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ABSTRACT

This article argued that counter productive work behaviour (CWB) among Nigerians is a make-up behaviour of employees in the workplace. The purpose of the study is to understand counterproductive behaviour not as a personality or organisational variable only but as an attempt for employees to make up an escape (a reactionary behaviour to augment for felt and actual nation induced poverty to enhance an employees well being. This paper adopted a meta-analytic review of existing literature on counterproductive work behaviour and posited that the situation poverty in Nigeria (nation induced poverty in which the employees in Nigeria characterized by high inflation and unemployment rate, employees would sought a way out of perceived poverty bracket and therefore engage in certain behaviour he feels will help him have a better tomorrow, hence he results to behaviour that are self enhancing and detrimental to the organisation, he seeks self interest which is above organisational interest. Counter productive work behaviour is costly and detrimental to the survival of the organisation. As it affects the individual, team, organisation, investors, customers and the community in general. The author suggested that the government should reduce the cost of living by reducing tariffs and other government charges, put up measures to reduce the galloping inflation, thus increasing organisational survival that will help in employment and reduce unemployment rate. Thus increasing the well being of employees will lead to increase in productivity, commitment and job satisfaction.
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INTRODUCTION

Perception is the process through which individuals organise and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment. The meaning they obtain is a determinant of their behaviour. It is the root of all organisational behaviour, the process of perception explains the manner in which information (stimuli) from the environment around us is selected, organised to provide meaning for the individual, it is the mental function of giving significance to stimuli and give rise to individual behavioural responses to particular situations.(Robbins and Judge, 2009).
Perception is affected by factors that reside in the individual (perceiver), in the object, or target being perceived, and in the context of the situation in which the perception is made. The workplace is one of the environment man interact and attempts to give meaning. People behaviour is based on their perception of what reality is, not on reality itself. The workplace characterised by internal and external environment(Nigeria) a country characterized by 13.3% of inflation with high level of unemployment, this study is of the view that employees perception could be a strong reason for the counterproductive behaviour experienced in our organisations. This study presumes that counterproductive work behaviour is a make-up behaviour employed by employees.

Counterproductive work behaviours include: abusive behaviour, physical and verbal aggression, making intentionate improper work, sabotage, theft, absenteeism, misuse of information, delays, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, and poor quality work. This includes destruction and misuse of organizational property and destruction acts directed toward organizations rather than people (although people are often indirect targets) doing work incorrectly, or failing to notify superiors about mistakes and work problems (e.g., a machine malfunction), and withdrawal (e.g., calling in sick when not ill). etc.. Research on such topics has proliferated in recent years in recognition of the staggering financial (Robinson, 2008), personal (Schat & Kelloway, 2005) and organizational costs associated with counterproductive behaviour (Rogers & Kelloway, 1997). These include economical cost (loss of productivity due to delay at the workplace, theft or sabotage) or psychological cost (withdrawal or low job satisfaction - for those who are targets of counterproductive interpersonal behaviours or high stress and uncertainty - for those who perceive such behaviours) (Varda and Weitz 2004)

Counterproductive work behaviour has been studied from a variety of perspectives, using different terms to refer to a partially overlapping set of harmful acts. This includes aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1997; Spector, 1978), workplace violence and aggression (Barling, Dupré, & Kelloway, 2009; Kelloway, Barling, & Hurrell, 2006). deviance (Hollinger, 1986; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), and revenge (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997). Acts directed specifically at people have been studied as bullying (Hoel, Rayner, & Cooper, 1999. Idiakheua, and Imhonde, 2010), emotional abuse (Keashly, 1998), and mobbing (Zapf, Knorz, & Kulla, 1996). This broad definition subsumes behaviours such as theft (e.g., Greenberg, 1990), sabotage (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002), and service sabotage (Harris & Ogbonna, 2002), incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), revenge (Bies & Tripp, 2005)

These behaviours are a set of distinct acts that have common characteristics, it is intentional (not accidental) and intend to harm the organization and / or their stakeholders-customers, colleagues and supervisors, viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests, while the individual finds it rewarding. Counterproductive work behaviour is seen as an element of job performance. CWB is behaviour that is intended to have a detrimental effect on organizations, their members, stakeholders, customers and the community in general, and of benefit to the individual as he feel fulfilled and psychologically relieved.

Fox and Spector, (2005) asserted that these behaviours have a negative nature either at the interpersonal level, for colleagues or clients, or at the organizational level, with the potential to cause significant damage and loss to the organization.
There are important arguments supporting the need to identify predictors of counterproductive work behaviour at both interpersonal and organizational level. Such information will help organizational actors in terms of how to prevent counter such acts from the selection stage to placement, directing their attention to those predictors related to personality that are linked to counterproductive work behaviour or to organizational level, taking into account situational factors that may trigger or encourage such behaviours.

This article wish to examine counterproductive work behaviour as a make-up behaviour of employees directed towards escape from poverty based on the individuals perception. The current study asserts that counter productive behaviour is a behavioural response as a make up to improve on quality of life in a country characterised with high galloping inflation and unemployment

This article has the following objectives:
To understand counterproductive work behaviour as a make-up behaviour i.e response to felt poverty due to removal of fuel subsidy, galloping inflation and gross unemployment in a country blessed with abundance natural resources. This has affected employees perception of the workplace. Counterproductive work behavioural as response by employees as a way of escaping the felt generalized poverty. As its understanding will help in suggesting ways of reducing it. Specifically this study wish to establish a causal link between situational perception and counterproductive work behaviour. Thus suggesting a new perspective in explaining counterproductive work behaviour, in addition to the already known causal factors e.g. Spector and Fox, (2005) assertion that counter productive behaviour is an intentional harm to the organisation and benefit the employee.

METHOD
This article adopted a meta-analytic study of existing literature on counterproductive work behaviour focussing on the peculiar nature of Nigeria situation.

