

**A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS AS
PREDICTORS OF COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK
BEHAVIOURS AMONG PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS IN
ILORIN METROPOLIS**

Paul O. Ajao^{1*}, Omosolape O. Owoseni² & Rotimi Oguntayo³

^{1,2}Department of Psychology, Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria

³Department of Psychology, Universidad Autonoma de Ciudad Juarez Chihuahua, Mexico.

*oluwatosinajao63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This study examined psychosocial factors as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in the Ilorin metropolis of Nigeria. A survey research method was adopted, and 342 teachers (139 males, 203 females; $M=3.12$, $SD=1.31$) were selected using purposive sampling. The research instruments used were the Job Insecurity Index, Genos EI Inventory, and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. The result showed that gender had no significant influence on counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin metropolis Nigeria $f((340) t= .531; p >.05)$. In addition, levels of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin metropolis Nigeria $f(340) t= 4.112; p<.05)$. Lastly, job insecurity and emotional intelligence have significant prediction of 26% on counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin metropolis Nigeria $\{R = .218; R^2 =.269; F(12.111) p<.01)$. Thus, it was concluded that job insecurity and emotional intelligence have a notable impact on counterproductive work behaviour. Also, it was discovered that there was no gender difference on CWB. It was thus suggested that the school administration prioritize ensuring job security for teachers, as increased job security correlates with a reduction in unproductive work behaviour. Also, school management should incorporate the evaluation of emotional intelligence in the recruitment and selection process and recognize the necessity of training teachers with low emotional intelligence, as this will enhance their capacity to effectively manage their own behaviour and that of their colleagues in the workplace.

Keywords: Gender, Job insecurity, Emotional intelligence, Counterproductive work behaviour, Teachers.

INTRODUCTION

The factors influencing counterproductive work behaviours are significant to both practitioners and theorists, primarily because of the substantial costs these behaviours impose on organizations and the broader economy (Anjum & Parvez, 2013; Campbell & Popescu, 2021; Szostek et al., 2020; 2021). Counterproductive work behaviours are voluntary actions, like theft, sabotage, or performing tasks improperly, that detrimentally affect organizations (Chinwuba, 2023). The behaviours are pervasive and result in significant financial losses and harm to the human capital

development of organizations. The significance of CWB in organizations cannot be overstated. This is predicated on the assumption that counterproductive work behaviour among employees is a significant contributor to subpar individual performance, which consequently affects overall organizational performance. Kanten and Ulker (2013) asserted that unproductive work practices are directly detrimental to the organization or its members, varying from small to severe issues.

According to Ajao and Owoseni, (2023), counterproductive work behaviour is any conduct or activity in the workplace that diverges from established norms and standards. Sypniewska (2020) defined counterproductive work behaviour as the antithesis of organizational citizenship behaviour. Counterproductive work behaviour denotes deliberate actions that contravene the established rules and procedures of an organization, hence jeopardising the organization's success or its personnel (Spector, 2021; Jackson, 2022). Counterproductive work behaviour includes any voluntary actions that diverge from an organization's standards and threaten the organization's welfare or those of its members (Ajao & Owoseni, 2023). CWB includes deliberate or arbitrary activities by employees that compromise the core objectives of the organization (Jackson, 2022; Spain, 2019; Spector, 2021). Counterproductive workplace behaviour may manifest as antagonism, deviance, revenge, retaliation, bullying, emotional abuse, and mobbing. Additional instances include substance misuse, efforts to form labour unions, workplace theft, excessive socializing (such as romantic relationships or internal factions), and lateness (Robbins & Judge, 2014). However, CWB does not consistently display feelings of animosity; rather, it relates to the deliberate actions of employees that contradict the objectives of an organization. Moreover, any activities or behaviours by employees that contravene the best interests of an organization can be categorized as counterproductive work behaviour (Pati & Dhal, 2021).

Fagbamiye (2012) contends that the prevalence of counterproductive work behaviours among teachers has led to reduced academic performance and the emergence of deviant behaviours among students in these educational settings. Ching et al. (2017) contend that teachers display considerable favouritism, practise poor time management, show reluctance in assuming administrative responsibilities, and exhibit bad communication skills. These behaviours indicate the prevalence and frequency of unproductive work habits among teachers. Counterproductive work conduct includes different forms of disruptive actions. The behaviours identified encompass theft, tardiness, misuse of sick leave, substance abuse, fraudulent accident claims, subversion of authority, violation of organizational policies, lack of contribution to team efforts, excessive breaks, apathy, workplace bullying, and resource hoarding (Abdul Rahim et al., 2016). The adverse results generated multiple enquiries to comprehend the underlying factors contributing to unproductive work behaviour.

