

Relationship between Person Organization Fit, Psychological Contract Violation on Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Sharizan Sharkawi

Faculty of Business Management
University Teknologi MARA
50450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.

Abdul Rahman Abdul Rahim

Faculty of Business Management
University Teknologi MARA
50450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.

Noor Azura Dahalan

Faculty of Business Management
University Teknologi MARA
50450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.

Abstract

The objective of this study is to identify the relationship between employees' psychological contract violation (PCV) and person organization fit (PO Fit) with CWB in the context of manufacturing industry. Data was collected from 192 employees of supervisor level and below. Several analyses were performed including factor analysis, correlations and regression analysis. Results revealed two dimensions of CWB, namely interpersonal CWB (CWB-I) and organizational CWB (CWB-O). Only PCV (Autonomy & Control) has positive relationship, and there is no significant relationship between PCV (Growth & Development), PCV (Organizational Support) with dimensions of CWB. This shows that when the employer violated the psychological contract with regards to 'autonomy and control', employees would reciprocate by displaying CWB. Meanwhile, the PO Fit has negative relationship with CWB which concludes that when employees are fit with their organization, their tendency to act counterproductively will be low.

Keywords: Psychological Contract Violation, Person Organization Fit, Counterproductive Work Behaviour

1. Introduction

The study on the topic of Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) has had numerous attentions from the Western researchers. CWB refers to behaviour of employees that harms an organization or its members (Spector and Fox, 2002) and it includes such as acts as theft, sabotage, verbal abuse, withholding of effort, lying, refusing to cooperate and physical assault (Penney and Spector, 2005). As a result of investigation done by other Western scholars, different terminologies surfaced which implied the same meaning as CWB such as: organizational delinquency (Hogan and Hogan, 1989), organization-motivated aggression (O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996), organizational retaliatory behaviours, workplace aggression and workplace deviance (Robinson and Bennet, 1995), revenge and intimidation (Gallagher et al., 2008) and antisocial behaviour in organizations (Lee et al., 2005).

This growing interest in CWB is due to the common CWB occurrences in organizations which had posed adverse effects on both organizations in terms of low productivity, increased insurance costs, lost or damage property and increased turnover (Leblanc and Kelloway, 2002); Penney and Spector, 2002) and the people in terms of increased dissatisfaction (Keashly et al., 1994) and expressed job stress.

Such losses to organization and negative emotions to individuals will only affect organizational performance as proven by (Dunlop and Lee, 2004; Harper, 1990). In view of the costs they bring about to the organizations and individuals, most research has focused on predicting CWB in an attempt to understand why individuals would engage in these behaviours and how they might be prevented. These behaviours are likely to be influenced by individuals' personality traits and attitudes (Douglas & Martinko, 2001), environmental antecedents, such as job stressors (Penney & Spector, 2005) and organizational variables such as employment relationships, psychological contract violations and organizational justice (Penny & Spector, 2005).

It should be highlighted that, most of these studies have been undertaken by Western scholars. Only few studies on CWB were conducted by Asian researchers and the numbers of studies are minuscule in Malaysia. Therefore, more empirical evidence on the predictors of CWB needs further investigations especially in the Asian context. As such, the purpose of this study is to explore the predictors of CWB at workplace focusing on the Malaysian employees, thus providing additional information to the existing literature. CWB is not a new phenomenon in Malaysia. Evidences from the Malaysia Industrial Law Journals indicated that cases of theft, stealing, fighting at work and insubordination are common cases brought to the Industrial Court (Ismail, 2009; Nazari, 2009; Moorthy, 2009; Azman 2009). Unfortunately, there is no formal statistics on the phenomenon of CWB produced by the Malaysia Labour Department (Shamsudin & Rahman, 2006).

There are inadequate researches with regards to the predictors of CWB conducted in Malaysia. Just to name a few would be, Radzi and Din (2005) which undertook a study on the relationship between perceived leadership integrity and CWB in a multinational high technology company in the northern region of Malaysia. Azib (2006) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and CWB among lecturers in local universities, whilst, Abdul Rahim and Nasurdin (2008), had explored the relationship between trust in organization, locus of control and CWB. Knowing that the manufacturing sector is a significant industry and the largest employer in the private sector in Malaysia, minimizing occurrences of CWB becomes imperatives. It would definitely help the organizations and the Malaysian economy largely if the predictors of CWB could be prevented. And based on the researcher's knowledge, studies examining the relationship between psychological contract violation (Robinson & Brown, 2004), person-organization fit (Vardi & Weiner, 1996) on CWB is still lacking.