The theories reviewed are: (1) the Employee Risk Triangle Theory, (2) the Stress Facilitation Theory, and (3) the Social Disorder Theory.

The relationships of each theory to both the economic downturn and the risk of unethical employee behaviour are discussed below.

The Employee Risk Triangle Theory

Researchers at DePaul University in Chicago formulated the “Employee Risk Triangle” theory which offers a common-sense theory of employee crime and deviance (Terris, 1985; see Figure 1). Empirical research supporting this model has focused heavily on the attitudinal component. This model identified three forces which act on an employee’s propensity to engage in unethical behaviors like employee theft and counterproductivity – Need, Opportunity, and Attitude. The theory also posits that when employees find themselves at the confluence of these three forces, then the odds of them engaging in on-the-job deviance are significantly higher.
This theory also has relevance to better understanding unethical employee behaviour during a turbulent economic downturn. For example, during an economic downturn one’s need for engaging in on-the-job deviance for financial gain is arguably higher (Deloitte Financial Advisory Services, 2008). Few employees have been left unscathed by the collapse of the stock market, a higher debt load, an uncompromising credit crunch, higher gas and food prices, a weaker U.S. dollar, and the collapse of the housing market, and therefore their financial needs are currently much higher.

Moreover, unemployment rates are currently high and climbing (Pepitone, 2009; PBS, 2008), as job losses continue to accrue and many employees fear for their jobs and have a greater psychological need for financial security. Finally, many companies are freezing salaries and even benefits during these tough economic times and in some cases salaries and benefits are even being reduced. It is reasonable to conclude that on average, the need for affected employees to engage in on-the-job deviance is going to increase.

An argument can also be made that the opportunity to engage in unethical workplace behaviours increases during an economic downturn. Many companies are forced to make the unfortunate decision to cut back on loss control and security services. The loss of these prevention and deterrence programs makes it easier for employees to steal or engage in on-the-job dishonesty. Moreover, many companies are also forced to cut back on supervisory positions resulting in less oversight to ensure that employees only engage in honest, reliable, and dependable behaviours at all times.

It is also likely that when massive store, plant, or business shutdowns and layoffs occur, apathy and/or distraction sets in during such closings and therefore co-workers might become “blind” to their co-workers’ unethical actions. It seems obvious that there are increased opportunities to engage in employee deviance during economic downturns.

Figure 1. The Employee Risk Triangle

Finally, employees’ attitudes can also be adversely impacted during tough economic times. For instance, if an organization cuts back on pre employment screening procedures that are aimed at ensuring the hiring of ethical and honest employees, then significantly more high-risk employees would be allowed into the organization. If an employer freezes and/or cuts back on pay adjustments, then employees might be more likely to rationalize and tolerate acts of fraud, theft, and related counterproductivity in an attempt to cognitively balance their employer’s cost-cutting needs with their own financial needs.

Employees could also become angry and frustrated with required layoffs and the expectation that the “survivors” need to work harder, and such feelings of anger could trigger acting out in the form of counterproductive and deviant workplace behaviours.

Employees’ attitudes could also be skewed toward more unethical thinking through a psychological phenomenon known as modeling. If more dishonest employees are allowed into the organization due to lower screening standards, and if more employees in general are stealing due to a greater tendency to rationalize theft and/or act out their anger during an economic downturn, then even the relatively honest employees will
become more disinhibited toward stealing when they constantly observe a higher frequency of employee deviance.

This type of phenomenon, if not checked through strong loss control communications and programming, could lead to a contagion effect. It is logical to conclude that downturns in the economy, especially when followed by a reduction of loss control programs, can adversely impact employees’ attitudes toward theft, dishonesty and other unethical behaviours in a material way.

The Stress Facilitation Theory
Employees definitely experience more stress during economic downturns (Gaba, 2009). It seems fair to say that during the current downturn, which has been described as an historic economic collapse that mirrors the Great Depression in many ways, many employees are experiencing considerable levels of stress. Such stress is due in large part to their devalued homes, inability to obtain reasonable credit, stock market losses, and fear of losing their jobs, to name a few stressors. This form of economy-generated distress can clearly lead to an increase in unethical and counterproductive behaviours at work.

The Stress Facilitation Theory posits that when more dishonest employees experience heightened job stress, their feelings of distress facilitate a multiplicative theft response (Jones, 1982a). Researchers have consistently documented that employees who endorse dishonest attitudes toward theft are reliably more likely to steal at work than job candidates and employees who endorse intolerant and punitive attitudes toward theft. Moreover, distressed workers are more likely to engage in on-the-job counterproductivity than less stressed employees.

Yet based on the Stress Facilitation Theory, employees with favourable attitudes toward theft who are also experiencing debilitating stress will steal significantly more cash, merchandise, and property from their employers than both (a) non-distressed employees with equally favourable attitudes toward theft, and (b) both distressed and non-distressed employees with intolerant and punitive attitudes toward theft. In fact, in one study conducted by the author that focused on the percentage of employees who engaged in “serious workplace theft” (i.e., routinely stealing $10 or more from one’s employer every 3 months), the following results were obtained that confirmed the theory (Jones, 1982b):

- Low Stress/Low Dishonesty Group (0% engaged in serious theft)
- High Stress/Low Dishonesty Group (6% engaged in serious theft)
- Low Stress/High Dishonesty Group (12% engaged in serious theft)
- High Stress/High Dishonesty Group (39% engaged in serious theft)

This study supported the notion that heightened levels of stress served as a source of arousal that activated the dominant theft responses in the dishonest group. That is, workers who were cognitively predisposed to steal actually stole considerably more when they were distressed compared to control groups who were calm and unstressed at work. Conversely, heightened levels of job stress apparently did not serve to appreciably “ignite” and “fuel” theft behaviour in workers with unfavourable attitudes toward theft.

