 11.53$, $p < 0.05$. This shows there is a significant difference between low perception of organisational justice and high perception of organisational justice on CWB. The main effect of organisational climate on CWB was also statistically significant, $F(1, 359) = 18.94$, $p < 0.05$, therefore, the findings support the hypothesis which states that there is a significant difference between favourable organisational climate and unfavourable organisational climate on CWB. There was no interaction between organisational justice and climate on CWB, $F(1, 359) = 0.62$, $p > 0.05$. This means that

Table 3: Descriptive Analysis of Organisational Climate and Justice on CWB

OrgJus1	OrgClim1	\bar{x}	SD	N
High	Favourable	24.44	9.77	124
	Unfavourable	18.81	7.39	36
	Total	23.18	9.56	160
Low	Favourable	19.85	9.92	55
	Unfavourable	15.95	8.02	148
	Total	17.00	8.73	203
Total	Favourable	23.03	10.01	179
	Unfavourable	16.51	7.97	184
	Total	19.72	9.60	363

Table 4: 2 x 2 ANOVA of Organisational Climate and Justice on CWB

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	Partial Eta ²
Corrected Model	4905.81 ^a	3	1635.27	20.66	< .05	.15
OrgJus	912.82	1	912.82	11.53	< .05	.03
OrgClim	1499.44	1	1499.44	18.94	< .05	.05
OrgJus * OrgClim	49.21	1	49.21	0.62	> .05	.00
Error	28420.65	359	79.17			
Total	174554.00	363				
Corrected Total	33326.45	362				

a R² = .147 (Adjusted R² = .140); OrgJus = Organisational justice; OrgClim = Organisational climate.

the hypothesis which states that employees that score low on organisational justice and unfavourable organisational climate are significantly higher on CWB, than those that score high on organisational justice and favourable organisational climate, was not supported.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings from the correlation analysis of the variables of perceived organisational justice, organisational climate and CWB revealed strong negative significant relationship between the factors of organisational climate and CWB. CWB also showed weak negative significance relationship with the dimensions of organisational climate (reward and warmth). Organisational support was found with a very weak relationship with counterproductive work behaviour. Organisational standard with structure on the other hand was found with moderate significant relationship with CWB. These findings corresponded with Kanten and Ulker's (2013) study which indicated that the dimensions of organisational climate have significant negative relationships on CWB. The relationship between organisational justice and CWB revealed a moderate negative significant statistics relationship; this is in line with Cochran's (2014) findings that meta-analysed the relationship between perceived organisational justice and CWB. The current study also revealed negative relationship between the dimensions of perceived organisational justice and CWB, thus, corresponding with the findings of Chernyak-Hai and Tziner (2014) and Chang (2015) which indicated that CWB negatively correlated with all dimensions of perceived organisational justice.

The findings on the difference between favourable organisational climate and unfavourable organisational climate on CWB revealed statistically significant

difference. It simply means that employees have a lower chance of encountering CWB when there is a favourable organisational climate; this does not correspond with the findings of Kanten and Ulker (2013). On the differences between high and low organisational justice on CWB, result revealed that there is a statistical difference between these variables on CWB. Further findings showed that no significant interaction was found between organisational climate and organisational justice on CWB. Conclusively, this study shows that there is an independent influence of organisational justice and organisational climate on CWB.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Even though the study achieved its objectives, there were some challenges that the researcher faced during the process of data collection from participants. Many questionnaires were distributed, however, not all participants manage to complete them, and some employees refused to participate. Poor responses from participants and facing challenges in convincing employees to participate were among the core challenges faced in the study. Other setbacks were related to financial constraints.

Recommendations for Practice and Future Research

It is recommended that organisations should take organisational justice and climate into consideration in their work procedures as they have a huge influence on employees' behaviour, especially, negative work behaviour. Organisations should ensure that the well-being of employees are prioritised so that they can be intrinsically, and extrinsically motivated, as happy employees provide good performance. It is important that managers and supervisors note that low

organisational justice and unfavourable organisational climate are some of the workplace factors which can provoke CWB and thus have subsequent negative effects on attainment of organisational performance.

