



Social Sciences Research
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Nigeria

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE DIMENSIONS AND PAY SATISFACTION AS PREDICTORS OF SABOTAGE BEHAVIOR AMONG NIGERIAN BANK EMPLOYEES

Ezeh, Leonard Nnaemeka Ph.D.¹, Etodike, Chukwuemeka Etodike¹ &
Chinyem Lucky Nwanzu, Ph.D.²

¹Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra State,

²Department of Psychology, Delta State University, Abraka, Delta State.

Contact: Email: nelsonetodike@gmail.com, Tel: +2348066614744

ABSTRACT

This study explored organizational justice dimensions and pay-satisfaction as predictors of sabotage behaviour among Nigerian bank employees in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. The participants of the study were three hundred and forty-seven (347) bank employees comprising sixty-three (163) males and a hundred and eighty four (184) females whose ages ranged from 23 to 52 years with an average age of 29.40 years and standard deviation of 3.05. Three instruments namely: Perceived Organizational Justice Questionnaire developed by Neihoff and Moorman, (1993); Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by White and Ruh, (1973) and Sabotage Behaviour Inventory developed by Skarlicki and Folger, (1997) were used for data collection. The design adopted for this study predictive design while the appropriate statistics used in analyzing the data was multiple regression analysis. The result from the multiple regression analysis confirmed that only distributive justice and pay satisfaction significantly and negatively predicted employee sabotage behaviour at $\beta = -2.94^$, $p < .05$ and $\beta = -2.53^*$, $p < .05$ ($N=347$) respectively. The finding implies that perceptions of injustice and low pay satisfaction in an organization may precipitate retaliatory behaviours in form of employee sabotage.*

Keywords: Employee sabotage behaviour, organizational justice, pay satisfaction, bank employees.

Introduction

The focus of most work organizations is to maximize profit, reduce the cost of production and to remain relevant and effective in the global competition. To achieve this, organizations need their workers to maintain a consistent level of effectiveness and efficiency which can be achieved through the efficient maximization of organizational resources and operating costs by the employees. In some cases, the goals of the organization may be in conflict with that of the employees who are interested in actualizing their dreams namely; earn livelihood, family provision and security in old age or retirement (Etodike, Ezeh & Chukwura, 2017; Oniye, 2012). Regrettably, this conflict in goals between the organizational owners and the employees are the reasons for organizational injustice and pay dissatisfaction among the employees at a high cost of employee sabotage which comes as a retaliatory behaviour (Ezeh, Etodike & Ike, 2017; Nweke, 2015). Ezeh (2016) asserts that this conflict is what often leads to industrial revolution and union activism to maintain organizational health and the wellbeing of the employees.

Against this backdrop, there are scholarly interests in what happens when union management and industrial revolution fail to broker a truce between the organization and their workers. Critical observation of the goings-on in many private sector organizations such as banks have left the authors with the conclusion that depending upon peculiar antecedents, Nigerian workers in the private sector organizations are more likely than not to engage in sabotage behaviour as a reprieve for what they perceive as organizational injustice and low pay satisfaction which are identified as frustration to their career progress.

Employee sabotage behaviours in most instances emanate as a result of unresolved grievances regarding the welfare and treatment of employees in their organizations (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Jones, 1982). In the face of many other challenging factors impacting negatively on organizational success, employee sabotage behaviour has been singled out as the most deadly organizational vice capable of destroying the entire organization unnoticed (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Employee sabotage behaviour is any

behaviour or act exhibited by the employee which is intended to harm, injure organizational name, members or resources deployed for the purpose of production or disrupt organization's productive processes (Kanten and Ulker, 2013). Crino (1994) conceptualized workplace sabotage as deviant work behaviours intended to damage, disrupt or subvert the organization's operations for the personal purposes of the saboteur, by creating unfavorable publicity, embarrassment, delays in production, damage to property, destruction of working relationships or the harming of employees or co-workers.

For the authors, employee sabotage behaviour is an act by an employee (commission or omission) which serves the best interest of the employee without the consideration of the norms of the organization or her goals. Employee sabotage is one of the key dimensions of counterproductive work behaviours in the organizations and it consists of two fundamental types namely: restoration equity and retaliatory behaviours. Deliberately slowing the traditional pace of work, or maliciously damaging company equipment, stealing, perversion of justice, embezzlement, office abuse are typical examples of employee sabotage behaviours. In other words, workplace sabotage is essentially antithetical to the overall organizational effectiveness and health.