This theory finds support in Nigeria as the nation itself reinforces those that steal from their employers who were not caught, mostly the civil servants who snatch the nations income and store them away in foreign banks, they are given national honours by the federal government, e.g OFR(Officer of the Federal Republic) MON, (Member Order of the Niger). The church
organisation reward him by either awarding a Knighthood, or simply make him a Deacon, other organised private sectors award Excellence of the year, and the Royal Fathers award the subject a chieftaincy title, thus encouraging stealing in various forms as every man desires a self esteem.

These results have clear-cut implications for feelings of distress associated with an economic downturn. While some rise in unethical employee behaviour is to be expected as a function of this type of heightened financial stress, the impact will be more pronounced with dishonest employees than with honest employees. Therefore, organizations that screened their workforces with preemployment ethics and integrity tests should be more immune from the impact of the stress caused by a tough economy compared to companies that did not screen their employees for integrity and ethics attitudes.

In fact, based on the Stress Facilitation Theory, the latter companies might need to brace for significantly higher rates of crime and counterproductivity among a larger base of workers who tolerate on-the-job theft and deviance.

**The Social Disorder Theory**

Recent experimental research conducted on the Social Disorder Theory has relevance to the troubled economy unethical employee behavior connection. That is, six field experiments conducted by researchers from the University of Groningen in the Netherlands supported the concept that “signs of disorder” in a neighborhood can, in a causal fashion, lead to other broken social norms and resultant delinquent behaviors (Keizer, Lindenberg & Steg, 2008).

These six experiments yielded a variety of results that have implications for corporate settings, but all results basically showed that when people see signs of disorder in a neighborhood, in the forms of graffiti, littering, disregarded regulations, and other signs of disorderly conduct, then these same people were significantly more likely, on average, to violate social norms and rules themselves compared to a control group that was exposed to a more orderly and “less socially violated” neighborhood.

In two of the neighborhood experiments these researchers found that the presence of graffiti and litter actual led to twice as much theft of exposed cash from a mailbox than the absence of these “environmental triggers.”

That is, the researchers placed an envelope that contained cash inside a mailbox so that passers by could see the envelope and the money inside. When graffiti covered the mailbox, twice as many people stole from the mailbox compared to the clean mailbox. When both graffiti and litter were present in the experimental setting, there was nearly 2.3 times more theft in the disorderly setting as in the orderly setting.

These researchers concluded that at a basic level, signs of disorderliness serve as a “trigger” mechanism that yields more disorderly conduct. That is, when people observe that others violated a specific social norm or rule, they are more likely to violate not only that same rule (e.g., if passers by deduce that an act of trespassing occurred then they will be significantly more likely, on average, to trespass themselves), but also other norms or rules (e.g., if passers by observe that rules against graffiti and littering were violated then they will be reliably more likely to steal).

The researchers concluded that when others observe deviant behavior, such observations weaken their concern for being rule-bound and appropriate while strengthening their more counterproductive goals such as doing what makes them feel good (e.g., being lazy and littering) or inappropriately gaining resources (e.g., stealing cash). These university researchers also concluded that social disorder can spread from one kind of deviant behaviour to other kinds of inappropriate behaviours; hence, neighborhoods could quickly decay and the quality of life of the inhabitants would deteriorate.
Conceivably, if left unchecked the inhabitants of such socially disordered neighborhoods would increasingly conform to the more deviant norms. So what is the connection of this theory of social disorder to the relationship between a turbulent economy and an increase in unethical employee behavior? Economic downturn can facilitate the transition of organizations from being more orderly to more disorderly. Based on the Social Disorder Theory, the more disorderly organizations would experience more employee crime and counterproductivity, and employees would gradually become less inhibited toward committing a wider variety of unethical workplace behaviors (e.g., theft, vandalism, truancy, on-the-job illicit substance abuse, and low productivity).

While no one is saying that all employees would engage in such unethical behavior, if one generalizes from the research conducted by the University of Groningen researchers it is reasonable to say that such deviance could eventually double. Hence organizations need to be very careful during turbulent economic times when they cut programs that might symbolically suggest that the organization is moving toward a more disorderly state of existence.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Below is definitions given by different researchers of the set of behaviours. Deviant behaviour is said to consist of voluntary acts that break major organizational norms and threaten the welfare of the organization and/or its members. Hollinger, (1986;,) Robinson and Bennett, (1995) identified the following types of deviant behaviour: production (damaging quantity and quality of work), property (abusing or stealing company property), political (badmouthing others or spreading rumours), and personal aggression (being hostile or violent toward others).

Antisocial behaviour brings harm or is intended to bring harm to an organization, its employees, or organizational stakeholders. It includes aggression, discrimination, theft, interpersonal violence, sabotage, harassment, lying, revenge, and whistle blowing. Antisocial behaviour focuses more on personal, political, and property and less so on production, with the exception of sabotage (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997).

Counterproductive behaviour is defined as “any intentional behaviour on the part of an organization member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests” (Sackett, 2002). Counterproductive behaviour is seen as an element of job performance and includes phenomena such as theft, property destruction, misuse of information, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance, and poor quality work.

Dysfunctional behaviour occurs when employees commit acts that have negative consequences for an individual within an organization, a group of individuals, and/or the organization itself. There are two general types: violent and deviant (e.g., aggression, physical and verbal assault, terrorism) and non-violent dysfunctional (e.g., alcohol and drug use, revenge, absence, theft) (Griffin, O’Leary-Kelly, and Collins, 1998).