Numerous elements, including leadership styles, organizational culture, job pressures, transparency issues, and personality traits, have been identified as contributors to counterproductive work behaviour (Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Ehrhart & Raver, 2014; Fida et al., 2015). Researchers in Nigeria and globally have employed diverse terminology, including misbehaviour (Uche et al., 2017) and antisocial behaviour or workplace deviance (Mase, 2017), to characterise counterproductive work behaviours. These efforts aim to underscore that such practices are genuinely detrimental and must be treated with seriousness in organizational management. To comprehend and mitigate harmful work habits in organizations, it is essential to

analyse the variables predicting these behaviours at both interpersonal and organizational levels. Although prior research has investigated the factors affecting counterproductive work conduct (Abdullah & Halim, 2016; Mase, 2017), there has been insufficient examination of its prevalence across diverse work environments. It is essential to prioritize the analysis of psychosocial aspects as predictors of unproductive work behaviour. Job insecurity is one of the psychological characteristics that predict counterproductive work behaviour in the workplace. Job insecurity may compel employees to rationalize detrimental behaviours by altering their moral convictions. They may justify their behaviour by viewing the organization as treating them unjustly so feeling vindicated in their harmful behaviours (Detert et al., 2007). Various factors, including inadequate employment contracts and organizational changes have exacerbated workers' concerns regarding job security. Consequently, their task efficiency, output volume, work quality, and professional expertise and creativity have all diminished (Aliyu et al., 2013).

Ajao and Owoseni (2023) defined job insecurity as the state of uncertainty over the future of one's employment, stemming from factors both internal and external to the organization. Shoss (2017) also defined job insecurity as the state in which an employee's position is threatened or there exists a perceived danger of employment termination. According to Sverke et al. (2006), work insecurity is the subjective perception of the threat of job loss or the uncertainty that employee feels over their career's future. Uncertainty may result in unemployment (Karkouljian et al., 2013; Shoss, 2017). Consequently, the apprehension of job loss at a time of employment instability is evident. Job security is a persistent and contemporary phenomenon. Job insecurity refers to the potential for individuals to lose their employment owing to uncontrollable reasons (Lasted et al., 2016; Shoss, 2017). Consequently, employment uncertainty is unavoidable. A person who voluntarily terminates their employment cannot be classified as experiencing job instability. The unpredictability stems from fluctuations in the company's financial assets and project availability, which influence operational sustainability and employee retention (Mathebula et al., 2015). The possibility of imminent job loss arises exclusively from either rumours or the overall atmosphere inside an organization (Lasted et al., 2016). A stable organization will avert circumstances that lead people to feel apprehensive about potential job loss. Employees who feel a threat to their job security are more inclined to exhibit diminished organizational citizenship behaviour (Reisel et al., 2010). Moreover, heightened job insecurity is frequently linked to deviant or unproductive behaviours in the workplace (Reisel et al., 2010).

Considering other factors that predicts counterproductive behaviours at work place, organizations are complex environments defined by sophisticated interpersonal dynamics that can be affected directly or indirectly by several factors, including psychological, economic, social, and personal aspects. Interpersonal conflicts among employees can intensify and yield unforeseen outcomes, contingent upon the particular conditions and individuals involved. Worker responses to ordinary workplace issues might vary considerably, indicating that emotional intelligence and managerial skills are essential for the effective handling of such situations (Patel, 2017). Ofoegbu and Ayobami (2013) describe emotional intelligence as an individual's ability to effectively manage their emotions and utilize this information to inform their thoughts and actions. Employees possessing elevated emotional intelligence understand contextual signals and conform to behavioural norms according with established standards (Jafri, et al., 2016; Rexhepi & Berisha,

2017). Emotional intelligence is regarded as an essential ability that facilitates the understanding of situational cues and the enactment of appropriate conduct (Ajao & Owoseni, 2023).

Employees exhibiting emotional intelligence can proficiently circumvent actions that may harm the organization, rendering emotional intelligence and its fundamental components very important in this situation (Ajao & Owoseni, 2023). The correlation between workforce emotional intelligence and counterproductive work behaviour has been thoroughly examined (Farrastama et al., 2019; Raman et al., 2016). Oguebe et al., (2014) investigated emotional intelligence as a negative predictor of workplace deviance among public secondary school teachers, revealing a substantial link between emotional intelligence and workplace deviance. Siu (2009) also discovered that emotional intelligence has a significant inverse connection with counterproductive job activity. Similarly, Joe-Akunne et al. (2015) found that the dimensions of self-awareness, self-control, and self-motivation were predictors of counterproductive job behaviour. Bibi and Karim (2013) also indicated a negative correlation between emotional intelligence and counterproductive job behaviour. Consequently, it is crucial to enhance the corpus of knowledge regarding the nature of linkages and forecasts.

