

Emotional Intelligence And Organizational Constraints As Predictors Of Counterproductive Work Behaviour Among Teachers In Abeokuta Metropolis, Ogun State.

Prof. B.O. Ehigie, Sholola Hameed A.

Department Of Psychology, University Of Ibadan, Nigeria

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.10.06.2020.p102102

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.10.06.2020.p102102>

Abstract- This study examined emotional intelligence and organizational constraints as predictors of counterproductive work behavior (CWB) among teachers in Ogun state. Cross sectional survey research design was adopted and a total of 300 participants were sampled, using purposive sampling technique. A structured questionnaire consisting of standardized psychological scales were used to collect data; two hypotheses were tested using hierarchical multiple regressions analysis. Findings revealed that there is significant positive relationship between organizational constraints and abuse ($r = .48, p < .01$). Inverse relationship between emotional intelligence and abuse ($r = -.38, p < .01$), positive relationship between organizational constraints and production deviance ($r = .46, p < .01$). Inverse relationship between emotional intelligence and production deviance ($r = -.37, p < .01$), organizational constraints and positive relationship with sabotage ($r = .41, p < .01$). Emotional intelligence had inverse relationship with sabotage ($r = -.36, p < .01$) organizational constraints had positive relationship with theft ($r = .45, p < .01$). Negative relationship between emotional intelligence and theft ($r = -.40, p < .01$) organizational constraints had positive relationship with withdrawal ($r = .44, p < .01$) and Emotional intelligence had inverse relationship with withdrawal ($r = -.32, p < .01$). Organizational constraints and emotional intelligence jointly predicted CWB ($R^2 = 0.36, F(2,297) = 82.83, p < .05$).

The study concluded that organizational constraint and emotional intelligence predicted counterproductive work behaviour among teachers. It is recommended that professional industrial/personnel psychologist should be engaged to design an emotional regulation session where teachers are trained in order to express positive emotions to school management, students, as well as colleagues which invariably will not trigger negative behaviour such as engagement of counterproductive work behaviour.

Index Terms- Abuse, Production Deviance, Sabotage, Withdrawal.

I. INTRODUCTION

Talented employees are the most important resources in any organization (Ivancevich, 2010). These resources affect other sources in the organization, so attention to them means attending to other important items at workplaces. While it is important to know the factors that contribute to successful working relationship

between an individual and an organization, it is also important to understand the factors that may contribute to undesirable work behavior, such as counterproductive work behavior (CWB). The issue of CWB cannot be overemphasized in organizations. This is based on the premise that CWB among workers is one of the factors that are suspected to be among the major causes of poor employee performance, and by inference poor organizational performance. To this effect, Kanten and Ulker (2013) added that counterproductive work behaviours are directly harmful to the organization or to other individuals in the organization and can range from relatively minor to very serious problem.

(CWB) refers to intentional behaviours by employees that have the potential to harm an organization, its members, or both (Spector & Fox, 2005). It has been investigated under various labels, including workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000) and antisocial behaviour (Giacolone & Greenberg, 1997). It is also seen as an occupational crime that may vary along a continuum of severity, from minor acts such as embarrassing co-workers and leaving early, to serious acts, such as sabotage and theft (Kwok, Au & Ho, 2005). It 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 (Idiakheua, & Obetoh, 2012). An act can be a workplace deviance if it violates the major rules of organizational life (Spector & Fox, 2005). This includes absenteeism, abusing sick day privileges, abusing drugs and alcohol, filing fake accident claims, sabotaging, breaking organizations' rules, withholding effort, stealing, taking long breaks, working slowly, harassing other employees and hiding needed resources (Abdul, 2008).

Counterproductive behaviours are threats that are highly costly and dangerous for organizations. Vardi and Weitz (2004) identified mentioned that discretionary behaviors have got two main costs: financial costs (such as productivity loss, lawsuits and compensation, reputation) and social costs (such as mental and physical injuries, psychological withdrawal, Job dissatisfaction). Marcus and Schuler (2004) are of the view that the potential for harm should be incorporated into CWB models; these are also responsible for producing a negative impression on both external and internal stakeholder of the organizations.