This sparked the interest of the researcher to study on the relationship of psychological contract violation (PCV) and person-organization fit (P-O Fit) on CWB focusing on the manufacturing industry as the sample demands. Simplistically, the objectives of this study are as follows;

- To examine the relationship between person-organization fit and counterproductive work behaviour.
- To examine the relationship between psychological contract violation and counterproductive work behaviour

Employees that participated in the study consist of production employees of supervisory level right down to the production operators from selected large manufacturing companies located in Selangor, Malaysia. It is expected that findings from this study will aid the practitioners to arrive to the decision(s) to minimise the occurrences of CWB by managing PCV, P-O Fit and enhance on people management. Moreover, it is hoped that findings of this study will provide additional literature in the field of human resource management. The study will begin by reviewing the literature on CWB, PCV and P-O Fit. Describing some of the work that had been done in the past and whether these variables had played important predictors to CWB. Then, results and findings of the data will be presented using quantitative methods using tested measurement instruments. Lastly, the researcher will share the conclusion and some recommendations that could be adopted by the managers and practitioners at large.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB)

Researchers often use the framework developed by Fox and Spector (1999) when discussing CWB. CWB is behaviour intended to hurt the organization or other members of the organization.

Therefore, it can be categorized around the target of the behaviour: The organization (CWB-O) and other individuals (CWB-I). Acts such as aggression and hostility are directed at people (CWB-I).

While others, such as doing task incorrectly or sabotage, are directed at organizations (CWB-O). Further classification was developed by Spector et.al. (2006), that categorizes CWB into five dimensions; abuse - harmful and nasty behaviours that affect other people; production deviance - purposely doing one's job incorrectly or allowing error to occur; sabotage – destroying organizational property; theft – wrongfully taking the personal goods or property of another; and withdrawal – avoiding work through being late or absent.

Another dimension CWB can be categorized is according to its severity, ranging from minor to severe. Some deviant behaviour, such as worker talking with co-workers instead of working, would be classified as a minor deviant act, whilst, other incidents such as physical assault, would be classified as severe (Hollinger, 1983). According to Kelloway (2010), CWB can be viewed as a form of protest within organizations, stemming from having a high degree of identification with a victim of injustice. It was also suggested that CWB can be both individually and collectively enacted. Collective CWB would be like work-slow campaigns, work to rule, bullying, and collective acts of violence that occur in the context of labour dispute.

Drawing from the various past researchers, there are many categories and classification of CWB. However, one must know what are the predictors or variables that lead to employees behaving negatively so as to prevent and manage the situation. Such pervasive behaviour would cost a lot to organizations and would project negative company image to the public if it has received media attention. Therefore, as mentioned earlier, the two variables studied for this research as the predictors of CWB are P-O Fit and PCV.

2.2 Person-Organization Fit (P-O Fit)

P-O Fit is defined as the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs or they share similar fundamental characteristics or both (Kristoff-Brown et al., 2005). According to Kristoff (1996) P-O Fit can be conceptualized from either supplementary or complementary perspective. Supplementary fit is when a person has characteristics, such as values and attitudes that are similar to those of the organization. Complementary fit is when a person brings unique characteristics to an organization that make the organization more “whole”.

Holland's theory of job fit (Holland, 1985) stated that people are happier and more successful in their work when their personality matches or fit with the characteristics of the organization. It is the match or fit between person and the organization that determine success on the job. It is important to pay attention to P-O Fit as it has been linked to organizational attitude and retention, recruiting selection decision and employee's related attitude and behaviour (Elfenbein & Reilly, 2007; Resick et al., 2007).