Although previous studies have considered psychological, biological, and economic issues, contradictions exist in the demographic information reported by the studied individuals. The current literature reveals inconsistent findings concerning the association between unproductive work activity and other human traits. Uchenna (2013) conducted a study in Nigeria and determined that age did not significantly affect employees' propensity to participate in unproductive job activity. Prior studies on the relationship between age and gender disparities in unproductive work behaviour have produced ambiguous findings. While Ajao and Owoseni (2023) demonstrated that there is no substantial gender difference in unproductive job behaviour among teachers, other studies have shown that men are more susceptible to excessive alcohol intake than women, whereas women exhibit a greater tendency for tardiness at work than men. For instance, Nowak (2020) asserts that men engage in these behaviours more frequently than women. To perform a thorough analysis, it is essential to investigate how psychosocial characteristics predict counterproductive job behaviour, especially in the setting of school teachers. It is essential to meticulously analyse any possible discrepancies in this context, as teachers represent a unique category of professionals. The incorporation of this expansion is crucial, as scholars have yet to attain a thorough comprehension of the complexities concerning the interrelations among the components examined in this study. This study aims to investigate the correlation between gender, job insecurity, emotional intelligence, and counterproductive work behaviour among private school teachers in Ilorin metropolis. The subsequent hypotheses guide the current inquiry:

- i. There will be gender difference on the measure of CWB among the selected school teachers in Ilorin metropolis.
- ii. Teachers with low levels of emotional intelligence will score significantly higher on counterproductive work behaviour than teachers with high levels of emotional intelligence.
- iii. Job insecurity and emotional intelligence will significantly jointly and independently influence CWB among the selected school teachers in Ilorin metropolis.

METHOD

Design and Participants

The study utilized survey research as its methodological framework. The investigation examined gender, job insecurity, and emotional intelligence as independent variables, while counterproductive work behaviour was considered the dependent variable. This study employed a purposive sampling method during the sampling process. The participants were chosen through purposive sampling, and subsequently, questionnaires were distributed to them at the selected private schools. A total of 360 questionnaires were distributed; however, only 342 were completed and considered valid for the study.

The descriptive statistics reveal that a larger segment of the participants were males, totalling 139 individuals (38.5%), in contrast to females, who accounted for 203 individuals (61.5%). The distribution of teachers by age is outlined below: A total of 61.5% of individuals fall within the age range of 26 to 35 years, while 33.7% are aged between 36 and 45 years. Additionally, 3.6% belong to the age group of 46 to 55 years, and 2.1% are 56 years or older.

Instruments

A structured questionnaire was used to collect data, ensuring accuracy. The research entails collecting socio-demographic data from participants, including gender while administering questionnaires to evaluate job insecurity, emotional intelligence, and counterproductive work conduct. The utilized scales have the following characteristics:

The participants' reported work insecurity was assessed using the Job Insecurity Questionnaire (JIQ) (De Witte, 1999), comprising 11 items. The items include both cognitive and emotional dimensions of work insecurity and are structured on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating severe disagreement, 3 signifying neutrality, and 5 denoting strong agreement. The questionnaire includes both affirmative and negative items to mitigate answer biases. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the questionnaire evaluated emotional work insecurity, with a particular emphasis on anxiety. Conversely, items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 investigated cognitive insecurity, particularly with the individual's degree of apprehension. Therefore, it is imperative to consider items 6, 9, 10, and 11 in a contrary fashion while assessing the JIQ. De Witte (1999) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.92 for the overall scale, 0.85 for the affective scale, and 0.90 for the cognitive scale utilising the same instrument. Moeletsi (2003) reported an alpha coefficient of 0.93 for the overall score, 0.86 for affective insecurity, and 0.91 for cognitive insecurity in South African studies. Buitendach and De Witte (2005) documented Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.84 for cognitive job insecurity and 0.89 for affective work insecurity. Respondents with high scores exhibit reduced perceived work insecurity, whereas those with low scores demonstrate elevated employment insecurity.

Genos EI Inventory (Genos EI) was designed to assess the emotional intelligence of individuals in a professional context (Palmer et al., 2009). Genos EI exhibits three unique characteristics: Emotional Self-Awareness, the capacity to recognize and understand one's own feelings and those

of others; Emotional Expression, the skill of articulating one's own emotions and those of others effectively. The self-report inventory employs a response framework comprising the following options: 1=Almost Never, 2=Rarely; 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, and 5=Almost Always. The Genos EI scale includes a range of both positive and negative emotions. Positive emotions include satisfaction, enthusiasm, optimism, excitement, engagement, motivation, and the perception of being valued by colleagues. Instances of negative emotions include worry, anger, tension, annoyance, frustration, disappointment, distress, and impatience. The Genos EI self-report inventory, evaluated by Gignac et al. (2009), exhibited internal consistency reliability between .71 and .85. This inventory solely allows for the calculation of a comprehensive emotional intelligence (EI) score. Ajao and Owoseni (2023) reported a coefficient of 0.87. Items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 are scored inversely, whilst the other things are scored directly. A score of 42 or above signifies elevated emotional intelligence. The Cronbach's alpha for this research is 0.88.

The counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist, developed by Spector et al. (2006), was employed to evaluate CWB. The 32-item assessment instrument produces five separate subscales that measure different types of harmful actions in the workplace. The subscales include abuse, which involves actions that inflict harm and offence on others; production deviance, characterised by the intentional execution of tasks incorrectly or permitting errors; sabotage, defined as the deliberate destruction of the physical environment; theft, which pertains to the unlawful appropriation of possessions or resources; and withdrawal, encompassing behaviours such as absenteeism or tardiness to evade work responsibilities. Responses are recorded using a 5-point frequency scale. Rarely, intermittently, monthly, weekly, and daily. The updated alpha coefficients are as follows: The abuse coefficient is 0.85, the production deviance coefficient is 0.63, the sabotage coefficient is 0.55, the theft coefficient is 0.63, and the withdrawal coefficient is 0.64. The system's coefficient is 0.86. Lawal et al. (2019) found that the alpha coefficient in Nigerian workplaces was .90. Akadiri and Umemezia (2019) documented Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.730, 0.712, 0.801, 0.706, and 0.804 for the constructs of the adapted scale, namely abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal, respectively.

Ethical Considerations

The study adheres to the ethical norms set forth for psychological research and evaluation and complies with the core concepts specified in the American Psychological Association's ethics code and pertinent rules. The principles encompass acquiring informed consent and supplying participants with essential information, protecting personal data and maintaining confidentiality, avoiding discrimination, abstaining from monetary incentives, and allowing participants the right to withdraw from the study at any time. The study did not obtain any institutional approval as it was a purposive sampling technique was employed.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were conducted with SPSS Statistics 24.0. The researchers employed descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, and frequency, to provide a succinct summary of the participants' demographic characteristics. The T-test for independent samples was

employed to compare separate groups. The researchers employed multiple regression to examine the validity of the prediction.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Hypothesis One:

There will be gender differences in CWB among the selected school teachers in the Ilorin metropolis.

Table 1: T-test for independent group showing gender difference in counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin metropolis.

	<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>CWB</i>	Male	139	51.12	28.25	340	.531	.229
	Female	203	55.61	30.48			

From Table 1, it can be observed that there exists no significant gender difference in counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin West LGA $f(340) t = .531; p > .05$. This implies there is no significant difference in male teachers ($M = 51.12$ $SD = 28.25$) and female teachers ($M = 55.61$ $SD = 30.48$). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Two:

Teachers with low levels of emotional intelligence will score significantly higher on counterproductive work behaviour than teachers with high levels of emotional intelligence.

Table 2: T-test for independent group showing levels of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin West LGA.

	<i>Emotional intelligence</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>CWB</i>	Low	155	32.42	15.09	340	4.112	.01
	High	187	25.11	7.24			

From Table 2, it can be observed that there's a significant difference in the levels of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin West LGA $f(340) t = 4.112; p < .05$). This implies that teachers on low level of emotional intelligence ($M = 32.42$ $SD = 15.09$) reported significant difference in counterproductive work behaviour to teachers on high level of emotional intelligence ($M = 25.11$ $SD = 9.24$). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted for this study.

Hypothesis three:

Job insecurity and emotional intelligence will significantly jointly and independently influence CWB among the selected school teachers in Ilorin metropolis.

A Summary Table of Multiple Regression Showing Prediction Job Insecurity and emotional Intelligence on Counterproductive Work behaviour among Selected Teachers in Ilorin West LGA.

	R	R ²	F	Sig	β	T	Sig
Job insecurity	.218	.269	12.111	.000	.318	3.743	.000
Emotional intelligence					-.384	3.631	.020

Predictors: (Constant): job insecurity and emotional intelligence

Dependent variable: Counterproductive work behaviour

From Table 3 above, the this suggests that job insecurity and emotional intelligence explain 26% of variance in CWB, indicating other contributing factors exist among selected teachers in Ilorin West LGA {R = .218; R² =.269; F(12.111) p<.01). The analysis of the independent prediction showed that job insecurity has a significant independent prediction on counterproductive work behaviour (t =3.743; p<.01; β = .318). Also, emotional intelligence has a significant independent prediction on counterproductive work behaviour (t = 3.631; p<.05; β =-.384). The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

DISCUSSIONS

Hypothesis one stated that there will be no significant gender difference in counterproductive work behaviour among selected teachers in Ilorin West LGA. The results presented in table above indicate that there is no significant difference in unproductive work conduct based on gender. The study conducted by Ajao and Owoseni (2023) concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers. The results of Nyarko et al. (2014) corroborate this finding, demonstrating no significant correlation between gender and CWB. Lawal et al. (2019) also corroborate this conclusion, demonstrating that there is no substantial disparity between male and female university support professionals regarding their engagement in unproductive job activity. Consequently, the influence of gender on unproductive work behaviour was determined to be statistically insignificant.

Contrary to the findings of this study, Spector and Zhou (2014) identified a minor gender disparity in the overall prevalence of unproductive work behaviour among the underexamined group. Anwar et al. (2020) also discovered that male teachers demonstrated a greater propensity for deviant

workplace behaviours than their female colleagues. Similarly, Uche et al. (2017) identified notable disparities in unproductive work behaviour between male and female employees. These contradictory findings may be because employees of all genders encounter comparable workplace pressures, including workload pressure, inequitable treatment, and insufficient autonomy, which may precipitate counterproductive work behaviour. Given that these parameters are not intrinsically linked to gender, it is plausible to anticipate no substantial disparities in CWB between genders. The propensity for counterproductive work behaviours is influenced by a confluence of factors rather than gender alone.