Organizational misbehaviour is a deliberate act by organizational members that violates basic organizational and/or societal norms. Such misbehaviour intend to benefit the individual or the organization and generally includes an objective to inflict damage (Vardi and Weitz, 2004;). Some writers consider misbehaviour in a broad sense (e.g., time wasting, absence, turnover, crime, sexual harassment) and view it as an inevitable result of class tension and conflict between managers and workers (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999).
Two streams of research have focused on ascertaining the causes of these behaviours. (Chen & Spector, 1992; Fox & Spector, 1999; Spector 1975, 1978; Storms & Spector, 1987) have portrayed Counterproductive Behaviour as an emotion-based response to stressful organizational conditions.

Greenberg and colleagues (e.g., Greenberg, 1990) and Skarlicki, Folger and colleagues (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999) have taken an organizational justice perspective, viewing CWB as a cognition-based response to experienced injustice. These two perspectives are not incompatible, in fact Spector (1978) noted links with the equity (justice) concept, and Greenberg (1990) noted links with frustration theory.

Fox, Spector and Miles, 2001; Martinko, Gundlach, and Douglas, 2002) analysed counterproductive behaviour as a general construct or through specific forms, more nuanced, as impoliteness, emotional abuse, bullying and mobbing (forms of nonsexual harassment) with an emphasis on the target of that behaviour, and other forms (revenge, retaliation, violence and aggression), focusing on the instigator, which manifests the behaviour, with his characteristics and motivation.

Although there is some overlap between the forms of counterproductive behaviour, Pearson, Andersson and Porath (2005) observed the following

1. intention to harm (which may be absent, present or ambiguous);
2. target (which may be represented by individuals, organization or both);
3. types of violated rules (of the society, organization, working group or none);
4. persistence of the act (a single act or repeated over time);
5. intensity and depth of behaviours.

This current study seeks to advance counterproductive work behaviour among Nigerians and take it from the makeup perspective, which seeks to explain it from economic behavioural adjustment to a country with misery index as a way of escape from poverty, ensuring survival and all effort directed towards improving quality of life.

TYPES AND STRUCTURES OF COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOUR

Counterproductive work behaviours were studied, initially, as isolated constructs (absenteeism, theft, etc.). Subsequently, research had turned increasingly toward finding a global construct designed to include more specific behaviours, based on the idea that a series of similar behaviours may be grouped, by some criteria, in dimensions or categories. If an individual manifests a behaviours from a dimension, then it is likely to manifest other similar behaviours as well.

The understanding as a global construct or as a behaviour has led to it being classified as with two dimensions (interpersonal and organizational - Bennett and Robinson, 2000), or having both those two dimensions, and related categories (Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh and Kessler, 2006). Robinson & Bennett, (1995) reported evidence that perceptions of
CWB and or relations of CWBs to individual and organizational variables allow us to distinguish two categories of behaviors: those targeting the organization and those targeting other persons in the organization.

In the last decade, most scholars have adopted the distinction made by Robinson and Bennett (1995) between behaviours that target the organization and those aimed at another person. This distinction was best operationalized through Bennett and Robinson (2000) instrument, a bidimensional scale that was used in many researches on this subject (Interpersonal and Organizational Deviance Scale).

Robinson and Bennett (1995) initially developed a typology of counterproductive behaviours using multi dimensional scaling technique. The two underlying dimensions explaining the model are characterized by two labels: organizational / interpersonal and minor / major. From them, yielded four quadrants in which are framed the associated behaviours, as shown in figure 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational</th>
<th>Minor and organizational deviance</th>
<th>Major and harmful for the organization deviance</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>PRODUCTION DEVIANCE</td>
<td>PROPETY DEVIANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaving early</td>
<td>Sabotage the equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive breaks</td>
<td>Accept bribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work intentionally slower</td>
<td>Lie about the worked hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste the resources</td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor and interpersonal deviance</td>
<td>POLITICAL DEVIANCE</td>
<td>PERSONAL AGGRESSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favouring</td>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gossip the colleagues</td>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accuse/blame colleagues</td>
<td>Stealing from colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfair competition</td>
<td>Jeopardize the colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fig.1. Deviant Behaviour Typology  (Robinson and Bennett, 1995)

The first dimension - minor deviance vs. major deviance - is reflecting, at one pole, minor deviant behaviours, that are not harmful nor for organization nor for the individuals, but the
other pole is characterized by seriousness, with serious implications for organizations and individuals;

The second dimension - interpersonal deviance vs. organizational deviance - has at a pole, damaging behaviours of individuals, but not for the organization, and at the other pole behaviours that are harmful to the organization, but not to individuals.

Spector et al. (2006) developed an instrument with 45 items - Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C) - which include the organizational and interpersonal dimension, and five categories: abuse, related production deviance, sabotage, theft, withdrawal. Abuse against others consists in harmful behaviours against colleagues and others to physical or psychological harm, through threats, inappropriate comments, ignoring the person or undermining its ability to work efficiently; production related deviance (more passive) is intentionally not doing the tasks as efficiently as it should; sabotage (more active) refers to the physical destruction or damage of property belonging to the employer; theft relating to stealing objects, information from the organization; withdrawal consisting in behaviours that reduce the working hours (employees work less than required in the organization, are absent, late or take more frequent breaks than permitted).

Lanyon and Goodstein(2004) developed Counterproductive behaviour Index, (CBI) which is another type of tool used in selection and organizational advice, but not in research. The authors assert that it is an integrity test, which is also a screening procedure for identifying job applicants whose behaviour, attitudes and work-related values are likely to interfere with their success as employees. The CBI consists of an objective questionnaire with 140 true/false items and have seven dimensions: honesty, aggression, substance abuse, computer abuse, sexual harassment and overall concerns.

NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE DIMENSIONS OF COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOUR.

Certain behaviours that deviate from predetermined rules in an organization may lead also to solutions and positive changes. Counter productive behaviour, will be discussed in two perspectives the negative, and the positive.