Empirical evidence has shown that a high level of P-O Fit is related to a number of positive outcomes; whereby, the better the P-O Fit, the greater the job satisfaction the employees experienced (Ambrose et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2010; Tepper et al., 2009). O'Reilly et al., (1991) has demonstrated that there is empirical association between P-O Fit and organizational commitment. P-O Fit was also found to predict intention to quit and turnover (Chatman, 1991; Vancouver, 1994). There is good reason to believe that poor P-O Fit leads to job dissatisfaction which in turn leads to turnover. There is also the tendency that employees will demonstrate a counterproductive behaviour at work place when they are not happy. In addition, when employee starts to develop negative emotions, negative affectivity, cynicism and anxiety, incidences of CWB is inevitable (Aquino et al., 1999; Penney & Spector, 2002). As such, it is postulated that employee's job satisfaction act as a mediator towards the relationship between P-O Fit and CWB.

Herein so far, no empirical studies found in determining P-O Fit as predictor in CWB in an organization yet. Therefore, the researcher will try to predict in this current study that P-O Fit will have a negative relationship with CWB. In other words, the increase of P-O Fit will have negative impacts on CWB in the organization where the employees work.

2.3 Psychological Contract Violation (PCV)

Psychological contract can be defined as employee's belief regarding the mutual obligations between the employee and the employer (Rousseau, 1989). These are the expectation of the employee from the organization, and the expectations of the organization from the employee.

The organization (or employer) is, for example, expected to treat the individual justly, provide safe working conditions, etc.; while on the other hand, the employee is expected to complete requested tasks, demonstrate a good attitude. When an employee perceives that the organization has failed to live up to one or more of its promises, scholars have labelled this as violation, breach, and/or low fulfilment (Morrison and Robinson, 1997; 2000; Rousseau and McLean Parks, 1993). Thus, PCV occurs when an employee perceives that the organization has failed to fulfil one or more of its 'contractual obligations'.

In order to fully understand the nature of psychological contract, one must differentiate between the components of psychological contract: transactional and relational (Rousseau, 1995). Transactional contracts are promises that can be characterized as a more economically oriented exchange, which happen in a short term (e.g. competitive wages; Rousseau, 1990). In contrast, the relational contracts are promises which are noneconomic focusing on building employee-employer relationship by development of trust, respect and loyalty over a long period of time (e.g. career development; Rousseau, 1990).

PCV have negative consequences to employees such as negative impact on employee's work behaviour and attitudes which can lead to all forms counterproductive work behaviours (CWBs). Robinson & Bennett (1995) have indicated in their study that violation of psychological contract may pose a threat to the well being of its organization (in both individual and organization deviance). Robinson et. al (1994) and Turnley Feldman (200) empirically demonstrated that PCVs were found to increase employees feelings of anger, reduces level of satisfaction and commitment.

It was also proven in another study that production deviance, or the purposeful failure to perform job tasks the way they are supposed to be done (a form of CWB) is positively related to relational contract breach (Jensen et. al., 2010). Theft which is also a form of CWB, was established in past research as a response to the feeling of unfairly paid (transactional contract breach) (Greenberg, 1996). When an employee perceives contract breach in terms of the way he/she is expected to spend time on the job (i.e., workload, meaningfulness of work), restoration of balance would focused on reallocation of time. The employee will regain time by not engaging in work tasks or slacking, which are all forms of withdrawal under CWB (Spector et. al., 2006). Stemming from this, Jensen et. al., 2010 has revealed in his study that there is a significant relationship between relational contract breach and withdrawal.

Thus, in this research, the researcher will try to predict whether PCV will have positive relationship with CWB in a more specific sample of production employees within the manufacturing industry in the state of Selangor, Malaysia. The framework of this study shows that there are two dimensions that may or may not influence CWB. The first dimension is a person-organization fit (P-O Fit), whereas, the second dimension is psychological contract violation (PCV). From these two variables, we are going to study the relationship for each independent variable towards the dependent variable of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB).

3. Methodology

Participants and procedures

This research involves voluntary participations by employees from 10 manufacturing companies located in the state of Selangor, Malaysia. These manufacturing companies includes from various sector such as automobile, electrical, chemical and etc. The study was based on individual employees as the unit of analysis, whereby production workers of supervisory level and below were the main focus of the respondents (N=200). The questionnaires were passed to the company's Human Resource Managers who had helped to distribute to their production employees. After discarding unusable questionnaires, only 192 useable responses were processed.