Hypothesis two stated that teachers in Ilorin West LGA who have a low level of emotional intelligence would report a significant difference in their act of counterproductive work behaviour compared to teachers who have a high level of emotional intelligence. The results indicate a significant difference in emotional intelligence about counterproductive job behaviour. This conclusion is corroborated by the study conducted by Irene and Sofia (2020), which indicated that elevated emotional intelligence correlates with a diminished propensity to exhibit counterproductive work behaviour. Dirican and Erdil (2020) also claimed that emotional intelligence significantly reduces counterproductive job behaviour in the workplace. Individuals with a high level of emotional intelligence exhibit a reduced propensity to engage in counterproductive work behaviour compared to those with a low level of emotional intelligence. Bibi et al., (2013) demonstrated a negative association between emotional intelligence and counterproductive job behaviour. Thus, it may be concluded that those possessing elevated emotional intelligence demonstrate reduced instances of unproductive work behaviours, including abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal, relative to those with diminished emotional intelligence. Consequent to these results, it may be affirmed that those with poor emotional intelligence engage in counterproductive work behaviour more frequently than those with high emotional intelligence. The proposed paradigm emphasises the individual's duty to regulate their emotions, encompassing both management and appropriate behavioural reactions.

Hypothesis three states that job insecurity and emotional intelligence will significantly independently and jointly predict CWB among the selected school teachers in the Ilorin metropolis. The hypothesis was evaluated, and the findings indicated that work insecurity and emotional intelligence strongly influence outcomes singly and collectively among the chosen school instructors. This result corresponds with the findings of Ajao and Owoseni (2023), Lu et al. (2023), and Oluwole et al. (2020), all of whom reported a substantial impact of job insecurity on counterproductive work conduct. Likewise, Idiakheua and Obetoh (2012) corroborated the findings, indicating that employment instability significantly affects unproductive work behaviour. Their research indicated that job security in these organizations had been negatively impacted by various factors, including difficult working conditions, industrialisation, and inflation. These factors may compel organizations to consider reducing their workforce to lower production expenses (Suleiman, 2013). Hence, teachers encountering job insecurity may develop irritation, animosity, and diminished organizational commitment. This emotional distress may result in detrimental behaviours, including absenteeism, diminished teaching efficacy, neglect of responsibilities, or even overt opposition to school policy. When teachers perceive a threat to their job security, they may recognize a violation of their psychological contract with the employer, resulting in a withdrawal of discretionary efforts or the adoption of retaliatory behaviours.

The independent influence of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviour has been substantiated by research conducted by Ehigie and Hameed, (2020), Wang and Lian (2015), and Dirican and Erdil (2020), demonstrating that emotional intelligence significantly affects CWB in the workplace. Likewise, Mohona and Sahidur (2023) affirm that emotional intelligence significantly contributes to the variety of unproductive work conduct. Irene and Sofia (2020) also discovered that individuals possessing strong emotional intelligence are less prone to participate in detrimental job behaviour. Thus, individuals possessing a high level of emotional intelligence are less inclined to engage in counterproductive job conduct than those with a low level of emotional intelligence. The rationale for these findings is that when employees encounter challenges in the workplace, coupled with their inability to foster positive moods and manage the negative emotions arising from these challenges, they may inevitably resort to counterproductive work behaviour.

Conclusion

Counterproductive work behaviours significantly disrupt workplaces. Extensive research has consistently demonstrated that unproductive work behaviours negatively affect organizational productivity and employee well-being. The study, therefore, concludes that job insecurity and emotional intelligence significantly predict counterproductive work behaviour. The magnitude of harm inflicted by employees in the workplace when they sense a threat to their job security is considerable. The persistent relationship between job insecurity and counterproductive work behaviour has been increasingly evident over time. A multitude of studies have substantiated this fact. Consequently, when teachers encounter insecurity about their future employment, especially when they perceive job retention as improbable, they are more prone to exhibit behaviours that hinder the advancement and development of the educational environment. Teachers with job security are more inclined to exhibit a strong level of job commitment and dedication.

This study also concludes that the prediction of emotional intelligence on unproductive work behaviour is noteworthy, particularly emphasising that teachers with elevated emotional intelligence are likely to demonstrate behaviours aligned with school norms and regulations. Teachers with low emotional intelligence will consistently engage in behaviours that adversely impact the school's operations and services. Given the importance of emotional intelligence in influencing counterproductive work behaviour, it is essential for school administration to prioritize this factor to mitigate its prevalence. This will enhance the understanding that teachers with high emotional intelligence, despite any worries about their employment or work conditions, regularly endeavour to communicate their issues constructively to the school administration. Conversely, teachers deficient in emotional intelligence often resort to detrimental professional actions as their primary mode of communication in adverse circumstances. Consequently, the presence of individuals with elevated emotional intelligence will reduce the incidence of counterproductive work conduct in the workplace.