Robinson and Bennett (1995), developed four typology of deviant work related activities (CWBs which include political deviance that contains behaviours as favoritism and gossiping, and is categorized as the minor-interpersonal category. The second is serious-interpersonal category which is called personal aggression

and contains behaviors as abuse and theft. The third is minor-organizational category which contains behaviors as withdrawal and is called production deviance. The serious-organizational category is the fourth and it contains behaviours as sabotaging and damaging organizations property, and is called as property deviance. Effiong, (2006) reported that absenteeism, tardiness, gossiping and lack of commitment are on a high increase among secondary school teachers in Nigerian schools; this has negative implications on the ethical decline in the Nigerian educational system.

Researchers over the years have found different factors or buffers that can influence counterproductive work behavior., Due to its costly and harmful consequences, Vardi and Weitz (2004), have suggested that more studies are needed to understand the determinants of CWB. The present study is therefore aimed at exploring some organizational and personal factors that are likely to predispose employees to such maladaptive workplace behaviors. CWB is harmful for the school and students in all its forms, whether it is overt or covert. Therefore, for such behaviour to be controlled, its antecedents need to be known and shared. This can be achieved through empirical investigation. Based on this assertion, this present study aim at examining some organizational and personal factors such as emotional intelligence and organizational constraints

Emotional intelligence (EI) has been defined as the ability to motivate oneself, to persist in the face of frustrations, to control impulse and delay gratification, to regulate one's moods, to keep distress from interfering with the ability to think, to empathize, to hope, to perform and to be creative (Erasmus, 2007). Ofoegbu and Ayobami, (2013) define emotional intelligence (EI) as a person's capacity to appropriately regulate his/her emotions, and to use the information to guide one's thinking and action. According to Goleman (1998), emotional intelligence has five major components: Knowing one's emotions (self-awareness), managing one's emotions (self-regulation), motivating one's emotion (motivation), recognizing emotions in others (empathy), and handling relationships (social skills). Self-awareness refers to the ability of a person to perceive his strengths, emotions, worth and capabilities. Thus, EI plays an important role in shaping the life of every individual's performance at home and workplace. An employee with high emotional intelligence can manage his or her own impulses, communicate with others effectively, manage change, solve problems, and use humour to build rapport in tense situations. This clarity in thinking and composure in stressful and chaotic situations is what separates top performers from weak performers in the workplace. The inability of some employees to regulate their emotions can be the major reason why teachers might engage in counterproductive behaviour at work.

Organizational constraint is another factor that is likely to predispose teachers to counterproductive work behavior. Organizational constraints are defined as perceived aspects or limitations of the work environment such as loss of resources or threatened loss of resources that inhibit an employee from completing a job. These constraints can take different forms, and involve varying situations such as: a lack of necessary teaching aids, and a lack of adequate teaching instructional materials, inadequate training for teachers, a lack of necessary information needed to perform required tasks, inadequate assistance, incorrect instructions, and organizational rules and procedures. Waite

(1998) states that individuals will react in different ways to the presence of organisational constraint, some individuals will perceive themselves as having a great deal of personal control over them; while other individuals will perceive themselves as having very little control over organisational constraints.

Organisational constraints may affect performance, because they alter the level of control individuals perceive that they have. Perceptions of behavioral control are created by an individual's ability to exert his or her influence over both internal and external factors of the work environment (Ajzen, 1991). Organizational constraints create feelings of frustration and animosity towards the organization. Often time, organizational constraint lead to stress for teachers such that this stress change teachers' emotion in a negative way which often time, make them want to retaliate to the organization or members. They often engage in behaviour that is detrimental to the organization such as being absent from school, coming to class late or to a more severe behaviour such as theft or destroying organization properties as a result of the constraints faced at the place of work. Available studies on the predictors of CWB (e.g., Bibi & Karim 2013; Onuoha 2013; Ansari, Maleki & Mazraeh 2013) have shown that lworkplace Incivility, perceived organizational support, job burnout, and age, personality factors play significant roles in CWB. However, despite the growing body of research on the predictors of CWB among employees, the roles of organisational constraint and emotional intelligence remain elusive.

The Affective Events Theory of counterproductive work behaviour was used as a theoretical framework and it assert that organizational events are proximal causes of effective reactions. By implication, "things happen to people in work setting and people often react emotionally to these events (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). In this context, we argue that when teachers perceive that their organisation has not been fair on them, this could make teachers experience negative emotion to such an organization which in turn can make an employee turn against such organisation by engaging in behaviour that can have detrimental effect on an organisation. Such behaviours can include but not limited to absenteeism, theft and tardiness.