In line with this study's main objective of assessing the relationship between P-O Fit, PCV and CWB, a questionnaire comprising of several sections were developed. The various sections of the questionnaire relates to the demographic, and the main focus of the study namely, person-organization fit, psychological contract violation and counterproductive work behaviour. Instruments of measurement used were adopted from past research developed by prominent scholars in the specific area.

3.2 Measurement Instruments

Person-organization Fit (P-O Fit)

The measurement used for P-O Fit was a 3-item self-report questionnaire developed by Cable & Judge (1996) and the coefficient alpha stated by Cable & Judge (1996) which was 0.87 was found to be reliable to be applied in this study. Responses were given on a 5-point likert scale from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. The example of item is *“Do you think the values and personality of this organization reflect your own values and personality?”*

Psychological contract violation (PCV)

15-item scale conceptualized by Kickul & Lester (2001) was used to measure psychological contract. All items were reverse coded to represent PCV. Respondents will rate the items using a 5-point likert scale from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. Sample items include *“My employer provides enough resources to do the job”* and *“My employer provide opportunities for personal growth”*. The reliability coefficient from past research ranges from 0.78 to 0.85.

Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB)

Participants responded to a 33-item self-report CWB scale (derived from Spector & Fox, 2001). Items asked respondents to rate the extent to which they engaged in CWB. Items were rated on a 5-point likert scale with 1= Never to 5= Everyday. Sample items include *“Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done”* and *“Took supplies or tools home without permission”*. Cronbach alpha of 0.86 was reported for this scale.

3.3 Data Analysis Technique

Several analysis methods were used by the researcher for this research to achieve the objectives and to answer the research questions. To interpret the data, the researcher used Statistically Packaged for Social Science (SPSS) 20. There are five procedures for analysis of data chosen in order to evaluate and interpret the data. They are descriptive frequency analysis, factor analysis, reliability analysis, correlations and regression analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Respondent Profile

There are a total number of 192 respondents from manufacturing industry involved in this research. The average age of the respondents participate in this research are in the range of 30-34 years old. Based on the findings, it showed that 84.4 percent of respondents are male while remaining 15.6 percent are female. The respondents are dominated by married people with 69.8 percent. 56.3 percent of respondents are qualified with SPM Certificate level which make up as the majority respondents. Malay respondents are the majority with 79.7 percent involved in this research. In terms of the position level, the majority of respondents involved in this study are supervisors at 31.3 percent. The average period for respondents work with the same organization is 2.52 years while average for job tenure is 2.60 years. This finding shows that none of the respondent work more than 3 years with the same organizations or hold the same position.

4.2 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was used in this research to look for ‘clumps’ or groups among the inter-correlations of the set of variables. There were a large number of items for the variables that were used as part of the questionnaires. Therefore, the researcher had used factor analysis to reduce the large number of related variables to a more manageable number prior to the correlation and regression analysis. All the items for the three variables namely, CWB (33 items), PCV (15 items) and PO Fit (3 items) were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS. Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed.

As depicted in Table 1, data reduction analysis yielded two-dimension solution with a simple structure. Five (5) items were removed from the original measurement due to low communality values (less than 0.6). The first dimension was represented by 16 items labelled as Counterproductive Work Behaviour- Organizational (CWB-O). Meanwhile, the second component which was constituted by 11 items labelled as “Counterproductive Work Behaviour- Interpersonal (CWB-I)”.

The independent variables were measured by psychological contract violations (PCV) and person-organization fit (POF). 15 items were used to measure employer's PCV and 3 items were used to measure POF. Before conducting the factor analysis, all items of the subordinates' perceptions of organizational psychological contract were reverse coded as to represent the respondents' perceptions of organization's psychological contract violation. In the data reduction process, three items were dropped before yielding the final solution. The item was dropped due to low communality value. F1 was labelled as "Psychological Contract Violation- Growth & Development (PCV-Growth & Dev). F2 was labelled as "Psychological Contract Violation- Organizational Support (PCV-Org Suppt) and F3 was labelled as "Psychological Contract Violation- Autonomy & Control (PCV-Auto & Ctrl). On the other hand, POF remains as single dimension as conceptualized. This as illustrated in Table 2 and 3.