No matter how bad the behaviour is, employee sabotage behaviour do not just happen in the organization rather it is triggered by a number of organizational factors including organizational injustice and pay dissatisfaction. In consideration of the associated dangers, an examination of the concept and antecedents of employee sabotage behaviour has become necessary especially in identifying its predictors. This study has focused on the predictive influences of organizational justice dimensions and pay satisfaction.

Perceived organizational justice is essentially referred to as the perceived fairness of organizational occurrences and situations (Greenberg, 1987). This implies that organizational justice is concerned with perceived fair treatment of employees in the work organization. Essentially, organizational justice is considered to consist of three

major dimensions: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Distributive justice is concerned with the fairness of outcomes such as pay, rewards and promotion, (Colquitt, Greenberg, Zapata & Phelan, 2005; Ezech, 2016). Distributive justice refers to the concerns expressed by employees with regards to the distribution of resources and outcome in the organization. The employee's perception of whether the outcome (resource allocation) is fair or otherwise forms the basis of the concept of distribution justice. It is the individual employees in the organization who determines the fairness of the distribution through comparison with others. The employee is concerned about equity issues and questions: do the individuals think that they are fairly treated in terms of work load, work schedule, salary, bonuses or promotion? However, procedural justice refers to the organization system and procedure for carrying out organizational tasks, including its assignment and use of organizational resources and the channels of communication and feedback. In terms of interactional justice, the organizational fairness in their inter relationship comes to mind. The relationship between the superiors and their subordinates on one hand; and among the employees on the other hand is an integral part of this justice system because favourable social climate is needed in the organizations to foster interpersonal interaction and development among members.

Each dimension of justice represents a unique challenge for employees depending upon the organizational climate. Ezech (2016) posits that there are indications that when employees are not fairly treated each of the dimensions or perceive injustice towards themselves they may nurse means to redress the situation which may lead to sabotage behaviours. This is supported by both Adams (1965) and Vroom (1964) who theorized that the judgment of justice is much embedded on the perception of expectation from a system which is harmonized in the employee contract. They further highlighted that this kind of expectation has personal, job and organizational outcomes and employee sabotage behaviour may be one of them. The authors are also interested in pay satisfaction a distinct aspect of distributive justice as it could also motivate sabotage behaviours among employees.

Pay includes salaries and wages, bonuses or other economic benefits that an employee receives as a result of employment in exchange for services rendered to the employing organization. Essentially, pay has long been recognized as one of the most important tool for organizational rewards (Heneman & Judge, 2000) because it also allows employees to enjoy other rewards which pay (money) can buy (Lawler, 1981). Organizational rewards converted as pay can be satisfactory or dissatisfactory. Pay satisfaction refers to employees' positive evaluation of the rewards system (pay system) in relation to his or her organizational inputs. Taylor (1911) was one of the earliest theorists to recognize the motivating impact of pay when he contends that workers put extra effort and energy to maximize their economic gains; thus, the authors are of the opinion that if this extra effort and the economic gains (usually pay) that emanate from it is not commensurate, then, the redress option may be sought either legitimately (where it is allowed) or otherwise by acts of sabotage.

Theoretical Framework

General Strain Theory (Agnew, 2014)

The General strain theory propounded by Agnew (2014) assumes individuals who experience strains or stressors often become upset and sometimes cope with crime, deviance or unacceptable behaviour. Also, the theory propounds that individuals may engage in crime or deviance to seek revenge against the source of their strains or related targets or to retaliate against injustice. In the work setting, employees who experience heightened job stress, and feelings of distress facilitate a multiplicative of negative responses such as theft, dishonesty, abuse, perversion of justice, corruption and various forms of sabotage. Agnew (2014) contended that in the work setting, distressed workers are more likely to engage in on-the-job counterproductive than less stressed employees. Based on the General Stress theory, the notion that heightened levels of stress served as a source of arousal that activated the dominant negative responses is accepted as retaliatory behavioural patterns in the workplace which is deployed by the employee to redress unfavourable circumstance in the organization.