Emotional Intelligence and Counterproductive Behaviour

Oguebe Uzoh and Anyikwa (2014) examined emotional intelligence as predictors of workplace deviance among 198 secondary school public teachers. The study adopted a correlational design with Pearson Product Moment correlation as statistical tool for data analysis. The finding indicated there is a significant correlation between emotional intelligence and workplace deviance. One of the shortcoming of this study is that they failed to investigate work deviant behaviour among private teachers Siu (2009) found that emotional intelligence have a significant inversely relationship with counterproductive work behaviour. The shortcoming of this study is that it did not include the respondents used. Joe-Akunne Tochukwu and Okonkwo (2015) examined Emotional Intelligence Dimensions as Predictors of Counterproductive Work Behaviour among local government employees. Two hundred and thirty-seven (237) workers from Awka South local government area, served as participants in the study. The result indicated dimension of self-awareness, self-control and self-motivation predicted counterproductive work

behaviour. The study failed to explain the methodology used for the study.

Bauer (2011) investigated how discrete negative emotions are related to specific facets of counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) among 241 employees. The study found that frequency of experiencing negative emotions influence frequency of committing counterproductive work behaviour in the workplace. Bibi and Karim (2013) examine the moderating role of emotional intelligence in the relationship between workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal behavior) among one hundred and sixty university teachers. The result showed that there was a positive relationship between incivility and counterproductive work behavior and negative relationship between emotional intelligence and counterproductive work behaviour.

Organisational Constraint and Counterproductive Behaviour

Ansari, Mazraeh and Arab-Khazaeli (2013) investigate the effect of organizational (distributive justice, organizational constraints) factors on counterproductive work behaviors (CWB). A random sample of 185 employees (men and women) of Second Gas Transmission Operational Area in Iran completed the following research questionnaire. The Findings revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between perceived organizational constraints with total counterproductive behavior and its dimensions. Chand and Chand (2014) investigate the effect between Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) and Job stressors among junior managers (scale -1 officer) of Indian public sector banks. Total 300 junior managers (scale -1 officers) were chosen through purposive sampling technique from various Indian public sector banks. Data was collected by questionnaire method and analyzed with structure equation modeling and Karl Pearson correlation. Result of research study reveals that sabotage, withdrawal and theft dimensions of counterproductive work behaviour were found positive and significant in correlation with organization constraints, quantitative workload inventory, inter personal conflict at workplace and physical symptoms inventory dimensions of job stressors. Aftab and Javeed (2012) find out the impact of job stress on the counterproductive work behavior among 352 bank employees. The results of this study revealed that the job stress among employees leads them somewhat towards counter-productive work behavior and there was sufficient positive correlations exist between job stress and employee CWB. Matthew, Chigozie, and Kosiso (2014) investigated organisational constraint on workplace deviance among 198 teachers from Nigeria. The findings indicated a significant relationship between occupational stress and workplace deviance of secondary school teachers

II. METHODS

Design

The study adopted the cross-sectional survey research design. The reason for a cross sectional design was that the participants were selected from four different schools in Ogun State. The independent variables in this study are organisational constraints and emotional intelligence while the dependent variable is counterproductive work behaviour.

Participants

A total of three hundred (300) participants participated in the study. Respondents' gender showed that 116(38.7%) are male, while 184(61.3%) are female. Also 37(12.3%) belong to age bracket of 20-24 years, 60(20.0%) fall between age group of 25-29 years, 54(18.0%) belong to age range of 30-34 years, 37(12.3%) are between 35-39 years, 64(21.3%) belong to age bracket of 40-44 years, 33(11.0%) are between 45-49 and 15(5.0%) are 50years above. Also, 100(33.3%) are single, majority 198(66.0%) are married, 2(0.7%) are divorced. Larger percent of the respondents are BSc/HND holders with frequency of 203(67.7%), followed by OND/NCE 52(17.3%), then MBA/MSc 25(8.3%), and 20(6.7%) acquired WAEC/GCE/NECO. In addition, 141(47.0%) had 1-4 years working experience, 61(20.3%) had 5-9 years working experience, 62(20.7%) had 10-14 years of experience, 11(3.7%) had 15-19 years of experience and 25(8.3%) had 20 years and above years of experience. Finally, 143(47.7%) were public school teachers, while the remaining 157(52.3%) were from private schools in Abeokuta south local government.