In addition, it is recommended that organisations should ensure creation of favourable organisational climate which can lead to organisational structure, standards and warmth that can accommodate all manners of employees. The provision of responsibility and full support from employers and co-workers, can be a panacea to employee commitment and consequent achievement of organisational goals, visions and missions. It is crucial that employees are rewarded accordingly so that they can take calculated risks with the aim of advancing the organisational objectives. Distributive and interactional justice are recommended as they are fair to employees, at all times. To achieve the objective that every employee should be treated fairly, organisations should strive towards this objective to ensure that employees are happy. The study recommends that a similar study should be carried out using qualitative approach or a combination of qualitative and quantitative research approach, either of these approaches will enable one to obtain enough subjective feedback from the participants. Furthermore, the study recommends that further studies be undertaken with private organisations.

REFERENCES

- Acquaah, M., and Tukamushaba, K.E. (2009). *Human factor, organisational justice and perceived organisational effectiveness: An empirical analysis from Ghana and Uganda*. Proceedings of the 10th Annual International Conference: Makerere University Business School, 19-23 May.
- Acykoza-Gunser, A. (2011). The effect of organisational climate on team innovativeness. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences* 24: 920-927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.102>
- Al-Saudi, M.A. (2012). The impact of organisational climate upon the innovative behaviour at Jordanian private universities as perceived by employees: A field study. *International Business and Management* 5(2): 14-26.
- Alsalem, M. and Alhaiani, A. (2007). Relationship between organizational justice and employees' performance. *Aledari* 108: 97-110.
- Awang, Z. (2012). *Research methodology and data analysis*. Shah Alam: Universiti Teknologi
- Azar, A., and Darvishi, Z. A. (2011). Development and validation of a measure of justice perception in the frame of fairness theory-fuzzy approach. *Expert Systems with Applications* 38(6): 7364-7372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2010.12.090>
- Baakile, M. (2011). Comparative analysis of teachers' perception of equity, pay satisfaction, affective commitment and intention to turnover in Botswana. *Journal of Management Research* 3(1): 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v3i1.501>
- Babalola, S.S., and Alarape, A.I. (2017). Perceived justice, prestige and career development as predictors of employee's turnover intention in small and medium enterprises. *International Business Management* 11(11): 1901-1907
- Babbie, E. (2013). *The practice of social research*. USA: Thompson Learning Inc.
- Bahrami, M.A., Taheri, G., Montazeralfaraj, R., and Tafti, A.D. (2013). The relationship between organisational climate and psychological well-being of hospital employees. *World Journal of Media Science* 9(1): 61-67.
- Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., and Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management* 4(9): 145-154. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n9p145>
- Bashir, S., Nasir, M., Qayyum, S., and Bashir, A. (2012). Dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviours in public sector organisations of Pakistan. *Public Organisation Review* 12: 357-366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-012-0177-8>
- Bennett, R.J., and Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85: 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Bennett, R.J., and Robinson, S.L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organisational behaviour: The state of the science*, pp. 247-281. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Blau, G. (1964). Influence of group lateness on individual lateness: A cross level examination. *Academy of Management Journal* 38: 1483-1495. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256867>
- Bryman, (2001). *Business research methods*. United State of America, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Business Dictionary.com. (2017). Workplace behaviour. Retrieved from: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/workplace-behaviour.html>.
- Chand, P., and Chand, P.K. (2014). Job stressors as predictor of counterproductive work behaviour in Indian banking sector. *International Journal of Applied or Innovation in Engineering and Management* 3(12): 43-55.
- Chang, C.S. (2015). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, constraints with performance: A meta-analysis. Bowling Green State University. Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/pg_10?0::No:10:P10_ACCESSION_NUM:bgsu1429212007
- Chang, K., and Smithikrai, C. (2010). Counterproductive work behaviour at work: An investigation into reduction strategies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 21(8): 1272-1288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2010.483852>
- Cheng, S.Y. (2014). The mediating role of organisational justice on the relationship between administrative performance appraisal practices and organisational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 25(8): 1131-1148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.816864>
- Chernyak-Hai, L., and Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behaviour, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology* 30: 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2014a1>
- Cochran, M.N. (2014). *Counterproductive work behaviours, justice and affect: A meta-analysis*. Orlando, Florida.
- Coffin, B. (2003). Breaking the silence on white-collar crime. *Risk Management* 50(9): 8-10.