Counter productive behaviour considered negative. This connotation of deviance which actually is the main concern of researchers and managers, highlights the main targets of various forms of counterproductive behaviour. Thus, to deal with employees in a manner that it inconvenient for them is an approach with a negative impact on employees; rule violations result in damage to the society; sabotage, as productivity and property deviance damage the organization (Warren, 2003). In the same register, providing incorrect information, lying, dishonesty, constitutes a potential harm to the receiver of information, and organization as well, and when an employee steals something that does not belong to him, he commits theft and damages the organization.

Counter productive behaviour considered positive. Although attention is mostly focused on damage and other adverse effects caused by counterproductive behaviour in certain situations, such behaviour may even have positive consequences for the organization or its members. Hanke and Saxberg (1985 quoted Gallperin, 2002) introduced the term constructive deviance, which applies when employees engage in discrepant behaviours to
advance organization’s interests. Similarly, employees who engage in discrepant behaviours such as „whistle-blowing”, meaning that they reveal the dysfunctional aspects of organization ,to certain persons in other organizations that would be able to take action against certain illegal, immoral or illegitimate practices made under the control of employers) (Miceli and Near, 1997 quoted by Gallperin, 2002).

Those who do so may violate the present organizational norms but contribute to overall well-being of the organization and have innovative and entrepreneurial spirit. In this view, they are seen as reformers, whose change efforts are of benefit to the organization.

In this constructive approach to deviance are mentioned: radical, but temperate employees behaviour, which may cause a certain state of things and lead to a change which is benefit for the organization; counter-role behaviour, which involves behaviour in a role opposite to the professional one, thus resulting in more efficient functioning of the organization; the disclosure of immoral or illegal practices, violating the rule on maintaining silence on the illegal activities of the organization; functional disobedience, or disobeying orders that are morally questionable, not complying the organizational procedures for solving a problem or supervisor instructions on labour efficiency (Warren, 2003).

These approaches to deviance highlight the importance of exploration of what underlies these behaviours. Even if such conducts have negative consequences on organization, it is important for managers to analyze their determinants and to interpret what signals these behaviors, to act on root causes and not just on the effects.

**Counter productive behaviour shares the following characteristics**

Counterproductive behaviours do not occur in isolation,

Each of these have a degree of visibility. Their observation by colleagues, first, makes them not only simple observers, but individuals who may have an important role in encouraging or discouraging these behaviours. Another perspective on “those who observe” focuses on how they can actually act, disclosing the behaviours observed. „Whistle-blowing”. This definition indicates that there are two main characters: one who engages in an unacceptable behaviour and the one who co acts. Gundlach et al. (2003) propose a model of social information processing related to the decision to „whistle-blowing”.

This perspective shows that people can be seen as motivated tacticians since they process the information about deviant behaviour and choose relevant actions based on this information. In this way, two sets of factors are considered: intrapersonal and interpersonal. Regarding the first category, individuals are held responsible for deviance when their actions are perceived to be caused by their own reasons (internal causes) and they are made under conditions that allows the freedom to choose behaviour (causes are controllable).

People are emotionally more sensitive to the deviant acts when they assign internal causes to those who make them. Disclosure behaviour is also related to perceptions of injustice that motivates employees to be centered on solving situations. The decision to disclose is largely focused, on the one hand, and measure the gravity of behaviour and, and secondly, to the balance between costs and benefits of such an action. With regard to interpersonal factors, is taken into account how attempts of social influence of those who engage in deviant
behaviours influence disclosure decisions. Among these are mentioned: the presentation of mitigating circumstances that made the behaviour, use the excuse or justification, underlying the isolated nature, but also the intimidation.

This analysis highlights another facet of the impact of counterproductive behaviours. On the one hand, they may be an opportunity for imitation by those who observe, or rather, “denouncing” them. Disclosure is not always easy, especially if it entails blaming by workgroup colleagues or even a leader who is not very interested in the reality of its work environment. Such initiatives, even whistle-blowing, can have a significant impact in managing counter productivity because the earliest possible detection of such behaviours also favours an effective intervention.

**Perspectives of counterproductive behaviour.**

Below are some perspectives of research on counterproductive behaviours.

1) Those dealing with deviance as a reaction to the employee experiences. Here are considered the reaction to frustration, lack of autonomy, organizational injustice, the organizational constraints and emotions experienced at work, perceptions of work situations. Counterproductive behaviour as a response to frustration received strong empirical support, sustaining the view that employee deviance is an emotional reaction to the experience of job related frustration stressors (Fox, Spector and Miles, 2001), the frustration being interpreted as interference with the goals of the person or that occurred in the ongoing activity of a person. Bennett and Robinson (2000) also found a strong relationship between frustration and interpersonal counterproductive behaviours. Greenberger (1993) suggested that perceptions of control are an important determinant of counterproductive work behaviour, as non constructive behavioural responses are more likely when a person perceives low control of the situation. Bennett and Robinson (2003) highlight three trends in analysis of predictors or causes of counterproductive behaviour.

2) Some researchers consider that the lack of employees autonomy and participation have an important role in the manifestation of counterproductive behaviour, it could constitute a way for letting down or correction for restoring employee’s sense of control over work environment. Analoui and Kakabadse (1992) have highlighted the possibility that one of the reasons why employees engage in unconventional practices is the desire to have more autonomy in the workplace.

Dwyer and Fox (2000) provided evidence, although indirectly, for possible effects of autonomy at work. In this regard, an exaggerated monitoring of the manner of achieving professional tasks and not taking into account an employee’s ideas and proposals can favour the tasks assigned sabotage activities or disregard the autonomy of peers or subordinates. Fox et al. (2001) showed that autonomy at work has a significant negative correlation with organizational counterproductive behaviour, but not with interpersonal counterproductive behaviour. However, when high autonomy employees perceive a high level of stress, the likelihood that they engage in counterproductive behaviours increases.