Measures

Organizational Constraints Scale

The scale is an 11-item that measures Organizational Constraints developed by Spector and Jex's (1998). It is a five-point 1 = less than once per month or never to 5 = several times per day). Sample of the item include "I find it difficult or impossible to do my job because of poor equipment or supplies". The scale is reported to have a reliability of 0.97. High scores on the scale represent high levels of constraints while low score represent low constraints. Item-total correlation computed for the present shows all items loading between .47 to .73 and a Cronbach's alpha .90 was obtain. study; all the items loaded above .30, therefore the coefficient ranges between .47 to .73. In this study a Cronbach's alpha .90 was reported for this scale.

Emotional intelligence scale

The emotional intelligence scale was measured with the 33-item scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998). The scale is structured on a 5-point rating format (5 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Strongly Disagree). Some examples of the items read "I know when to speak about my personal problems to others", "I expect that I will do well on most things I try", "I like to share my emotions with others", and "I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others". The Cronbach's alpha of the Emotional Intelligence is 0.83; test re-test was 0.88 for male and 0.81 for female. In Nigeria, Akomolafe and Ogunmakin, (2014) reported the reliability of 0.79 among secondary school. An item-total correlation was conducted in the study; of all the 33 items, 31 items loaded above .30. After the deletion of the two items, the remaining 31 items had item-total correlations items ranging between .33 to .81. The reliability Cronbach's alpha for the resultant scale is 0.96.

Counterproductive work Behaviour scale

The 32- item version of Counterproductive work Behaviour (CWB) developed by Spector and Fox (2005) was used to measure counterproductive work behaviour. The respondents was required to respond on a five item category scale ranging from

1 to 5 where 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 stand for Never, Once or Twice, Once or Twice per month, Once or Twice per week, and Everyday respectively. This scale is divided into five subscales, including Abuse, Sabotage, Production Deviance, Theft and Withdrawal. The reliability statistics of these dimensions are reported as; Abuse ($\alpha = 0.77$), Sabotage ($\alpha = 0.81$), Production Deviance ($\alpha = 0.83$), Theft ($\alpha = 0.83$) and Withdrawal ($\alpha = 0.88$). The reliability of the total scale was 0.87.

Procedure

The researcher sought participants consent and also assured them of confidentiality and discretion of the study before the commencement of the data collection. Instruction on how to

complete the questionnaire was given and, the participants were encouraged to be honest in responding to the questionnaire items and confidentiality was guaranteed. A total number of three hundred and twenty copies of questionnaires were purposively distributed across all the participants in the various schools used but only three hundred were retrieved. The usable questionnaires were subjected to appropriate statistical analysis.

III. RESULTS

The correlation coefficients between the studied variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Zero-order correlation showing relationship among organizational constraints, emotional intelligence and dimensions of counterproductive work behavior

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Abuse	26.19	13.19	-						
2. Production deviance	4.65	2.53	.72**	-					
3. Sabotage	4.43	2.30	.73**	.72**	-				
4. Theft	7.55	4.21	.89**	.73**	.75**	-			
5. Withdrawal	6.52	3.29	.77**	.79**	.73**	.73**	-		
6. Organizational constraints	22.44	9.50	.48**	.46**	.41**	.45**	.44**	-	
7. Emotional intelligence	107.46	29.40	-.38**	-.37**	-.36**	-.40**	-.32**	-.15**	-

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1 reveals the association among sub-dimensions of counterproductive behaviour (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, withdrawal). The result shows that there is significant positive relationship between organizational constraints and abuse ($r = .48, p < .01$), indicating that employees with higher organizational constraints express increasing abuse at workplace. There is significant inverse relationship between emotional intelligence and abuse ($r = -.38, p < .01$). Implying that employees with higher emotional intelligence significantly report lower abuse. In addition, there is significant positive relationship between organizational constraints and production deviance ($r = .46, p < .01$); the result implies that increase in organizational constraints significantly relate to increase in production deviance. The result also revealed that there was inverse relationship between emotional intelligence and production deviance ($r = -.37, p < .01$). Indicating that increased emotional intelligent significantly relate to decrease in production deviance.

Additionally, organizational constraints had significant positive relationship with sabotage ($r = .41, p < .01$). It implies that employees with higher organizational constraints significantly report higher sabotage. Emotional intelligence had significant inverse relationship with sabotage ($r = -.36, p < .01$); meaning that

increase in emotional intelligence significantly relates to increase in sabotage.