- Cohen-Charash, Y., and Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organisations: A meta-analysis. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 86(2): 278-321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C.O.L.H., and Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analysis review of 25 years of organisational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86: 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Crawshaw, J., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C.M., and Nadicic, T. (2013). Organisational justice: New insights from behavioural ethics. *Human Relations* 66(7): 885-904. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713485609>
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach*. London, United Kingdom. Sage.
- Cropanzano, R. (1993). *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crow, M.S., Lee, C., and Joo, J. (2012). Organisational justice and organisational commitment among South Korean police officers: An investigation of work satisfaction as a mediator. *International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 35(2): 402-423. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511211230156>
- Dirican, H.A., and Erdil, O. (2016). An exploration of academic staff's organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour in relation to demographic characteristics. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences* 235(1): 315-360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.043>
- Fox, S., Spector, P.E., and Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) in response to job stressors and organisational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* 59: 291-309. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803>
- Galperin, B.L. (2002). *Determinants of deviance in the workplace: An empirical examination in Canada and Mexico [unpublished doctoral dissertation]*, Concordia University, Montreal.
- Ghosh, P., Rai, A., and Sinha, A. (2014). Organisational justice and employee engagement. *Personnel* 43(4): 628-652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2013-0148>
- Giles, P. (2010). *The impact of adult degree-completion programs on the organisational climate of Christian colleges and universities*. Doctoral Thesis, Walden University.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behaviour in organisations* (10th. ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Greenberg, J., and Baron, R.A. (2003). *Behaviour in organisation: Understanding and managing the human side of work*, (8th ed.). New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
- Heyart, B. (2011). *The role of organisational climate and culture in service encounters*. Doctoral Thesis, Wayne State University.
- Hinton, P.R., Brownlow, C., McMurray, I., and Cozens, B. (2011). *SPSS Explained. using SPSS to analyse questionnaires: Reliability*, Pp. 355-365. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London.
- Hinton, P.R., Brownlow, C., McMurray, I., and Cozens, B. (2004). *SPSS Explained*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203642597>
- Homans, G.C. (1958). Social behaviour as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology* 63(1): 597-606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Huang, Y.H., Lee, J., McFadden, A.C., Murphy, L.A., Robertson, M.M., Cheung, J.H., and Zohar, D. (2016). Beyond safety outcomes: An investigation of the impact of safety climate and job satisfaction, employee engagement and turnover using social exchange theory as the theoretical framework. *Applied Ergonomics* 55(1): 248-257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2015.10.007>
- Hulin, C., Netemeyer, R., and Cudeck, R. (2001). Can a reliability coefficient be too high? *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 10(1): 55-58. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1001&2_05
- Kang, D. (2007). Perceived organisational justice as a predictor of employees' motivation to participate in training. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management* 15(1): 89-107.
- Kanten, P., and Ulker, F.E. (2013). The effect of organisational climate and counterproductive behaviour: An empirical study on employees of the manufacturing enterprises. *The Macrotheme Review* 2(4): 144.
- Kaseke, L.L. (2011). *Challenges facing the Limpopo Department of Public Works with regards to service delivery: A case study of the core functions of the Department*. Master of Public Administration, University of Limpopo, South Africa.
- Koopmans, L., Benaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V.H., Van Buuren, S., Van der Beek, A.J. and deVet, H.C.W. (2013). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* 62(1): 6-28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t35489-000>
- Kozako, A.M.F., Safin, S.Z., and Rahim, A.R.A. (2013). The relationship of big five personality traits on counterproductive work behaviour among hotel employees: An exploration study. *Procedia Economics and Finance* 7: 181-187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(13\)00233-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(13)00233-5)
- Lawal, A.B., Babalola, S.S., and Ordu, U.F. (2019). Examining age, pay satisfaction and intent to leave in counterproductive work behaviour among university Support Staff. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology* 16(2): 194-205.
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Leedy, P.D., & Omrod, J.E. (2016). *Practical research: Planning and design*, 11th Ed. New York: Wiley.
- Liou, S-R, and Cheng, C. (2010). Organisational climate, organisational commitment and intention to leave amongst hospital nurses in Taiwan. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 19(11-12):1635-1644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2009.03080.x>
- Maduenyi, S., Oke, A.O., Fadeyi, O., and Ajagbe, M.A. (2015). *Impact of organisational structure on organisational performance*. In the Proceedings of The Covenant University International Conference on African Development Issues (CU-ICADI) held on 11-13th May, 354-358.
- Martinez-Tur, V., Moliner, C., Ramos, J., Luque, O., and Gracia, E. (2014). Quality and well-being in service organisations: The role of service climate and organisational justice. *Papelsedel Psicologo* 35(2): 99-106.
- Mearns, K., Hope, L., Ford, M.T., and Tetrick, L.E. (2010). Investment in workforce health: Exploring the implications for workforce safety climate and commitment. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 42(1): 1445-1454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2009.08.009>
- Mikulay, S., Neuman, G., and Finkelstein, L. (2001). Counterproductive workplace behaviours. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs* 3(127): 279-300.
- Mitchell, M.L., and Jolley, J.M. (2010). *Research design explained*. New York: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Nyarko, K., Ansah-Nyarko, M., and Sempah, D.B. (2014). Organisational injustice and interpersonal conflict on counterproductive work behaviour. *European Journal of Business and Management* 6(21): 117-123.