Finally, this study concludes that there is no statistically significant difference in the level of unproductive work conduct displayed by instructors based on gender. The results indicated no statistically significant difference in the level of unproductive work behaviour exhibited by the teachers based on gender. Regardless of gender discrepancies, teachers demonstrate harmful job

behaviour at approximately equivalent rates. This may be ascribed to the similarities in the duties allocated to teachers by the school administration. In the context of course allocation and related responsibilities allocated to teachers at school, any gender is equally qualified to undertake these duties. Any teacher can undertake responsibilities including instruction, oversight, supervision, and attendance recording. Both genders demonstrate counterproductive work behaviour at almost equal rates when faced with workplace challenges.

Limitations

This study is constrained by unique limitations. A limitation was the employment of purposive sampling rather than simple random selection, potentially constraining the generalisability of the results. Data was gathered from multiple private schools, and subsequent research may expand the investigation to analyse and contrast the outcomes of private and public schools, other vocations, and organizational contexts. The study neglected to include more advanced statistical analysis techniques, such as the inclusion of mediating or moderating variables, which could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between psychosocial characteristics and counterproductive work behaviours. Further enquiries could explore this topic to uncover the other variables (e.g., personality traits, organizational culture, job satisfaction) that might influence CWB.

Recommendations

The study's conclusions and findings underscore the significance of job stability for teachers, as it bolsters their capacity to operate effectively and efficiently in their roles. Given the persistent adverse effects of unproductive work behaviour on the school and its students, the management must take decisive action to eradicate any occurrences of unethical conduct among instructors. The significance of teachers' job comfort is paramount, as studies have shown a strong link between employment insecurity and unethical conduct in the workplace. Thus, when individuals possess an elevated sense of job security, their participation in detrimental work behaviours diminishes. The study's conclusion and findings also indicate that holding a high degree of intelligence is significant for school teachers, as it allows them to effectively manage demanding professional settings.

It is so advised that school management dedicate time for training instructors in emotional intelligence. This training would enhance their professional positions as well as other facets of their life. Also, it is essential that school management assess the emotional intelligence of teachers during recruiting to identify individuals who need teaching and training in this domain before they may engage in such actions. Moreover, the institution should meticulously oversee the teachers recognized as possessing inadequate emotional intelligence.

References

Abdul Rahim, A. R., Shabudin, A., & Mohd Nasurdin, A. (2016). Effects of job characteristics on counterproductive work behavior among production employees: Malaysian experience. *International Journal of Business and Development Studies*, 8(1), 117-139.

- Abdullah, A., & Halim, F. W. (2016). The influence of work ethic and counterproductive work behaviour of civil servants. *Journal of Technology Management and Business*, 3(1), 1-14.
- Ajao, P.O. & Owoseni, O. O. (2023). Investigating the role of demographic factors and emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviour among teachers. *Studies in the social sciences*, Vol. 3, No 1, 2023: 109-126 ISSN: 2736-190x
- Aliyu, T. K., Ajani, O. A., & Adisa, A. L. (2013). Declining job security level and workers' performance in selected banks in South Western Nigeria. *African Sociological Review*, 17(2), 55-70.
- Anjum, M. A., & Parvez, A. (2013). Counterproductive behavior at work: A comparison of blue collar and white collar workers. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 417-434.
- Aubé, C., Rousseau, V., Mama, C., & Morin, E. M. (2009). Counterproductive behaviors and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24, 351-361.
- Bauer, J. A. (2011). *The Role of Discrete Motions in Predicting Counterproductive Work Behavior*; University of South Florida. Texas (USA)
- Bibi, Z., Karim, J., & Din, S. (2013). Workplace incivility and counterproductive work behavior: Moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(2), 317-334.
- Biswas, M. B. M., & Rahman, M. S. (2023). Emotional Intelligence and Counterproductive Work Behavior-An Empirical Investigation for Asia. *The Journal of Management Theory and Practice (JMTP)*, 4(1), 14-22.
- Buitendach, J. H., & De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment of maintenance workers in a parastatal. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 36(2), 27-37.
- Campbell, E., & Popescu, G. H. (2021). Psychological distress, moral trauma, and burnout syndrome among COVID-19 frontline medical personnel. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, 9(2), 63–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22381/pihrm9220215>.
- Carpenter, N. C., & Berry, C. M. (2017). Are counterproductive work behavior and withdrawal empirically distinct? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Management*, 43(3), 834-863.
- Chinwuba, U. C. (2023). Counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs): Antecedents and outcomes. In *Organizational Behavior-Negative Aspects*. IntechOpen.

