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ABSTRACT

Counterproductive Work Behaviours have a major negative effect on organisations and their employees. Since employees engage in various forms of counterproductive work behaviour for various reasons, there is a need to analyse the different forms of counterproductive work behaviour. The existence of CWBs such as abuse against others, withdrawal behaviors, lateness etc. in an organization, can harm organizations or people in organization including employees and clients, customers or patients as documented in the body of the literature.

This research is to investigate the counterproductive work behaviour of nurses in 13 hospitals in Bengaluru. The components of counterproductive work behaviour were evaluated using a questionnaire in a sample size of 143 nurses. Among the finding the major parameter i.e. abusing others is the predominant behavior shown by employees. The research also reveals that the age, experience, gender, salary does not show in any significance in counterproductive work behaviors of employees.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Counterproductive Work Behaviours (CWB) is defined as an intentional unacceptable behaviour that has the potential to have negative consequences to an organisation and their employees. CWB leads to destruction of property, misuse of time, information and resources, drug and alcohol use, inappropriate actions, etc.

Due to the huge potential losses to an institution from CWBs it is very important these behaviours are not overlooked. Measures need to be taken to reduce the higher risk of potential loss due to CWB, because these not only affect the organisation but also the well-being and performance of employees in workplace.

Through the available literature it is observed that counterproductive behavior is widespread among employees in organizations. Despite the growing literature on employees' counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior, few studies have examined the various dimensions of workplace counterproductive behavior and the extent of its occurrence of counterproductive behavior in the hospitals amongst nurses.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Robert .T. Hitlan and Jennifer Noel (2009) research identified that workplace exclusion, ostracism and personality contribute to Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB). Research reveals that higher levels of supervisor exclusion were related to higher levels of organizational CWB but not interpersonal forms of CWB. In addition, co-worker exclusion was positively associated to interpersonal CWB. Research also reveals that, a significant relation between co-worker exclusion and organizational CWB.

Frone (2000) study found that both interpersonal conflict with supervisors and with co-workers arises depression, self-esteem, somatic symptoms, job satisfaction related to individual level and reduced in organizational commitment and higher turnover at organizational level.

Emily. M. Hunter and Lisa. M. Penny (2014) Study reveals that customer stressors were more strongly correlated with customer-directed CWB, in this study they used following drives of CWB customer stressors, emotional dissonance, and emotional exhaustion.

Matrecia S.L. James, Angela K. Miles and Terry Mullins (2011) study reveals that there is a strong positive relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and spirituality with CWB.

Hui, L., & Tian-yao, S(2014) study depicts transactional leadership style effectively reduce the CWB of employees.

Chirumbolo (2015) study shows that job insecurity positively effects on counterproductive work behaviours, study also reveals that Honesty–Humility were negatively associated to CWB of employees.
Chang, K., & Smithkrai, (2010) study found that to reduce CWB of employees by changing personality characteristics through proper implementation of organizational justice enhancement policies and programs to enhance OCB.

Bruursema, K., Kessler, S. R., & Spector, P. E. (2011) research identified that job boredom showed significant relationships with various dimensions of CWB like abuse against others, production deviance, sabotage, withdrawal and theft.

Anjum, M. A., & Parvez, A. (2013) examines the significance of abuse against others, production deviance, sabotage, theft, withdrawal behavior dimensions of CWB and tried to find the relationship between CWB, interpersonal Conflict and job satisfaction. The study reveals that the higher the job satisfaction minimizes the CWB and frequent interpersonal conflict mounts up the CWB.

Suzy Fox, Paul E Spector and Don Miles (2001) examines the relationship among job stressors, perceived justice, negative emotional reactions to work, CWB, autonomy, and affective traits. Study identified that CWB of employees is because of different types of stressors such as organizational constraints, interpersonal conflict, and perceived injustice.

Ayoko, Oluremi B., Victor J. Callan, and Charmine EJ Härtel (2003) examined the relationship between CWB and victims of bullying. It reveals that bullying events and their related emotions arouses CWB in the workplace. (14)

Lisa M. Penney and Paul E Spector (2005) examined the relationship between workplace stressors such as workplace incivility, interpersonal conflict and organizational constraint, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). The research found that workplace incivility and other job stressors appears to increase the likelihood that an individual will engage in CWB.