4.3 Reliability Analysis

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a set of indicators of a latent construct is internally consistent in their measurement (Hair et al., 2006). The reliability for each measure was examined by computing its Cronbach's alpha. Table 4 provides the reliability coefficients of the measures. It was shown that all studied variables Cronbach's alpha values were higher than 0.7. Hair et al., (2006) indicated that a very good reliability level is when the alpha value is 0.7 and above. Therefore, the internal consistency of the measures used in this study is considered acceptable.

4.4 Correlation Analysis

The correlations and directions of the study variables were examined by computing the Pearson (product-moment) correlation coefficients (r). The Pearson's r indicated the coefficient's estimate of linear associations based on sampling data. However, it does not distinguish the correlation between the independent and dependent variables. Thus, the summary statistics of correlations does not reveal the appropriateness of the data for the model. The negative and positive signs only signify the direction of the relationship but do not reveal the size of the relationship (Cooper & Schneider, 2001; Hair et al., 2006). For the purpose of this study, correlations of .30 are considered low level. Meanwhile, correlations of .80 are considered high level (Cooper & Schneider, 2001).

As shown in Table 5, out of 45 correlations, approximately 53.4% (24) of the intercorrelations were statistically significant. PO Fit was found to be significant and negatively correlated with interpersonal CWB ($p > .05$) and organizational CWB ($p > .01$), and the r value ranged from .182 to .202. Despite the significant correlations between PO Fit, interpersonal CWB and organizational CWB, the intercorrelations were considered weak.

The correlation coefficient between dimensions of PCV, interpersonal CWB and organizational CWB demonstrated mixed findings. PCV (Growth & Development) demonstrated a positive and significant correlation with interpersonal CWB ($p > .05$) and organizational CWB ($p > .01$) and the r value ranged from .177 to .186. In similar note, PCV (Autonomy & Control) also demonstrated a positive and significant correlation with interpersonal CWB ($p > .05$) and organizational CWB ($p > .05$) and the r value ranged from .238 to .308. However, PCV(Organizational Support) does not show any significant relationship with the dependent variables.

In general, the findings of correlation coefficients among variables indicated that statistical interdependence existed between dimensions of PCV, PO Fit, and dimensions of CWB. Although, correlations among the variables were significant, the strength of the correlations was mostly below .30 which depicted low level of correlations (Hair et al., 2006; Cooper & Schneider, 2001).

4.5 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis (MRA) is used to analyze the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The analysis outcome is the prediction of the dependent variables from the independent variables and can be characterized in terms of the strength of the relationship or its effect size. This study postulated a direct relationship between all dimensions of PCV variables, PO Fit and CWB. In order to achieve the objective of this study, all independent variables were regressed on the dimensions of CWB.

Table 6 revealed the tabulated findings of the analyses on the relationships between the studied variables. All the independent variables explained 9.9 percent of the variance in organizational CWB (O-CWB) and 11.6 percent of the variance in interpersonal CWB (I-CWB). O-CWB was impacted by PCV (autonomy and control) (24.4%), and PO Fit (15.5%).

Meanwhile, I-CWB was impacted by PCV (autonomy and control) (14.9%), and PO Fit (22.3%). In contrast, PCV (growth and development) and PCV (organizational support) do not demonstrate any significant relationship with both dimensions of CWB. It should also be noted that findings of this study demonstrated only the relationship PCV (autonomy and control) (14.9%) and dimensions of CWB was as postulated. Hence, findings of the study demonstrated a partial support on the relationship between PCV and dimensions of CWB. Meanwhile, the relationship between PO Fit and dimensions of CWB are as postulated.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The contents of this section are based on the following points. Firstly, the dimensions of CWB are discussed. Secondly, the relationships between the independent variable (PCV, PO Fit) and the dependent variables (CWB) were elaborated.

5.1 Dimensions of Counterproductive Work Behaviour

Identification of the dimensions of CWB has not been conclusive. Hollinger and Clark (1983) proposed two dimensions of CWB, namely property CWB and production CWB. Robinson and Bennett (1995) added two more dimensions, namely personal aggression, and political deviance, to Hollinger's and Clark's (1983) dimensions. These resulting four dimensions were based on the target and severity of the deviance. Lee and Allen (2002) and Judge, Scott, and Ilies (2006) conceptualized CWB as a single dimension. However, findings of this study was supported by local scholars (Radzi & Din, 2005; Shamsudin, 2003) who conceptualized CWB in two dimensions, namely interpersonal CWB and organizational CWB.