- Ching, G. S., Tsay, W. R., Hu, Y. L., & Hung, C. H. (2017). Counterproductive work behaviors within academic institutions: A myth or a reality. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 6(1), 1-14.
- Chirumbolo, A., & Hellgren, J. (2003). Individual and organizational consequences of job insecurity: A European study. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 24(2), 217-240.
- Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., & Turan, N. (2013). Predicting counterproductive work behaviour from guilt proneness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 45-53.
- De Cuyper, N. Schreurs, B., De Witte, H., & Selenko, E. (2020). Impact of job insecurity on job performance. *Career Development International*, 25(3), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-06-2020-332>
- Detert, J. R., Trevino, L. K., Burris, E. R., & Andiappan, M. (2007). Managerial modes of influence and counterproductivity in organizations: A longitudinal business-unit-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 993.
- De Witte, H.. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of work and Organizational psychology*, 8(2), 155-177.
- De Witte, H. (Ed., 2005). Job insecurity, union involvement and union activism. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Dirican, A. H., & Erdil, O. (2020). The influence of ability-based emotional intelligence on discretionary workplace behaviors. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 30(3), 369-382.
- Ehigie, B. O., & Hameed, S. A. (2020). Emotional intelligence and organizational constraints as predictors of counterproductive work behaviour among teachers in abeokuta metropolis, Ogun State. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 10(6), 866-872.
- Farrastama, D. N., Asmony, T., & Hermanto, H. (2019). Effect of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behavior with job stress as an intervening variable: Study on civil servants in Mataram city. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1), 14-25.
- Gignac, G. E. (2009). Psychometrics and the measurement of emotional intelligence. *Assessing emotional intelligence: Theory, research, and applications*, 9-40.
- Greenidge, D., Devonish, D., & Alleyne, P. (2014). The relationship between ability-based emotional intelligence and contextual performance and counterproductive work

- behaviors: A test of the mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Human Performance*, 27(3), 225-242.
- Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 30-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00224>
- Hu, Y.-L., Hung, C.-H., & Ching, G. S. (2015). Examining the counterproductive work behaviors within Taiwan academic setting: A pilot study. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 9(1), 63-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6197/HEED.2015.0901.04>
- 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, 912-937.
- Irene Samanta & Sofia Kallou. (2020). The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Counterproductive Work Behavior. *European Business & Management*. Vol. 6, No. 2, 2020, pp. 20-27. doi: 10.11648/j.ebm.20200602.11
- Jackson, S. (2022). *5 Types of Counterproductive Work Behavior*. Retrieved from <https://www.organizationalpsychologydegrees.com/lists/5-types-of-counterproductive-work-behavior/>
- Jafri, M. H., Dem, C., & Choden, S. (2016). Emotional intelligence and employee creativity: Moderating role of proactive personality and organizational climate. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 4(1), 54-66.
- Jiang, L., & Lavaysse, L. M. (2018). Cognitive and affective job insecurity: A meta-analysis and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, 44(6), 2307-2342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318773853>
- Joe-Akunne Chiamaka, O., Oguegbe Tochukwu, M., & Okonkwo Kizito, I. (2015). Impact of emotional intelligence and job boredom proneness on counterproductive work behaviour. *Advances in Applied Psychology*, 1(2), 101-106.
- Ju, D., Xu, M., Qin, X., & Spector, P. (2019). A multilevel study of abusive supervision, norms, and personal control on counterproductive work behavior: A theory of planned behavior approach. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 26(2), 163-178.
- Kanten, 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

- Karkoulian, S., Mukaddam, W., McCarthy, R., & Messarra, L. C. (2013). Job insecurity: A whirlpool of chronic powerlessness. *Education, Business and Society*, 6(1), 55– 70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17537981311314727>
- Khahtani, A.A., (2013). Employee Emotional Intelligence and Employee Performance in the Higher Education Institutions in Saudi Arabia: A Proposed Theoretical Framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(9), 80-95.
- Lasted, L., Elst, T. V. & De Witte, H. (2016). On the reciprocal relationship between individual job insecurity and job insecurity climate. *Career Development International*, 21(3), 246–269. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cdi-03-2015-0046>
- Lau, C. S., Au, W. T., & Ho, M. C. (2003). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18, 73–99. doi:[10.1023/A:1025035004930](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025035004930).
- Lawal A.M, Babalola S.S. & Ordu U.F. (2019). Examining Age, Pay Satisfaction and Intent to Leave in Counterproductive Work Behaviour among University Support Staff *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*. Volume 16, Number 2.
- Lu, W., Liu, X., Liu, S., Wu, H., Qin, C., & Ma, B. (2023). On the link between job insecurity and CWB: moderated mediation by employment status and turnover intention. *Chinese Management Studies*, 17(3), 683-700.
- Marcus, B., Taylor, O. A., Hastings, S. E., Sturm, A., & Weigelt, O. (2016). The structure of counterproductive work behavior: A review, a structural meta-analysis, and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 203-233.
- Mase, J. A. (2017). Personality Factors as Predictors of Counterproductive Work Behaviour Among Benue State Civil Servants. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies (IJIRAS)* 3(12), 139-151
- Mathebulaa, L., Mukukab, M., Aigbavboac, C., and Thwalad, W. (2015). A Theoretical Assessment of Causes of Job Insecurity in the Construction Industry, OTMC Conference, pp 1–6, University of Johannesburg, South Africa. Conference proceedings. <http://hdl.handle.net/10210/73303>
- Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 59, 507-536.
- Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2017). Are the emotionally intelligent good citizens or counterproductive? A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and its relationships with organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 116, 144-156.

