Counterproductive Behaviour and Job Performance among Secondary School Teachers: School Climate as a Mediator.
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ABSTRACT
This study determined the mediating effect of school climate (SC) on the relationship between teachers’ counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) and job performance (JP) in secondary schools in Ogun State, Nigeria. This study employed the descriptive research design type. Three hundred and sixty participants selected through multi-stage stratified random sampling technique, were used for the study. Three main instruments were used in collecting data. Data was analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Hierarchical Multiple Regression. Results showed an inverse relationship between CWB and positive SC (\(\beta = -.573, P =.05\)), and JP (\(\beta = -.381, P =.05\)), while convergent significant relationship existed between positive SC and JP (\(\beta = .53\)). Also, a significant mediation effect of positive school climate (PSC) on the relationship between CWB and JP (\(\beta = .416, \text{sig} = .005\)). On the basis of the findings, it was established that SC is a strong factor in the relationship between CWB and JP. It is concluded that teachers’ perception of the school climate as being satisfactory or not to a great extent will influence their behaviour positively or negatively in achieving the school vision, as well as enhancing their commitment to work.
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INTRODUCTION
Teaching is one of the most significant professions of the world. All the professions in the society have its base in this noble profession; it is quite evident from that the pace of evolution greatly depends on teaching quality. Schools are important institutions where children follow careers and give meaning to their lives. However, the Federal Government of Nigeria in her National Policy on Education (2004:2) emphatically stated that “No education system can rise above the level of its teachers”. To a large extent therefore, the success or failure of any educational system, depends majorly on the teachers, being the hub of the educational system. It was generally perceived that teachers’ attitude to work was one of the major factors in the decline in educational achievement. Poor performance of students in both internal and external examinations had been attributed to the poor performance of teachers, as well as their attitudinal disposition toward their job and school vision. However, there were other contributing factors to the decline in educational achievement, such as communication problems, lack of motivation and encouragement of teachers, absence and lack of commitment on the part of teachers, to mention a few (Effiong, 2006).

In view of the foregoing, the purpose of this study was to determine mediating effect of school climate on the relationship between teachers’ counterproductive work behaviour and job performance in secondary schools in Ogun State, Nigeria.

Teachers’ Job Performance
Job performance has been variously defined by many scholars and researchers. Generally, it is seen as the way and manner in which a staff in an organization performs the duties assigned to him or expected of him in order to realize the organization’s goals and objectives. Nayyar (1994) sees job performance as the degree to which an individual employee executes a particular role or responsibility, in accordance with certain specified standards. It could also be described as the ability to combine skillfully the right behaviour towards the achievement of organizational goals and objectives (Olaniyan, 1999). Meindl (1995) argued that job performance is determined by the worker’s level of participation in the day to day running of the organization.

In the school system, a teachers’ job performance could be described as the duties performed by a teacher at any given time in the school geared towards achieving both the daily school and classroom objectives and the entire set goals and objectives of education (Duze, 2012). Also, teacher’s performance means the behavior of a teacher which changes differently with the change in surrounding environment, in such way that
when a particular task is assigned to teacher, he/she successful takes action to carry out that task (Cheng & Tsui, 1998; Marsh, 1987; Medley, 1982).

Just like any other organization, employee’s job performance could either be described as low, moderate, high, depending on the extent of his commitment to work in order to achieve set objectives and goals (Adeyemi, 2004; Blase and Blase, 2000; Olaniyan, 1999; Baskett and Mikios, 1992; Bernd, 1992; Okunola, 1990). The implication of this as rightly noted by researchers like Adepoju (1996), Duze (2012) is that the variables associated with teachers’ job performance such as effective teaching, effective use of scheme of work, lesson note preparation, effective supervision, monitoring of students’ work and disciplinary ability are virtues which teachers should uphold effectively in the school system.

Researchers like Hanif, (2010) argued that good teachers has not only to teach in a way that he/she can satisfy the class with his prominent teaching style, moreover he/she has to manage time and other duties assigned to him/her apart from teaching, like managing ethics and discipline in class, motivating students, ensuring students’ interaction, and maintaining a proper link with the parents of students and administration of educational institution.