5.2 The Relationship between Independent variables and CWB

This study has attempted to answer the question of whether independent variables, specifically the PCV and PO Fit have significant relationships with CWB. It is also an attempt to answer questions of whether social exchange would influence employee in determining his/her behaviour. Reciprocity would be the basis where an individual would not hesitate to express disapproval or act to reciprocate on those who violated his/her expectations or standard of conduct.

5.3 The Relationship between PCV and CWB

A substantial body of literature had found that PCV and CWB are two important concepts in the organizational behaviour field. As proposed by Bolin et al. (2001) and Kickul, (2001), PCV would lead to CWB. However, specific relationship between PCV and forms of counterproductive behaviour has not been delineated (Kickul, 2001). In other words, empirical evidence on the relationship between PCV and CWB are scarce. Thus, this study claims that PCV has a positive relationship with CWB (OCWB, ICWB). The results of the study demonstrated that when the employer violated the psychological contract with regards to 'autonomy and control', employees would reciprocate by displaying O-CWB ($\beta = .244, p < .05$) and I-CWB ($\beta = .149, p < .05$). This finding is consistent with Parks and Kidder (1994), Robinson and Rousseau (1994) and Kickul, Lester, and Finkl (2003). Moreover, the findings support the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) that when the employee perceived that the organization does not fulfill their promises, they would reciprocate in a counterproductive manner towards the organization's production as a way to even the score (Greenberg, 1997) via retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 2004).

On the other hand, findings of this study demonstrated no significant relationship between PCV (Growth & Development), PCV (Organizational Support) and dimensions of CWB. The possible explanation lays in interpreting this finding from the labor market perspectives and management perspectives. The current unemployment rate is about 3.5% (Department of Statistics, 2012) reflecting a loose labor market. Hence, the most important factor among employees is to retain and secure their current position. Moreover, at current Malaysian economic conditions, companies are more focused to increase their profit rather than sending their employees for development purposes and to experience lost man working hours. In addition, knowing that assigning of duties and matters related to development is considered as 'managerial prerogatives', employees care less on issues related to their growth, development and organizational support. However, the study demonstrated that once jobs were assigned, the employees expect the employer to practice their concept of autonomy and control. If the employer violated employees' PCV (autonomy and control), incidences or organizational CWB and interpersonal CWB would be high.

5.4 The Relationship between PO Fit and CWB

This study postulated that when employees are fit with their organization, their tendency to act counterproductively will be low. As evident from the findings of this study PO Fit demonstrated a significant and negative relationship with both OCWB (-.155**, $p < .10$) and ICWB (-.223, $P < .05$). As conceptualized by Cable and Judge (1994), employees prefer organizations where their personal characteristics are aligned with organizational attributes. When employees develop positive perceptions concerning their degree of fit with the organization, their liking and communication in their organization would be high. Hence, the tendency to act negatively at workplace would be low. Specifically, as demonstrated by this study, when employees PO Fit is high, the tendency to display a counterproductive work behavior would be low.

6. Recommendations

Findings of the study reveal that PO Fit demonstrated a significant negative relationship with CWB. In other words, when employees are fit with the organization, the tendency to act counterproductively would be low. This suggests that organization should have the right mechanism for identifying and selecting their potential employees. Furthermore, the organization should have a good filtering and screening system that could help facilitate in the identification of potential employees. It was also evident that when employer violated employees' psychological contract on autonomy and control, they will retaliate. As such, organization must ensure that in designing employees' job, the element of autonomy and control (i.e. one of the characteristics in designing a job) should be taken into consideration.

Like all studies, this study is also subjected to some limitations. First, the sample of this study was taken from the manufacturing industries alone. Vardi and Weitz (2004) indicated that CWB is a universal problem and occurs in any work organization. The work nature and work environment between the service and production organizations differs. Moreover, Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) emphasized that the work nature and work environment between the public and private sector is also different. Therefore, future research should also investigate the occurrences of CWB in service organization for both the public and private sector.