It was further reveal that organizational constraints had significant positive relationship with theft ($r = .45, p < .01$). The result implies that increase in organizational constraints significantly relates to increase in theft. There was significant negative relationship between emotional intelligence and theft ($r = -.40, p < .01$), demonstrating that increase in emotional intelligence significantly relates to decrease in theft.

Finally, organizational constraints had significant positive relationship with withdrawal ($r = .44, p < .01$), implying that increase in organizational constraints significantly relates to increase in withdrawal. Emotional intelligence had significant inverse relationship with withdrawal ($r = -.32, p < .01$), indicating that increase in emotional intelligence significantly relates to decrease in withdrawal.

To determine the joint prediction of counterproductive work behavior of teachers by organizational constraints and emotional intelligence. This was tested using multiple regression analysis. The results are presented in Table 2

Table 2: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Showing the Prediction of Counterproductive Work Behavior by organizational constraints and emotional intelligence

DV	Predictors	β	t	P	R	R ²	F	P
Counterproductive work behavior	Organizational constraints	.45	9.50	<.05	0.60	0.36	82.83	<.05
	Emotional intelligence	-.34	-7.11	<.05				
Abuse	Organizational constraints	.43	8.89	<.05	0.57	0.32	71.33	<.05
	Emotional intelligence	-.31	-6.51	<.05				
Production deviance	Organizational constraints	.42	8.47	<.05	0.55	0.31	65.43	<.05
	Emotional intelligence	-.31	-6.29	<.05				
Sabotage	Organizational constraints	.36	7.20	<.05	0.51	0.26	52.59	<.05
	Emotional intelligence	-.31	-6.11	<.05				
Theft	Organizational constraints	.40	8.19	<.05	0.56	0.31	68.06	<.05
	Emotional intelligence	-.34	-6.94	<.05				
Withdrawal	Organizational constraints	.40	7.85	<.05	0.51	0.26	50.75	<.05
	Emotional intelligence	-.26	-5.02	<.05				

The result revealed that organizational constraints and emotional intelligence jointly predicted counterproductive work behaviour ($R^2 = 0.36$, $F(2,297) = 82.83$, $p < .05$). When combined organizational constraints and emotional intelligence accounted for 36% of the change observed in the self-report of counterproductive work behaviour. This revealed that the collective presence of organizational constraints and emotional intelligence has significant influence on counterproductive work behaviour. The result further revealed that organizational constraints ($\beta = .45$, $t = 9.50$, $p < .05$) and emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.34$, $t = -7.11$; $p < .05$) were significant independent contributors in the joint prediction of counterproductive work behaviour. The result implies that teachers with high organizational constraints and low emotional intelligence significantly report high counterproductive work behaviour.

It was further revealed that organizational constraints and emotional intelligence jointly predicted abuse sub-dimension of counterproductive work behaviour ($R^2 = 0.32$, $F(2,297) = 71.33$, $p < .05$). When combined organizational constraints and emotional intelligence accounted for 32% of the change observed in the self-report of abuse. Independently, organizational constraints ($\beta = .43$, $t = 8.89$, $p < .05$) and emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.31$, $t = -6.51$; $p < .05$) significantly predicted abuse.

In addition, organizational constraints and emotional intelligence jointly predicted production deviance ($R^2 = 0.31$, $F(2,297) = 65.43$, $p < .05$). When combined organizational constraints and emotional intelligence accounted for 31% of the change observed in the self-report of production deviance. organizational constraints ($\beta = .43$, $t = 8.89$, $p < .05$) and emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.31$, $t = -6.51$; $p < .05$) were significant independent predictors of production deviance.

Apparently, there was significant joint influence of organizational constraints and emotional intelligence on sabotage ($R^2 = 0.26$, $F(2,297) = 52.59$, $p < .05$). When combined

organizational constraints and emotional intelligence accounted for 26% of the change observed in the self-report of sabotage. More so, organizational constraints ($\beta = .36$, $t = 7.20$, $p < .05$) and emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.31$, $t = -6.11$; $p < .05$) were significant independent predictors of sabotage.

Furthermore, organizational constraints and emotional intelligence on theft ($R^2 = 0.31$, $F(2,297) = 68.06$, $p < .05$). When combined organizational constraints and emotional intelligence accounted for 31% of the change observed in the self-report of theft. More so, organizational constraints ($\beta = .40$, $t = 8.19$; $p < .05$) and emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.34$, $t = -6.94$; $p < .05$) were significant independent predictors of theft.