Arno R. Kolz (1999) examined the influence of “Big five” traits on CWBs. The result shows that, conscientiousness is the major trait which could be used to predict CWBs such as theft, absenteeism, tardiness, lack of cooperation, taking long breaks and excess socializing.

Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003), study investigated the eleven dimensions of CWB Theft and Related Behaviour, Destruction of Property, Misuse of Information, Misuse of Time and Resources, Unsafe Behaviour, Poor Attendance, Poor Quality Work, Alcohol Use, Drug Use, Inappropriate Verbal Actions, Inappropriate Physical Actions. It was found that CWB dimensions are positively related. Interpersonal components, organizational components and task relevance components were positively related to CWB.

From the literature it is identified that many components instigates CWB of employees in an organization. It also reveals that different researchers used different components to quantify CWB.

Keeping in view the available literature and based on the frequency of usage of different researchers the five dimensions i.e. Sabotage, Withdrawal Behavior, Production Deviance, Theft and Abuse against others of CWB are considered for the present study.

III. OBJECTIVES

This empirical study aims to identify the existence of counterproductive work behaviour of nurses working in hospitals.

The objective of this study includes, identifying the extent of occurrence of CWB of nurses working in hospitals, effect of demographical factors on CWB and finally to find the relationship between the parameters of CWB.

IV. METHODOLOGY

To know the existence of CWBs in employees, a modified Spector et.al. (2006) were used. It consists of 32 questions which includes five dimensions such as sabotage, theft, abuse against others, production deviances and withdrawal behaviour. All the questions are in 5-point likert scale ranging from 1-Never to 5-Very Often, questionnaires also includes demographical characteristics of employees like age, gender, salary and experience. The questionnaire was distributed to 200 staff nurses from various 13 hospitals in Bengaluru. 147 filled questionnaires were collected out of that 143 questionnaires were appropriate and considered for analysis.

Using MS Excel and Mini Tab 14 software data was analysed and carried out different statistical test like Chi Square test, correlation analysis and regression analysis to draw the inferences.

V. RESULTS

Level of occurrence of CWB

To explore the extent of occurrence of CWB, employees were divided into two groups namely, Never and Very Often, based on their average score. The individual response choices, ranged between 1 to 5. The maximum average score for an individual is 5, while minimum score is 1. Those scoring more than the overall mean were assigned as “CWB” and those scoring less than overall mean were assigned as “NCWB”. For the present study overall mean is 2. According to Jerome (2013), Vijay Anand (2013), Srinivas and Swamy D R (2013), Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy D R (2013), Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy D R (2015) the overall mean is considered as cut off score.
From the above figure 1, based on the average score 49% of employees have counterproductive work behaviors and 51% of employees are categorized as NCWB.

**Gender wise level of occurrence of CWB**

The analysis on the extent of occurrence of CWB gender wise is done for the present sample. It is represented in the figure 2. In the total sample of 143, the male employees are 17 and 126 are female employees. Among 17 male employees 5 agreed to have shown behaviours of CWB. Among 126 female employees 65 agreed to have shown the behaviours of CWB.
From the above figure 3, it is observed that the level of occurrence of CWB is very high in female nurses as compared to male nurses. But the sample is further tested for significance of gender with CWB.

**Relationship between gender and CWB:**

The sample is tested for likely-hood of gender having significance with counterproductive behaviours. For this purpose a null hypothesis is formulated as given below.

\[ H_0: \text{There is an association between gender and counterproductive work behaviour.} \]

The below table 1 shows the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Table value</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Calculated Value</th>
<th>( P ) value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCWB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Gender and counterproductive behaviour

The critical value is 3.84. The Chi-square value was 2.948, which is less than 3.8. Thus, there is no significant difference in CWB between men and women in our sample. It is concluded that based on this sample, men and women in general seem equally likely to be showing CWB.

**Age wise level of occurrence of CWB**

The sample is further subjected to test for the extent of occurrence of CWB with respect to age. It is represented in the figure 4. It is clear from the figure that, more number of employees from age group of 26-30 have shown the CWB.

But in order to get a clear picture, the percentage analysis is done by considering number of employees categorized as CWB in each group to total number of employees in that group. It is shown in the figure 5.
From the above figure 5, the percentage of employees increases linearly with age. But the sample is further tested for its significance of age with CWB.

**Relationship between Age of employees and CWB:**

The sample is tested for likely-hood of age having any significance with counterproductive work behaviours. For this purpose a null hypothesis is formulated as given below. The data is fed into a Minitab worksheet and a chi-square analysis is done. The below table 2 shows the results.