- Moeletsi, M. M. (2003). *Psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job insecurity in divisions of a packaging organization* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University).
- Nair, N., & Bhatnagar, D. (2011). Understanding workplace deviant behavior in Nonprofit Organizations: Toward an integrative conceptual framework. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 21(3), 289-309.
- Nowak, M. (2020). Entrepreneurship in china's greater bay area-a gender perspective. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 324-344. doi:10.17512/pjms.2020.22.2.22
- Nyarko, K., Ansah-Nyarko, M., & Sempah, D. B. (2014). Injustice and interpersonal conflict on counterproductive work behaviour. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(21), 117-123.
- 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.
- Oguebe 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
- Olabimitan, B., & Alausa, W. M. (2014). Psychological factors predicting workplace deviance behaviour among nurses in the public health sector in Lagos. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 2, 137-152.
- Oluwole, O. J., Aderibigbe, J. K., & Mjoli, T. Q. (2020). The Attenuating Effects of Organizational Justice on Job Insecurity and Counterproductive Work Behaviours Relationship. *African Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 15(1).
- Onuoha U. C. (2013). Counterproductive work behaviour among employees in emotionally demanding jobs: The roles of perceived organizational support, job burnout, and age. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behaviour Science*, 1, 105-114
- Onyishi, I. E., & Onunkwo, C. B. (2014). Counterproductive work behaviour among school teachers: The contributions of psychological contract breach and job stress. *Journal of the African Educational Research Network*, 14(1/2), 140-147
- Palmer, R. B., Stough, C., Harmer, R. & Gignac, G. (2009). Construct redundancy within the Five Factor Model as measured by the NEO PI-R: Implications for emotional intelligence and incremental coherence. Genos Pty Ltd, Suite 11/365 Little Collins Street, Melbourne VIC 3000, Australia.

- Patel, T. G. (2017). Benefits of Mindfulness in the Workplace: The Effects of Mindful Practices on Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University).
- Pati, S. P., & Manoranjan, D. H. A. L. (2021). Counterproductive Work Behavior by Drivers of Platform Based Cab Aggregators in India: A Human Rights Perspective¹. *Japan Labor Issues*, 17.
- Raman, P., Sambasivan, M., & Kumar, N. (2016). Counterproductive work behavior among frontline government employees: Role of personality, emotional intelligence, affectivity, emotional labor, and emotional exhaustion. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 32(1), 25-37. <https://www.jil.go.jp/english/jli/documents/2021/032-02.pdf>
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S. L., Maloles, C. M., & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and negative emotions of employees. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 40(1), 74-91.
- Rexhepi, G., & Berisha, B. (2017). The effects of emotional intelligence in managing changes: An entrepreneurial perspective. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 13(2-3), 237-251.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational Behavior* (16th Edition ed.).
- Shoss, M. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 43, 1911–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691574> Spain, S.M. (2019). *Leadership, Work, and the Dark Side of Personality*. Netherlands: Elsevier Inc.
- Singh, D. (2006). *Emotional intelligence at work: A professional guide*. Sage.
- Spector, P. E. (2021). *What Is Counterproductive Work Behavior?* Retrieved from <https://paulspector.com/what-is-counterproductive-work-behavior/>
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A. & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
- Spector, P. E., & Zhou, Z. E. (2014). The moderating role of gender in relationships of stressors and personality with counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 29(4), 669-681.

- Suleiman, W. (2013). A study of causes of poor attitude to work among workers of both public and private sectors organizations in Bauchi State-Nigeria. *International journal of academic research in business and social sciences*, 3(7), 143.
- Sypniewska, B. (2020). Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Advances in cognitive psychology*, 16(4), 321.
- Szostek, (2019). The impact of the quality of interpersonal relationships between employees on counterproductive work behavior: A study of employees in Poland. *Sustainability*, 11(21), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11215916>.
- Szostek, D. (2022). Central European version of counterproductive work behavior checklist (CWB-C PL). *Economics and Sociology*, 15(2), 74-94. doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2022/15-2/5.
- Szostek, D., Balcerzak, A. P., & Rogalska, E. (2020). The relationship between personality, organizational and interpersonal counterproductive work challenges in industry 4.0. *Acta Montanistica Slovaca*, 25(4), 577-592. <https://doi.org/10.46544/AMS.v25i4.11>.
- Uche, I. I. George, O. & Abiola, W. (2017). Counterproductive work behaviours: a socio-demographic characteristics-based study among employees in the Nigerian Maritime sector. *Acta University, Sapeintae, Economic and Business*, 5, 117–138
- Uchenna, C. O. (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. http://elibrary.aaua.edu.ng/library_files/57b2dec4e525997c29dcfa8f00a7165d.pdf
- Vatankhah, S., Javid, E., & Raoofi, A. (2017). Perceived organizational support as the mediator of the relationships between high-performance work practices and counter-productive work behavior: Evidence from airline industry. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 59, 107-115.
- 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