The teachers’ performance can be broadly divided in to three major categories:

1. The task performance means, set of behaviors by which an employee recognizes and comprehends that the organizational goals have been highlighted and explored (Cai & Lin, 2006). Task performance is actually the technical behavior and activities involved in the employee’s job (Griffin, Neal, & Neale, 2000). From teaching perspective, the task performance means set of regulated job behaviors, which a teacher can do. The teachers’ task performance consists of teaching effectiveness, teacher–student interaction, and teaching value (Cai & Lin, 2006).

2. The contextual performance refers to the employees’ activities, which do not contribute to the technical core but it support the organizational, social and psychological environment in which the organizational goals are followed (Borman & Brush, 1993). It is consisted of occupation morality, job dedication, and assistance and cooperation among the teachers (Cai & Lin, 2006).

3. The adaptive performance is a new performance concept in which learning comprises a major performance dimension (Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). This consist of dimensions like handling emergencies, handling stress at work, solving problems creatively, demonstration of interpersonal adaptability, and showing physically oriented adaptability.

It should be noted, however, that these three types of teachers’ performances are not only connected with each other but also they influence each other, however these types can be distinguished and studied separated (Cai & Lin, 2006; Griffin, et al., 2000; Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Stephan & James, 1994).

**Teachers’ Counterproductive Behaviour**

One of the major concerns of many organizations that need urgent attention is counterproductive work behavior which is assumed to be a problem that violates significant organizational norms and threatens the wellbeing of an organization, its members, or both. Counterproductive work behavior is an urgent concern of the organization because it is assumed to cost organization billions of dollars each year (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Negative emotions are related to counterproductive work behavior because employees who create problem in others’ work and not help others usually have negative emotions (Khan, Afzal & Zia, 2010).

Counterproductive workplace behaviour is a class of behaviours that acts against the interests of the organization, which individuals, usually, consciously choose to engage in (Chang and Smithkrai, 2010). Based on Gruys and Sackett (2003) treatment, counterproductive work behavior is any intentional behavior on the part of an organization member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests.

Increase in counterproductive work behavior has been linked to decrease in performance or productivity, employer dissatisfaction, and greater psychological distress (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Tepper, 2000). Negative employee behavior is related to behavior of employees with others which in turn may reduce other employee performance and cause conflict (Folger & Skarlicki, 2005). Studies in the past have shown that majority of the employees involve themselves in the negative behaviour (withholding effort, reporting late to work, absenteeism, abusing medical certificates, working slowly and hiding needed resources ) at the workplace due to un-conducive work environment (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

Studies (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Marcus & Schuler, 2004; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001) have shown that counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) is an intentional employee behaviour that is harmful to the legitimate interests of an organization. Different terms have been used to denote CWB behaviours such as misbehaviour (Ackroyd & Thomson, 1999), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), antisocial behaviour (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997); deviance (Martinko, Gundlach & Douglas, 2002) and aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1998). A review of past literature by Abdul-Rahman, Shabudin, and Nasurdin (2012), Fox, Spector and Miles, (2001); and Robinson and Bennett (1995) showed that regardless of the different terms that have been
employed, these behaviours share some common characteristics namely: (1) it reflects any form of behaviour that violates customary norms or values either dominant organizational norms, societal norms, or violates both norms, (2) it indicates intentions that could be either voluntary or intentional that will or cause harm to the organization, its members or both; and, (3) it results in negative consequences to the organization, its members or even other people that have direct connection with the organization. CWB can vary based on its target: organizational and individual.

It is indeed evident that employees’ counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) cases are critical factors in the behaviour of workers in relation to the achievement of the organizational goal.

School Climate as a mediator

The construct of climate has been studied extensively and has proven useful in capturing perceptions of the work context (Denissen, 2006; Ostroff, Kinicki & Tamkins, 2007). Climate has been described as an experientially based description of the work environment and, more specifically, employees’ perceptions of the formal and informal policies, practices and procedures in their organization (Schneider, 2008).