3) Researchers examined the perceived fairness of outcomes Two major forms of justice have been studied, namely: distributive justice procedures (Distributive justice relates to people’s perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes they receive relative to their contributions and to
the outcomes and contributions of others.), and procedural justice (Procedural justice involves people’s perceptions of the fairness of procedures used to determine those distributions and treatment by authorities (interactional justice).

Also two forms of justice has been identified by Colquit (2003) namely Interactional justice includes perceptions of interpersonal justice, ie the extent to which authorities in the organization treat employees with respect and dignity, and informational justice, which is the degree to which authorities provide adequate explanations for decisions (Colquitt, 2001, Greenberg, 1993 ). Colquitt (2001) showed in his studies that organizational justice is best conceptualized in terms of four distinct dimensions: procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational, the last two types being facets of interactional justice.

Regardless of its forms, injustice is a loss of something, employees considering that they are entitled to that something, conviction that constitutes a significant motivator for attempting to restore the sense of justice. Organizational justice is concerned with employee perceptions of fair or just treatment on the job. It fits definitions of job stressors as being situations that elicit an adaptive response (Jex and Beehr, 1991) or situations that elicit negative emotional reactions (Spector, 1998). For example, the seminal equity theory and empirical work by Adams (1965) suggests that inequity (injustice) motivates people to make adaptive responses in a variety of ways, both cognitive and behavioural. More recent work on justice has linked perceptions of injustice to negative emotion(e.g., Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).

Zohar (1995) specifically demonstrated the role of organizational justice in the job stress process as a role stressor, in the elicitation of both negative emotion and consequent strain responses, but did not link stress to counterproductive behaviour. Folger & Greenberg, (1985); Levanthal, Karusa, & Fry,(1980). studies have linked both forms of justice perceptions with counterproductive organizational behaviours. Skarlicki and Folger (1997) summarized research that indicates employees may respond to perceptions of unfair treatment with negative emotions, such as anger, outrage, and resentment (Folger, 1993); desire for retribution; and a range of direct and indirect behavioural responses such as theft (Greenberg, 1990), vandalism, sabotage, reduction of citizenship behaviours, withdrawal, and resistance (Jermier, Knights, & Nord, 1994).

Skarlicki, Folger, and Tesluk (1999) further demonstrated that the relation between perceived injustice and what they call organizational retaliatory behavior (ORB) is moderated by personality factors such as negative affectivity and agreeableness. Cropanzano and Baron (1991) linked injustice to emotions and workplace conflict. Different kinds of injustice are related to various forms of counterproductive behaviour. Aquino, Lewis and Bradfield (1999) showed that perceptions on interactional justice were strong predictors of deviant behaviour oriented on organization and others, positive perceptions being negatively related to both interpersonal deviance and organization oriented.

Bennett and Robinson (2000) showed that scores on the interpersonal and organizational deviance scales were negatively correlated with perception of procedural and interactional justice. Fox et al. (2001) found that distributive justice is significant correlated with organizational counterproductive behaviour. Similarly, related to procedural justice, were found strong negative correlations with organizational and interpersonal deviance. Ambrose, Seabright, and Schminke (2002) showed in their study that individuals will engage in more serious forms of sabotage when experiencing various types of injustice.
4) Fox et al. (2001) reported that some organizational constraints (e.g., situational constraints resulting from policies and procedures, lack of resources, etc.) are positively correlated with counterproductive behaviours, especially with such as vengeance. They also showed that for individuals with high scores on trait anxiety, the high levels of constraints were associated with high levels of interpersonal counterproductive behaviours. For those who had high scores for anger, high levels of conflict were associated with high levels of interpersonal behavioural counterproductive. Mehta (2000), also, showed in his research that some organizational constraints are significant predictors of both organizational and interpersonal counterproductive behaviours.

5) As for work satisfaction, it is related to counterproductive behaviours, correlations tending to be stronger for organizational counterproductive behaviours (Chen and Spector, 1992, Fox and Spector, 1999, Penney and Spector, 2005). People who had a low work satisfaction developed more counterproductive behaviours (Lau, Au and Ho, 2003).

6) Those addressing deviance as a reflection of employees personality. In this context, are analyzed dimensions of personality on the Big Five model, negative affectivity, and other types of emotions, locus of control, machiavellianism, narcissism, age and gender. Lee, Ashton, and Shin (2005) found that certain personality factors predict various types of workplace deviance. Deviance oriented on organization is thus associated with low conscientiousness and interpersonal deviance is associated with low levels of extraversion and agreeableness.

Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004) showed that personality factors, as conscientiousness, emotional stability and agreeableness moderates the relationship between perceived work situation and counterproductive behaviours. Relationship between perceptions of environment development and organizational deviance was stronger for employees with low conscientiousness and emotional stability, and that between perceived organizational support and interpersonal deviance was stronger for those with low agreeableness. Salgado’s (2002) meta-analysis demonstrated that factors such as conscientiousness predict deviant behaviours such as theft and drug abuse. He also showed that this factor is the most important predictor and that employees who have high scores on conscientiousness and agreeableness factors tend not to manifest counterproductive behaviours.

Aquino et al. (1999) showed that there is a direct relationship between negative affectivity and counterproductive behaviours, negative affectivity was positively correlated with both interpersonal and organizational deviance. Negative affectivity is an important personality variable that describes the degree to which an individual manifests (in terms of frequency and intensity) levels of disturbing emotions such as anger, hostility, fear or anxiety (Watson and Clark, 1984), found that high levels of negative affectivity are related to laying down minimum and a high possibility to engage in withdrawal behaviours, to have a higher level of hostility, claims, and a more distant conduct (Necowitz and Roznowski, 1994). Both Lee and Allen (2002) argued that job affects (work-related emotions) may be predictors for interpersonal deviance and job cognitions (work-related cognitions) predict organizational deviance.