Finally, organizational constraints and emotional intelligence on theft ($R^2 = 0.26$, $F(2,297) = 50.75$, $p < .05$). When combined organizational constraints and emotional intelligence accounted for 26% of the change observed in the self-report of theft. More so, organizational constraints ($\beta = .40$, $t = 7.85$; $p < .05$) and emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.26$, $t = -5.02$; $p < .05$) were significant independent predictors of theft.

IV. DISCUSSION

The study investigated the predictive role of emotional intelligence and organizational constraints on counterproductive behavior among teachers in Abeokuta, Ogun state, Nigeria. Regarding the hypotheses postulated to guide this present study, the result of the first hypothesis which states that organizational constraints and emotional intelligence will jointly and independently predict counterproductive work behavior revealed that there was joint and independent influence of organizational constraints and emotional intelligence. This study is similar to that of Winkel et.al (2011) who found that emotional intelligence have influence on workplace deviance among 234 individual employees. The study is in line with Wang and Lian (2015) who

found that emotional intelligence and organizational constraints jointly influence counterproductive work behaviour. Other, study by Mayer et.al (2000) found a joint influence of emotional intelligence and organizational constraints on work deviant behavior among 123 police officers. Theoretically, The Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence reveals that when employees do not have the ability to regulate his or her emotion, they often tend to engage in counterproductive work behaviour. The justification why this findings was so is because when an employees are faced with constraints in the workplace couple with the fact that they don't have the ability to induce positive mood, and manage negative emotions occasioned by this challenges in the workplace could invariably make employee engage in counterproductive work behavior

The result of this study has made a valuable contribution to the counterproductive work behaviour studies. This study has established that there is a joint influence of emotional intelligence and organisational constraint on counterproductive work behaviour. These two variables have shown to be very important variables if the menace of counterproductive work behaviour among teachers in Nigeria is to be reduced. The result of this study has implication for professional industrial and personnel psychologist, Private school management as well as government. Firstly, the study has practical implication for professional industrial/personnel psychologist, through understanding the role that emotional intelligence and organizational constraint could have on the display of counterproductive work behaviour among teachers as well as appropriate intervention such as psycho-education as well as counterproductive work behavior reduction interventions that can help reduce counterproductive work behaviour.. Finally, the study also has implication for government policies on improving the standard of education through creating conducive environment that will enhance positive behaviour among employees.

It is therefore recommended that professional industrial/personnel psychologist should help design an emotional regulation session where teachers who have low emotional intelligence are trained in order to express positive emotions to school management, students, as well as colleagues which invariably will not trigger negative behavior such as engagement of counterproductive work behavior Furthermore, psychologist should help design work in such a way that is devoid of too much constraint which could affect teachers to engage in negative behaviors. Finally, government should enact policies to all secondary schools in Nigeria on the need to create a conducive work atmosphere that will make employee exhibit a positive affect toward the organization.

This present study is faced with some limitations. This finding of this study may be argued to be relevant or important within the scope of the setting of this study. This is because the respondents of this study were relatively small and only selected from teachers in Abeokuta in Ogun state, Nigeria; therefore generalizability of the study findings to all public and private secondary school teachers across the globe may be nearly impossible.

It is recommended that future studies should take into consideration large sample size that cuts across the globe. Also, future research can also improve the method of data collection such as the use of qualitative methods like interview, focus group