Secondly, this study is a cross-sectional in nature. In cross-sectional study, the data was collected at one point in time (Sekaran, 2003). Henle (2005) point out that employees are more likely to be tactful and covert when doing deviant acts. Such tactful and covert acts were found to be pervasive, costly and harmful to the organizations as mentioned by scholars such as Aquino, Galperin, and Bennett (2004), Griffin and O'Leary-Kelly, (2004) and Vardi and Weitz, (2004). This suggests that future CWB research should adopt the longitudinal study. In longitudinal study, the data will be collected over time (Sekaran, 2003). Therefore, it will provide avenues for tracking the employees' work behaviour over time and to have better understanding on the impact of organizational variables, work-related variables, employees' attitude and personality traits on CWB.

This study suggests that future research should look into other personal variables such as the ethical values in organizations. According to (Tenbrunsel et al., 2003) ethical values is important due to its direct influence on employees work behaviour. In order to develop good ethical values, members need to communicate and reinforce ethical principles. Moreover, understanding employees' level of perceptions and their ethical values will provide another insight for understanding occurrences of CWB. It should be noted that Weber, Kurke, and Pentico (2003) provide evidence that when employees prefer ethical work climate, occurrences of deviant behaviour was low.

In addition, previous studies (e.g. Bolin & Heatherly, 2001; Shamsudin, 2003; Bolin & Heatherly, 2001) empirically demonstrated significant correlations between employees work attitude and CWB. Hence, future research should also investigate employee's attitude such as their commitment in practicing the ethical principles outlined by their organization and CWB.

Tables & Figures

Table 1: Factor Analysis – Rotated Component Matrix - CWB

No		Component	
		1	2
1	Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for	.209	.702
2	Purposely did your work incorrectly	.158	.805
3	Came to work late without permission	.356	.670
4	Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren't	.342	.777
5	Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property	.564	.758
6	Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work	.408	.837
7	Stolen something belonging to your employer	.430	.743
8	Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work	.574	.674
9	Purposely failed to follow instructions	.446	.782
10	Made fun of someone's personal life	.493	.688
11	Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked	.272	.754
12	Been nasty or rude to a client or customer	.717	.569
13	Took money from your employer without permission	.776	.329
14	Ignored someone at work	.725	.509
15	Blamed someone at work for error you made	.712	.480
16	Started an argument with someone at work	.848	.396
17	Stole something belonging to someone at work	.811	.378
18	Verbally abused someone at work	.814	.452
19	Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work	.842	.326
20	Threatened someone at work with violence	.817	.369
21	Threatened someone at work, but not physically	.797	.254
22	Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad	.842	.423
23	Did something to make someone at work look bad	.573	.111
24	Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work	.846	.390
25	Looked at someone at work's private mail/property without permission	.704	.370
26	Hit or pushed someone at work	.840	.385
27	Insulted or made fun of someone at work	.789	.456

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Table 2: Factor Analysis – Rotated Component Matrix – PCV

No.		F1	F2	F3
1	Provide freedom to be creative	.085	.121	.857
2	Provide a job that provides autonomy and control	.127	.084	.747
3	Provide increasing responsibilities	.460	.019	.581
4	Provide opportunity to develop new skills	.415	.248	.593
5	Provide enough resources to do the job	.280	.814	.134
6	Provide adequate equipment to perform job	.112	.838	.184
7	Gives flexible work schedule	.169	.718	.274
8	Offer job security	.167	.739	-.104
9	Offer continual professional training	.753	.279	.178
10	Provide opportunities for personal growth	.702	.153	.351
11	Offer career guidance and mentoring	.863	.129	.171
12	Provide job training	.856	.280	.076

Table 3: Factor Analysis – Rotated Component Matrix – PO Fit

No.		F1
1	To what degree you feel your values “match” or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization.	.720
2	POF2: My values match those of the current employees in this organization	.824
3	POF3: Do you think the values and ‘personality’ of this organization reflects your own values and personality.	.827

Table 4: Alpha Coefficient Range of Variables

Variable	No. of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha
CWB-Organizational	11	0.961
CWB-Interpersonal	16	0.975
PCV-Growth and Development	4	0.756
PCV-Organization Support	4	0.818
PCV-Autonomy and Control	4	0.873
PO Fit	3	0.702