Vardi and Wiener (1996) examined the low level of individuals’ moral development and value incongruity between individual and organization. Also Gallperin (2002) showed that
people with a strong ethical orientation are less likely to engage in either of the two forms of deviance.

Personality traits are also relevant factors in CWB, and an entire integrity test industry has grown around the idea that personality tests can predict these behaviours (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993). Affective dispositions, the tendency to experience similar emotions across situations, seem particularly relevant. Negative affectivity (NA), a generalized dispositional tendency for an individual to experience negative emotions across time and situations, has been studied widely in relation to perceptions of job stressors, injustice, constraints, and strains (Chen & Spector, 1991; Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999; Spector & O’Connell, 1994).

Trait anxiety (Spielberger & Sydeman, 1994), the relatively stable tendency to perceive stressful situations as threatening, has been used frequently in stress research in place of NA (Ganster & Schoebroeck, 1991).

Fox and Spector (1999) found trait anxiety to be associated with CWB. Other authors mention the predictive nature of the level of individual integrity and certain personality inventory scales of the CPI (Hakistan, Farrell and Tweed, 2002). Individuals who have tolerance towards counterproductive behaviours have a greater willingness to show such behaviour at work. Gallperin (2002), who showed that machiavellianism (a person’s tendency to perceive and treat people as objects that can be manipulated to achieve a particular purpose) is positively correlated with destructive organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Bennett and Robinson (2000) also found that scores on the machiavellianism scale correlate with the organizational and interpersonal deviance.

Mikulay, Neuman and Finkelstein (2001) mention several personal factors which may be predictors of counterproductive behaviour, such as employees that have not yet developed loyalty to the organization where they work. It is also considered relevant the specific nature of jobs that certain persons have, involving a lower status or a salary. Douglas and Martinko (2001) showed that trait anger, attributional style, negative affectivity and other factors of personality are a big part of the aggression variance in workplace. O’Brien (2004) showed that workplace perceived support is negative related to counterproductive behaviours and internal locus of control is negative correlated with these behaviours. Storms and Spector (1987) showed that people with an external locus of control are more likely to react to frustration with counterproductive behaviours.

Trait anger correlates consistently with counterproductive behaviour (Douglas and Martinko, 2001; Fox and Spector, 1999; Penney and Spector, 2002). Fox and Spector (1999) showed that temperament structures that include anger is more strongly linked to interpersonal counterproductive behaviour, while anger as response is related to organizational counterproductive behaviour. Herschovis, Turner, Barling, Arnold, Dupre, Innes, LeBlanc, Sivanathan (2007) in their meta-analysis showed that trait anger and interpersonal conflict were the strongest predictors of interpersonal aggression. For the organizational aggression, the most powerful predictors were: interpersonal conflict, situational constraints and work dissatisfaction. Penney and Spector (2002) found in their study that individuals with high levels of narcissism gets angry more often and tend to express themselves through counterproductive behaviours, especially when they perceive constraints in their work environment.
Personal and demographic factors also have an important role. Peterson (2002) found that some forms of counterproductive behaviour are related to employees who are young, new in the organization and who work part time and have low paid jobs. Herschovis et al. (2007) found that men are more aggressive than women. Applebaum, Shapiro and Molson (2006), in their research, obtained results that showed that men tend to engage in more aggressive behaviors than women, for employees with less seniority are more likely to exhibit deviant behaviors related to organizations’ resources. Lau et al. (2003), in their meta-analysis showed that older people were generally less involved in counterproductive behaviors.

An important observation made by Megargee (1997, quoted by Ones and Viswesvaran, 2003) is that people avoid to manifest behaviors with an increased probability of negative consequences or of those that are not leading to achievements. Liao, Joshi and Chuang (in 2004) reported that organizational commitment is negatively correlated with counterproductive behaviours.

7) Those who consider deviance as adjustment to social context. Even if, by definition, organizational deviance may involve violation of significant organizational rules, it could that the pressures of local work groups, the rules and regulations supporting deviance to be essential for it to occur. In this regard, investigations have revealed that a primary predictor of antisocial behaviour at work is the degree to which an employee’s colleagues are engaged in similar behaviours (Robinson and O’Leary-Kelly, 1998).

Situational factors emphasize the nature of individual and organizational circumstances that would increase the probability of counterproductive behaviour development. Varda and Wiener (1996) take into account the specific nature of the job opportunity, too loose system of monitoring and control of job activity and unrealistic or too demanding for employees organizational goals.

Various surveys have revealed a number of predictors present both at the individual level and at the level of context in which business operates. This report make the argument that counterproductive work behaviour, in Nigeria such as theft, sabotage and aggression are a form of make up behaviour directed towards escape from poverty, in order to improve their quality of life that are functional in reaching some desired end for individuals in organizations. Drawing from accepted definitions of counterproductive work behaviour (Fox & Spector, 2005) and established models of protest, their paper view that, counterproductive behaviour is a non normative form of protest stemming, at least in part, from having a high degree of identification with an organisation of an injustice and a low degree of identification with the target of the behaviour. The framework of this article is guided by consideration of employees context of organisational perception as a victim, thus resulting in counterproductive work behaviour. The author is considering a model of counter productive behaviour as a make-up behaviour on employees situational perception. It is generally accepted that the targets of counterproductive work behaviour can be either organizations or individuals. In this context organisations are perceived as no mans own, this can be further explained as our own, with a detached concern. (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Berry et al., 2007; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Thus, one of the proposed dimensions is the identity of the target (organization vs. individual). In either case the author suggest that the target must be seen as a source of injustice to the perpetrator or others in the workplace.

Moreover, this paper assume that the actor or perpetrator of the counterproductive behaviour must have a low level of identification with the target consequences, and a high level of
identification with the victim to result in the counterproductive behaviour and also argued that counterproductive work behaviour can be either individually enacted or a collective action. As shown below in figure 2.