School climate is a measure, real or perceived school environment as it relates to interpersonal, academic, and professional interactions. Researchers (Denison, 1996; Oti, 2012; Verbeke, Volgering & Hessels, 1998), asserts that school climate entails the way in which members of the school perceive and characterize their environment in an attitudinal and value-based manner. Organizational climate has been asserted as an important and influential aspect of satisfaction and retention, as well as institutional effectiveness and success in academia. As a result of its subjective nature and vulnerability to control and manipulation by individuals within an organization’s decision-making mechanism, the organizational climate is greatly influenced by organizational leadership (Smart, 1990; Cameron and Smart, 1998; Volkwein and Parmley, 2000; Johnsrud, 2002; Allen, 2003).

School climate could either be seen from psychological or organizational point of view. Individuals own perceptions of the work environment constitute psychological climate at the individual level of analysis, whereas organizational climate has been proposed as an organizational or unit-level construct. The importance of the organizational climate to teachers’ performance is relevant to a high degree, since it is indicative of how well the teacher manages to realize his/her full potential. High-performance school tends to make optimal use of everyone’s capabilities. Thus, Ajay & Mandakini (2013) asserts that organizational climate definitely affects the teacher’s performance in school. It will affect their motivation and dedication at work, job satisfaction and efficacy. In an organization with a high extent of humanistic relationship, collegiality, and participation, the teaching effectiveness is high, triggering a higher success of education, too.

Climate affects productivity and effectiveness of employees, as well as their ability to provide an ideal learning environment for their students and to serve their community. It affects individuals’ opportunities to grow professionally and personally (Study Group on University Diversity, 2008; Allen, 2003).

Number of reports has shown that teacher’s job performance is deteriorating around the world in general and Nigeria in particular, which seems to be affecting the teaching and learning process instructional activities at school, as well as the school output in terms of students/graduate turnout. As a result, students are the most affected individuals.

THE PROBLEM

In the Nigeria context, research regarding job performance, counterproductive work behaviour and organizational climate has been researched on by various researchers in the past of which most of the studies were done in manufacturing industry but not education industry. Even the one done in the education industry did not combine the three variables together or find the mediating effect of any of the variable on the other. Hence, there is a gap in literature with regards to understanding the mediating effect of school climate on teachers’ counterproductive behaviour and job performance in secondary school.

The concern of this present study therefore is to determine the mediating effect of school climate on teachers’ counterproductive work behaviour and job performance relations as presented in the model below.
It was therefore hypothesized that school climate will not significantly mediate the relationship between teachers’ counterproductive work behaviour and job performance.

METHODS
Participants: In this study were involved 360 public secondary school teachers randomly selected from eighteen (18) secondary schools in Remo Educational Block (comprising of 3 local government areas – Ikenne, Remo-north, and Sagamu LGAs), Ogun State, Nigeria. The mean age and standard deviation of the participants at the time of data collection were 33 and 10.12 respectively with age range of 28 and 57 years. Among the participants 147 (40.8%) were male and 213 (59.2%) female. Most of the participants were married (76.5%) and very few were not (23.5%). 58.6% of the participants were with first degree and masters, while the remaining 41.4% were with NCE. In regard to number of teaching experience with the government majority of the participants (69.3%) have spent over ten (10) years on the job while the remaining 30.7% have spent less than ten years.

Instruments
Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C; Spector et al., 2006) is composed of 45 items. The items ask respondents to indicate how often they have done each behavior at work, and it can be used to indicate the behavior of others, as coworkers or subordinates. Response choices range from 1 (Never) to 5 (Every day).
Organizational Climate Index (OCI; Hoy, Smith, and Sweetland, 2002): It’s a 30-item descriptive questionnaire that measures four critical aspects of school climate (collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, achievement press, and institutional vulnerability). The reliability scores for each subtest of the OCI are .94, .88, .92, and .87 respectively for collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, achievement press, and institutional vulnerability. Response choices range from 1 (Rarely Occurs) to 4 (Very Frequent Occurs).
Work Performance Scale: Teacher’s job performance is measured by using a self-developed questionnaire that contains 20 question items which are developed to assess the job performance of respondents. The scale was anchored on four empirically determined categories of teacher job performance, which are Teaching Skills, Management Skills, Discipline & Regularity, and Interpersonal Skills. A 5-point Likert scale (1- never, 2-sometimes, 3 - often, 4- mostly and 5 - always) was exploiting to record the responses. High scores represent the high level of teachers’ job performance.