- Nyarko, K., Ansah-Nyarko, M., and Sempah, D.B. (2014). Organisational injustice and interpersonal conflict on counterproductive work behaviour. *European Journal of Business and Management* 6(21): 117-123.
- Pansiri, J. (2009). Evolution of a doctoral thesis research topic and methodology: a personal experience. *Tourism Management* 30(1): 83-89.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.04.001>
- Permarupan, P.Y., Al-Mamum, A., Saufi, R.A., and Zainol, N.R.B. (2013). Organisational climate and employees' work passion: A review. *Canadian Social Sciences* 9(4): 63-68.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n7p268>
- Priesemuth, M., Arnaud, A., and Schminke, M. (2013). Bad behaviour in groups: The impact of overall justice climate and functional dependence on counterproductive work behaviour in work units. *Group and Organisation Management* 38(2): 230-257.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113479399>
- Putter, L. (2010). *Organisational climate and performance: The relation between organisational climate and performance and an investigation of the antecedents of organisational climate*. Graduation thesis Master of Science in Management of Technology, Delft University of Technology, Delft.
- Qadeer, F., and Jaffery, H. (2014). Mediation of psychological capital between organisational climate and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences* 8(2): 453- 470.
- Qureshi, M., Rali, A.M., and Zaman, K. (2014). A new trilogy to understand the relationship among organisational climate, workplace bullying and employee health. *Arab Economics and Business Journal* 9(1): 133-146.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aebj.2014.05.009>
- Raman, P., Sambasivan, M., & Kumar, N. (2016). Counterproductive work behaviour among frontline government employees: role of personality, emotional intelligence, affectivity, emotional labour, and emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology* 32(1): 25–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2015.11.002>
- Rana, G., and Rastogi, R. (2015). Organisational justice enhancing managerial effectiveness in terms of his position, achieving results and developing further potential. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 5(1): 24-32.
- Sackett, P.R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviour: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 10(1-2): 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00189>
- Sackett, P.R., and DeVore, C.J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviour at work. In Anderson, D. Ones, N. Sinangil and C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial: Work and organisational psychology, Vol.1*, pp. 145-164. London, UK: SAGE.
- Salari, F., Zainalipour, H., and Fini, A.S. (2013). Investigation the relationship between organisational climate and job burnout of personnel in University of Bandar Abbas. *Academic Journal of Psychological Studies* 2(2): 39-46.
- Salas-Fumás, V., Carlos Sáenz-Royo, C., and Lozano-Rojo, A. (2016). Organisational structure and performance of consensus decisions through mutual influences: A computer simulation approach. *Decision Support Systems* 86: 61–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2016.03.008>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Sekaran, S., and Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*, 5th ed. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Sekaran, U., and Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Smith, C.A., and Lazarus, R.S. (1990). Emotions and adaptation. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 609-637). New York: Guilford
- Spector, P.E., Bauer, J.A., and Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artefacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(4): 781-790.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019477>
- Tabachnick, B.G., and Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*, (6th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc: New Jersey.
- Tessema, M.T., Tsegai, G., Ready, K., Embaye, A., and Windrow, B. (2014). Effect of employee background on perceived organisational justice: Managerial implications. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 80(2): 444-463.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852313514516>
- Toka, N., Schyns, B., & Looise, J.K. (2010). Direct participation quality and organisational commitment: The role of leader-member-exchange. *Employee Relations* 32: 418-434.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451011051622>
- Wan, W.H., and Antonucci, T.C. (2016). Social exchange theory and aging. *Encyclopaedia of Geropsychology* 1(1): 1-9.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-080-3_285-1
- Welman, C., Kruger, F., and Mitchel, B. (2005). *Research methodology*, (3rd ed.). Cape Town, SA: Oxford University Press South Africa.

Received on 14-11-2019

Accepted on 05-12-2019

Published on 23-12-2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-7092.2019.08.94>

© 2019 Madzivhandila et al.; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.