Adapted from Kelloway, Francis, Prosser, and Cameron,

The Compound Risk Effect
A critical review of all three theories strongly suggests that the current economic downturn will more than likely trigger increased instances of unethical employee behavior (i.e., crime and counterproductivity). The Employee Risk Triangle Theory clearly indicates that all three drivers of increased employee risk potential – need, opportunity, and attitudes – will be adversely impacted during this turbulent economic period.

The Stress Facilitation Theory indicates that the odds are high that many employees will experience increased financial stress due to the economic downturn, and that this heightened stress will be directly correlated with increased unethical behavior. However, higher levels of distress will increase employee deviance significantly more in those employees who already possess tolerant and nonpunitive attitudes toward unethical workplace behaviors (e.g., theft and dishonesty) in the first place, demonstrating the importance of hiring individuals with the proper attitudes in these areas.

Finally, the Social Disorder Theory suggests that those organizations that must engage in economy related downsizing and budget cuts could easily put themselves in a position that causes the organization to be perceived as “disorderly” by the surviving employees, and these
perceptions of social disorder could actually become a trigger for a wide variety of unethical workplace behaviors due to what the university researchers called a “cross-norm disinhibition effect” (i.e., employees exposed to a specific form of social disorder will become less inhibited about breaking any type of social norm and therefore an increase in a variety of forms of employee deviance will ensue). While there are surely some unanswered questions with all three theories, and while some of the logic presented in this paper can be challenged, taken as a whole it is reasonable to conclude that ethics professionals, corporate risk managers, and loss control specialists will be needed more than ever during the current economic downturn in order to preserve organizational ethics and integrity.

Conclusions

This article argued that counterproductive behaviour of employees in Nigeria is a response to escape from felt and actual poverty induced by the nation. Hence they result to behaviour that are of immediate benefit, self gratification, to seek self enhancement and esteem. As the affluent is praised and respected in the communities.

Counterproductive behaviours have an organizational and an interpersonal dimension, with the potential to cause damage and negative effects both to the organization itself and to the people who are part of the organization. Among the organizational predictors, we mention the importance of perception about organizational injustice, the low job satisfaction and other organizational constraints and stressors such as role ambiguity. And finally, but not the last, an important role is played by employees discomfort at work. As for work groups, they may be a factor for encouraging and maintaining counterproductive conducts because of their subculture, but also their role models, whom exemplify such behaviour.

From the individual perspective these types of behaviours are the product of interaction of certain individual and organizational factors. Among the main individual factors are personality traits, conscientiousness, negative affectivity, and agreeableness, whose low levels play an important role in the emergence of counterproductive behaviours. Also relevant are employees judgments - more specifically, their attributions related to what happens at work.

In some circumstances, various forms of behaviour (e.g., sabotage or theft) can have the same goal and purpose of retaliating against the employer for real or imagined injustices. In other cases, different behaviours can be committed for different reasons. For example, theft can be committed out of real need by a low paid employee with a sick child, or to restore equity by an employee who has lost a benefit. Thus the counterproductive concept is useful as a way to classify a variety of actions, but it should not be considered a unitary construct.

From the scholars perspective, there are a number of factors that is responsible hence counterproductive work behaviour is a multifactorial, multidirectional and multidimensional issue which is located either in the organisation, individual or in the environment, the target
is the organisation, the perpetrator is the individuals, and the organisational environment determines the manifestation of the behaviour.

Various self-report instruments to analyze these behaviours have been developed, the most popular being developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000), Ganyon and Lanyon (2004) and Spector et al. (2006).

IMPLICATIONS

Arising from this study, it implies the reason for the heightened insecurity in the workplace leading to huge amount of money being used as security vote, fear to investment in Nigeria, among those who have snatched money before, this may be the reason, majority of the money is stacked away in Swiss Bank, heavy presence of security personnel in organisation, untold disagreement between employers and employees, lack of organisational future, and the prevalent of financial theft, property theft, and gross financial misappropriation among leaders and captains of organisation and commissions in Nigeria, may be tied to retaliatory workplace counter productive behaviour.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If you are in a position of management, counterproductive workplace behaviours can become a hefty problem. They range from the mildly severe (cell phone use on the job) to the downright dangerous (violence against others). But if managers are armed with solutions to reduce instances of counterproductive employee behaviour, then the work environment can improve dramatically. The following guidelines can assist facility managers in combating this problem

1 Identify the ethical orientation of each candidate. A simple written test could suffice. When hiring individuals who will be working face to face with the public, ask questions pertaining to integrity and honesty. Additionally, when checking references, actually call those listed instead of simply reading a letter of recommendation. By speaking with prior employers, a facility manager can gain insight into applicants' past behaviours.

2 Understand employee perceptions. Creating a work environment with fair and equitable policies while also treating employees with respect. Positive staff perceptions often hold the key to thwarting counterproductive workplace behaviour throughout an organization. However, it is important to remember that employees may not always voice their feelings. So observing body language and other behavioural signs is important.

3 Be a role model. When policies and procedures are implemented within a facility, those in power need to follow the same rules. For instance, if a health club manager asks his or her employees to limit the number of personal calls they make or take per day, then a supervisor needs to do the same. If the operation requires eight-hour shifts, then a supervisor should work an eight-hour shift, too.

4 Be innovative. Let employees have a say in their day-to-day work activities, when possible. If employees perceive ownership in their job responsibilities, they tend to have positive perceptions. When feasible, change up their daily routines, so work does not become tedious. Challenge them with new projects or encourage them to improve the work they currently produce.
5 Be assertive. Without losing your temper, combat counterproductive work behaviours assertively. Make it clear that a positive work environment is paramount to the success of your facility, and maintain that authority. Employees who consistently engage in counterproductive behaviour prefer managers who do not fight back. If you keep quiet, the unwanted behaviour will persist and may even escalate into dangerous situations.
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