discussion and observational method. Further studies can also investigate more psychosocial variables that can influence work deviant behaviour with emphasis on comparative analysis of public and private school teachers.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdul, K. O. (2008). Emotional intelligence and work effectiveness in service organizations. The preliminary findings. In The 4th National Human Resource Management Conference 17 – 19 August 2008, Tiara Beach Resort, Port Dickson (Unpublished).
- [2] Aftab, H., & Javeed, A. (2012). The Impact of Job Stress on the Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB), A Case Study from the financial Sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Organisational behaviour*, 4 (7), 590-604
- [3] Ajzen, I. (1991). The influence of attitudes on behaviour. *The Handbook of Attitudes*, 173-221.
- [4] Ansari, M., Mazraeh, S., & Arab-Khazaeli, P. (2013) Individual, Job, and Organizational Predictors of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*,3(4)78-86
- [5] Bauer, J. A. (2011). *The Role of Discrete motions in Predicting Counterproductive Work Behavior*; University of South Florida. Texas (USA)
- [6] Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360.
- [7] Bibi, Z., & Karim, K. (2013) Workplace Incivility and Counterproductive Work Behavior: Moderating Role of Emotional Intelligence. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(2), 317-334
- [8] Chand, P., & Chand, K. (2014) Job Stressors as predictor of Counterproductive work behaviour in Indian banking sector. *International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering & Management (IJAEM)*, 3, (12), 43-53
- [9] Effiong, D.A. (2006). Employees' job performance as affected by demographic variables in Nigerian educational system. *Journal of Educational Management*, 5(1-2): 38-
- [10] Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997, 2004). *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*. London. UK: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [11] Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books
- [12] Idiakheua, E. O. & Obetoh, G. I. (2012). Counterproductive Work Behaviour of Nigerians: An Insight into Make-Up Theory. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(7), 23-34
- [13] Ivancevich, J. M. (2010). *Human Resource Management 8th ed*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill
- [14] Joe-Akunne, C., Tochukwu, O., & Okonkwo, I. (2015) Impact of Emotional Intelligence and Job Boredom Proneness on Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Advances in Applied Psychology*, 1(2), 101-106
- [15] Kantan, P & Ülker, P. (2013). The Effect of Organizational Climate on Counterproductive Behaviors: An Empirical Study on the Employees of Manufacturing Enterprises. *Journal of behavioral science*, 12, 45-67
- [16] Lau, V. C. S.; Au, W. T., & Ho, J. M. C. (2002). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behaviour in organisations. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 18(1): 73–99
- [17] Levine, E. L. (2010). Emotion and power (as social influence): Their impact on organizational citizenship and counterproductive individual and organizational behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 4-17. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.011
- [18] Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.647
- [19] Matthew, O., Chigozie, U., & Kosio, A. (2014) Workplace Deviance: A Predictive study of Occupational Stress and Emotional Intelligence among Secondary School teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(12), 178-186
- [20] Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396-420). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Murphey, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- [22] Ofoegbu O., & Ayobami, A. (2013). Exploring The Link Between Emotional Intelligence And Workplace Friendship. *International Journal of Business Management & Research (IJBMR)* 3,(3), 45-54.
- [23] Oguegbe U., & Anyikwa, K. (2014). Workplace Deviance: A Predictive study of Occupational Stress and Emotional Intelligence among Secondary School teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(12), 178-186
- [24] Robinson, S. & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (2), 555- 572.
- [25] Siu, A.F. (2009). Trait Emotional Intelligence and its Relationship with Problem Behaviour in Hong Kong Adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences* 47(6) 553-557.
- [26] Spector & Fox, 2005 Best, C., Stapleton, O., & Downey, D. (2005). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (2), 410-424.
- [27] Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (20010). *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigation of actors and targets*. Washington, DC: APA Books.
- [28] Uche, I., George, O., & Abiola, W. (2017) Counterproductive Work Behaviors: a Socio-Demographic Characteristic-Based Study among Employees in the Nigerian Maritime Sector. *Acta Univ. Sapientiae, economics and business*, 5, 117–138
- [29] Uchenna, C. (2013). Counterproductive work behavior among employees in emotionally demanding jobs: the roles of perceived organizational support, job burnout, and age. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 1, 105-114
- [30] Vardi, Y & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehaviour in organizations: theory, research & management*. Retrieved at www.findarticle.com.
- [31] Waite, H. (1999). Comparing the incomparable: An essay on the importance of big assumptions and scant. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 18(4), 10-16. doi:10.1111/j.1745-3992.1999.tb00277.x
- [32] Wang, X., & Lian, O., (2015) Psychological Capital, Emotional Labor and Counterproductive Work Behavior of Service Employees: The Moderating Role of Leaders' Emotional Intelligence. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 5, 388-395
- [33] Weiss, H.M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 1 – 74. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00045-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00045-1)
- [34] Winkel, D. E., Wyland, R. L., Shaffer, M. A., & Clason, P. (2011). A new perspective on psychological resources: Unanticipated consequences of impulsivity and emotional intelligence. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 84(1), 78-94.
- [35] Zannu, M. (2016). Socio demographic factors and workplace deviance behaviour among workers of (I.A.R&T), Ibadan. An Unpublished Undergraduate project submitted to the Department of Psychology University of Ibadan, Oyo state

AUTHORS

First Author – Prof. B.O. Ehigie, Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan. (benosang@yahoo.com)

Second Author – Sholola Hameed A. Bsc, Msc in view, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. (shololahameed1@gmail.com)