Note: N=192: *p<.01, **p<.05, ***p<.10

Table 5: Pearson Correlations

	Gender	Age	Marital Status	Designation	POF	PCV-Grwth_Dev	PCV-Org_Suppt	PCV-Auto_Ctrl	O_CWB	I_CWB
Gender	1									
Age	-.151*	1								
Marital Status	-.179*	.443**	1							
Designation	.315**	-.315**	-.241**	1						
POF	.100	.079	.151*	-.182*	(3.33)					
Grwth_Dev	-.005	.021	-.099	.003	-.425**	(2.57)				
Org_Suppt	-.044	-.009	-.047	.004	-.497**	.481**	(2.77)			
Auto_Ctrl	.153*	-.086	-.126	.119	-.411**	.551**	.366**	(2.30)		
O_CWB	-.052	.077	.189**	-.097	-.182*	.177*	.133	.308**	(1.74)	
I_CWB	.006	.178*	.127	-.069	-.202**	.186**	.114	.234**	.802**	(1.57)

Note: N=192, *p<0.05, **p<0.01; Mean value are provided in parentheses

Table 6: Regression Results between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

Variables		Dependent Variables	
		CWB-O	CWB-I
1	(Constant)		
	PCV_Growth& Development	-.015	.088
	PCV_Organizational Support	-.092	-.068
	PCV_Autonomy& Control	.244**	.149**
	PO Fit	-.155*	-.223**
	R Square	.099	.116
	Adjusted R Square	.075	.096
	R Square Change	.099	.116
	F Change	4.579	5.752
	Sig. F Change	.002	.000

7. References

- Abdul Rahim, Abdul Rahman & Nasurdin, Aizzat Mohd. (2008). Trust in Organization and Workplace Deviant Behaviour: The Moderating Effect of Locus of Control. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 10(2), 211-242
- Aquino, K., Galperin, B. L., & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderator of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 34(5), 1001-1029.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.
- Bolin, A., & Heatherly, L. (2001). Predictors of employee deviance: The relationship between bad attitudes and bad behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 405-418.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in predicting of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 547-559.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 291-309.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*. London. UK: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Giacalone, R. A., Riordan, C. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1997). Employee sabotage: Toward a practitioner-scholar understanding. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*. Thousand Oak: Sage.
- Hussain M.F., Younas M.F., Ahmed A., Rizwan-ul-haq, Fahim-ul-noor, Yameen H.(2011). Psychological contract breach and work place deviance: moderating. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(1), 574-586
- Joseph F. Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis (6th ed)*. NJ, USA: Pearson International Edition.
- Kelloway E.K., Francis L., Prosser M., Cameron J.E. (2010). Counterproductive work behaviour as protest. *Human Resource Management Review*, (20), 18-25.
- La Marcus R. B, Liesl K.B., & Larissa K. B. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49, 537-541.
- Liao, H., Joshi, A., & Chuang, A. (2004). Sticking out like a sore thumb: Employee dissimilarity and deviance at Work. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(4), 969-1000.
- Liu, B., Liu, B., & Hu, J. (2010). Person-organization fit, job satisfaction and turnover intention: An empirical study in the Chinese Public Sector. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(8), 615-626.
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660.
- Nasurdin, A. M., & Razali, A. A. (2006). *Organizational politics, gender, and workplace deviant behaviour: An empirical test*. Paper presented at the OIC Human Capital Management 2006.
- Robinson, S. L., & Brown, G. (2004). Psychological contract breach and violation in organizations. In R. W. Griffin & A. O'Leary-Kelly (Eds.), *The Darkside of the Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods For Business*. (4th Ed.). John Wiley & Sons Ltd
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion centred model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269-292.
- Sutarjo (2011). Ten ways of managing Person-Organization Fit (PO Fit) effectively: A Literature Study. *International Journal of Social Science*, 2(21), 226-233.
- Tekleab, A. G., & Taylor, M. S. (2003). Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organization-employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 585-608.
- Thomas, D. C., Au, K., & Ravlin, E. C. (2003). Cultural variation and the psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 451-471.