**H0:** There is an association between age and counterproductive work behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>NCWB</th>
<th>χ² Table value</th>
<th>χ² Calculated Value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>4.196</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Relationship between age and counterproductive work behaviors

The critical value is 7.81. The Chi-square value was 4.196, which is less than 7.81. Thus, there is no significant difference in CWB between different age groups in our sample. It is concluded, that based on this sample, age does not have any significance in showing counterproductive work behaviours. Employees in any age group are equally likely to show the counterproductive behaviours.

**Work experience and level of occurrence of CWB**

The sample is tested for the extent of occurrence of CWB with respect to experience. It is represented in the figure 6. As it can be understood from figure 6 and figure 8, it is very difficult to draw any conclusion on relationship between work experience and CWB. Thus, the sample was further statistically tested to find any relationship between work experience and CWB.

**Relationship between work experience of employees and CWB:**

The sample is tested for likely-hood of work experience having any significance with counterproductive work behaviours. For this purpose a null hypothesis is formulated as given below.

**H0:** There is an association between work experience and counterproductive work behaviour.
The below table 3 shows the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience groups (years)</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>NCWB</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Table value</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Calculated Value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Relationship between work experience and counterproductive work behaviors

The critical value is 5.99. The Chi-square value was 1.604, which is less than 5.99. Thus, there is no significant difference in employees showing counterproductive work behaviours with experience. It can be concluded based on this sample that, work experience does not have any significance in showing counterproductive work behaviours. Employees with any work experience are equally likely to show the counterproductive behaviours.

**Level of existence of components of CWB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWB Parameters</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>NCWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabotage</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal behavior</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Deviance</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse against others</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Level of existence of each parameter of CWB

It is clear from the above figure 7 that, amongst 5 parameters the, 23% of employees engage in theft dimension of CWB. As per the sample, theft is the most common CWB amongst employees. 42 % of employees engage in Sabotage and withdrawal behaviours CWBs. Only 18% of employees engage in production deviance behaviour and 16% of employees engage in abusing against others CWB.

**Correlations between CWB and components of CWB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>P - value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse against others</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabotage</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Deviance</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal behavior</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Magnitude of each components of CWB

Further the sample is tested for the magnitude of influence of CWB components on employees CWB, Pearson correlation test was conducted for 5% level of significance and it reveals that p<0.05 for all the components. The results of hypotheses test were presented in Table 4. From this, it is concluded that there is a positive correlation between Components of CWB and employees CWB in surveyed hospitals and relationship is statistically significant.
Correlations between each component of CWB

Using Excel’s Correlation data analysis tool, the sample is computed for the pairwise correlation coefficients for the components of CWB. The results are shown in table 5. From this, it is observed that the strongly correlated counterproductive behaviours are Withdrawal behaviours and abuse against others. The least correlated CWBs are Production deviance and Sabotage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWB Components</th>
<th>Sabotage</th>
<th>Withdrawal Behaviour</th>
<th>Production Deviance</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Abuse against others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabotage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Behaviour</td>
<td>0.516969</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Deviance</td>
<td>0.134325</td>
<td>0.375682</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>0.340892</td>
<td>0.457628</td>
<td>0.309793</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse against others</td>
<td>0.582313</td>
<td>0.641241</td>
<td>0.366895</td>
<td>0.513916</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Correlation between each component of CWB

Regression equation for CWB and components of CWB of employees

In this research, CWB the dependent variable and FIVE components of CWB are the independent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of CWB</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse against others</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabotage</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production deviance</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal behavior</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression equation is

\[ CWB = 0.003 + 0.113 C1 + 0.625 C2 + 0.086 C3 + 0.058 C4 + 0.114 C5 \]

The following interpretation can be drawn from the above equation.

The highly occurring behavior is abuse against others, followed by withdrawal behavior, theft, sabotage and production deviance respectively.

VI. CONCLUSION

The findings of the study not only enhance our understanding of counterproductive work behaviours among nurses in hospitals of Bengaluru. The impact of each component of CWB is analyzed using regression analysis. Abuse against others is the predominant factor which is contributing to the overall CWB in the organization. The most frequently combined parameter which occur together are abuse against others and withdrawal behaviour. The prevalence rates of CWB highlights the need for having an effective control mechanism to curb them in order to increase the efficiency of the organization.
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