Procedure
Biographical data scale was used to assess the demographic details of the participants while counterproductive work behavior scale, work performance scale, and school climate questionnaire were administered on the sample with other four (4) research assistants who were postgraduate students.

Data analysis
The data obtained were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics analysis and Pearson product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Hierarchical Multiple Regression statistical tools.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach’s Alpha & Correlations of Teachers’ Counterproductive Work Behavior, Work Performance, and School Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive behaviour</td>
<td>79.937</td>
<td>10.237</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>40.886</td>
<td>15.001</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-573</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>41.287</td>
<td>12.989</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-381</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 360; P=.05

Table 1 shows the reliability of the variables. The Cronbach’s alpha for counterproductive work behaviour scale is .873, school climate index is .903 and for job performance scale is .86, which meets the minimum acceptable recommended level. For Correlation, Pearson Correlation matrix is used in this study. It is shown from the Table 1 that an inverse relationship exist between counterproductive work behaviour and school climate (.573) at a high significant level (p = .05). This finding support the earlier finding of Trace, Scott and Michael (2005) who found out that work environment that exist in the work place affects the behaviour of employed workers. The result is also in line with the Taiwanese organizations’ study by Silverthorne (2004) which indicated that positive environment will result in higher organizational commitment and lower turnover intention.

Counterproductive work behaviour and job performance showed a negative relationship (-.381) at significant level P =.05). This lends credence from the study of Netemeyer, Boles, McKee, & McMurrian, (1997) that found a fit between the person and the environment which is related to several job responses. Also, the result strengthens the findings of Appelbaum, Laconi and Matousek (2007) and Lucas and Friedrich (2005) that negative deviant behaviours have negative organizational consequences.

The findings on the significant convergent (positive) relationship between school climate and job performance (.53), at a significant level (p = .05) agreed with the findings made by Adeyemi (2008) in his study of the relationship between organizational climate and teachers’ job performance in primary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria found significant relationship between organizational climate and teachers’ job performance.

Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis of School Climate, Counterproductive Work Behavior and Teachers’ Work Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Beta β</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School Climate (SC)</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>5.432*</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>6.358*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB)</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>3.086*</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>3.171*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job Performance (JP)</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>3.190*</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>3.419*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>11.007*</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SC X JP</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>4.407*</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SC X CWB</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>3.008*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N =360, *P<.05 (2-tailed)

The hierarchical multiple regression analysis showed that all the variables as shown in step 1, 2, and 3 are significant in this study. Testing the mediating power level of school climate on the other two variables (step 4), showed a significant mediation effect of school climate on the relationship between counterproductive work behaviour and job performance (β = .416, sig = .011). Specifically, school climate moderates teachers’ job performance (β = .399, t = 4.407; sig = .005) and counterproductive work behaviour (β = .399, t = 4.407; sig = .005) separately as shown in Step 5 and 6. This report support the works of Allen (2003) and Study Group on University Diversity (2008) that climate affects productivity and effectiveness of employees, as well as their ability to provide an ideal learning environment for their students and to serve their community. It affects individuals’ opportunities to grow professionally and personally. Also, the significant relationship found in this study was consistent with Adeyemi, (2008) and Nurharani, Nur Zahira, & Nur Shaminah (2013) that found organizational climate to be a significant factor that could affect teachers’ job performance as well as promoting deviant behaviour at work.

Conclusion

This study has empirically established the mediation effect of school climate on the relationship between teachers’ job performance and counterproductive work behaviour. The foregoing showed that school
climate is a critical and potent variable of administrative effectiveness of secondary school teachers in Remo educational block of Ogun State, Nigeria.

However, understanding the existence of counterproductive work behavior in academia is a relevant issue for organizational behavior, notably in clarifying the established relation with important organizational variables such as school climate and job performance or effectiveness. Therefore, school climate mediates between the predictor teachers’ job performance and the outcome, counterproductive work behavior. Lastly, it is concluded that teachers’ perception of the school climate as being satisfactory or not to a great extent will influence their behaviour positively or negatively in achieving the school vision, as well as enhancing their commitment to work.
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