In principle, stress facilitation theory offers explanation on part of the reasons why sabotage may occur in an organization as a stress-induced behaviour due to injustice and low satisfactorily pay. However, the theory did not offer insight into the behaviour as a volitional behaviour initiated by an employee to satisfy his or her selfish interest rather, it anchors as a consequence of stress which is its weakness. Based on this, Self-control theory by Gouldner, (1960) was therefore utilized in this framework to capture this aspect (as volitional act) not covered by General Strain theory.

Self-Control Theory (Gouldner, 1960)

Gouldner (1960) propounded Self-control theory with the following assumptions:

Self-control or internal-control is a stable individual difference that tends to exhibit the expression of deviant behaviours as a consequence of not restraining the self against the behaviours that are against the norm. It is a volitional act in the sense that employees often consider the gains of counter-productive work behaviour (sabotage) and compare same with the possibility of getting caught; but those employees that have resolved to quit, the possibility of being caught further counsels toward more sophistication in afflicting the organization with their deviant behaviours.

In application, the theory accounts for sabotage behaviour as a volitional act irrespective of whether the employee who engages in it was unjustly treated or unfairly treated. The theory assumes that under such circumstances, the perpetrator has options as typified when he or she weighs the possibility of being caught in the act or the supposed gains that may accrue from carrying out the act.

In view of the highlighted theoretical framework linking predictors to the criterion variables, four hypotheses have been formulated to guide the study. They are:

- i. Distributive justice will significantly and negatively predict employee sabotage behaviour.
- ii. Procedural justice will significantly and negatively correlate employee sabotage behaviour.

- iii. Interactional justice will significantly and negatively correlate employee sabotage behaviour.
- iv. Pay satisfaction will significantly and negatively correlate employee sabotage behaviour.

Method

Participants in the study were three hundred and forty-seven (347) bank employees drawn from banks in Awka, Nnewi and Onitsha which make up the three Senatorial Districts of Anambra State. The banks include: First Bank Plc (40 participants), Guaranty Trust Bank Plc (22 participants), Zenith Bank Plc (49 participants), Diamond Bank Plc (26 participants), Fidelity Bank Plc (32 participants), Sky Bank Plc (24 participants), Access Bank Plc (34 participants), Union Bank Plc (24 participants), United Bank for Africa Plc (58 participants) and Eco Trans-international Bank Plc (38 participants). The participants were made up of one hundred and sixty-three (163) males and a hundred and eighty four (184) females whose ages ranged from 23 to 52 years with an average age of 29.40 years and standard deviation of 3.05. One hundred and ninety-six (196) participants were single while one hundred and fifty-one (151) participants were married. The participants were drawn using simple randomization technique. Analysis of the educational qualification of the participants revealed that 6 had Doctorate degree (Ph.D), 35 had Masters' degree, 197 had Bachelors degree, 68 had HND, 33 had OND and while 8 had First school leaving certificate (FSLC).

Measurement

Three instruments were used in this study namely: Perceived Organizational Justice Questionnaire developed by Neihoff and Moorman, (1993); Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by White and Ruh, (1973) and Sabotage Behaviour Inventory developed by Starlicki and Folger, (1997).

Perceived Organizational Justice Questionnaire is 20-item questionnaire developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) to measure employees' perceptions of the prevalence of three dimensions of perceived organizational justice (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) in the workplace. It is measured on a 5-point Likert type

scale ranging from: (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree which the participants (bank employees) responded to. Sample items of the scale based on the three dimensions of perceived organizational justice include: 'I think my pay level is fair' (distributive justice); 'All job decisions are applied consistently, across all affected employees' (procedural justice); and 'When decisions are made about my job, management shows concern for my rights as an employee' (interactional justice). For its validity/reliability - Niehoff and Moorman (1993) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability of .90 (distributive justice); .91 (procedural justice) and .92 (interactional justice). Al-zubi (2014) reported reliability coefficient of .87. Having been adopted in Nigerian by Chukwu (2014) who obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability of .87; the current study through its pilot study using 50 participants obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .69, .74, and .72 respectively for distributive, procedural and interactional dimensions of organizational justice.

Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ) is a 5-item questionnaire developed by White and Ruh (1973). It measures employees' perceptions of satisfaction with their pay in the organization. Also, on a 5- point Likert type format ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. A sample item from the scale states thus: 'I am paid fairly for what I contribute to this organization'. For its validity/reliability - White and Ruh (1973) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability of .89. For Nigerian sample, Obikeze and Olukoye (2004) obtained reliability coefficient of .78 for general scale while Ndukaihe (2013) reported a reliability coefficient of .71. For its use in this study a pilot study using 50 participants was carried out and a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .76 was obtained.

Sabotage Behaviour Inventory (SBI) is a scale developed by Starlicki and Folger (1997) which was designed to measure employees' tendencies towards sabotage and other aspects of counterproductive work behaviours in the workplace. It is 17-item scale which is measured on a 5 – point Likert format ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. A sample item of the scale include thus: 'I deliberately waste bank's resources'. For its validity/reliability - Starlicki and Folger, (1977) reported a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .90. For the Nigerian sample, Ejembi & Issah, (2012) reported a

Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability of .73 among Nigerian workers. For its use in this study, a pilot study using 50 participants was carried out and a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .73 was obtained.

Design/Statistics

The design adopted for this study was predictive design while the appropriate statistics used in analyzing the data was multiple regression analysis. Statistical Package for Social Sciences SPSS version 15.00 was used as data management tool.

Results

Table 1: Shows descriptive statistics, mean, standard deviations and number of participants for the variables of the study.

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Sabotage behaviour	19.4165	1.65004	347
Distributive justice	16.3163	1.08543	347
Procedural justice	23.3012	2.67230	347
Interactional justice	38.5014	1.99245	347
Pay satisfaction	14.6830	1.32780	347

DV = Dependent Variable: Employee Sabotage Behaviour

Table 2: correlation table

		SB	DJ	PJ	IJ	PS
Pearson Correlation	Sabotage Behaviour	1.000	.607	.369	.417	.591
	Distributive Justice	.607	1.000	.420	.439	.530
	Procedural Justice	.369	.420	1.000	.444	.345
	Interactional Justice	.417	.439	.444	1.000	.476
	Pay Satisfaction	.591	.530	.345	.476	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	Sabotage Behaviour	.	.002	.056	.067
Distributive Justice		.002	.	.000	.064	.007
Procedural Justice		.056	.000	.	.015	.011
Interactional Justice		.067	.067	.015	.	.058.
Pay Satisfaction		.008	.007	.011	.058	.
N		Sabotage Behaviour	347	347	347	347
	Distributive Justice	347	347	347	347	347
	Procedural Justice	347	347	347	347	347
	Interactional Justice	347	347	347	347	347
	Pay Satisfaction	347	347	347	347	347

Table 3 Multiple linear regression analysis for predictive effects of Organizational justice dimensions and Pay satisfaction on Sabotage behaviour

Coefficients (a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.624	1.406	-	1.00	.000
	Distributive justice	-.752	1.108	-.694*	-2.428	.021
	Procedural justice	-.496	.653	-.390	-1.412	.157
	Interactional justice	-.534	.598	-.415	-2.591	.085
	Pay satisfaction	-.783	1.745	-.532*	-1.393	.033

a Dependent Variable: Sabotage behaviour, * significant at $p < .05$

Table 4 Model Summary

Model Summary								
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	F
1	.604 ^a	.531	.506	1.66554	.531	8.547	4	.000

The result from the multiple regression analysis showed significant correlation among variables of interest in Table 2 which informed further analysis of predictive influences in Table 3.

From the regression analysis, hypothesis I which stated that distributive justice significantly and negatively predicted employee sabotage behaviour was confirmed at $\beta = -.694^*$, $p < .05$ (N=347). The finding implies that there is an inverse relationship which

depicts an increase in employee sabotage behaviour as distributive justice decreases. However, in hypothesis II, no significant predictive effect was observed of procedural justice on employee sabotage behaviour at $\beta = - .390$, $p > .05$ (N=347); although, negative relationship was ascertained between the variables, the relationship did not reach significant proportions. Also, in hypothesis III no significant predictive effect was observed of interactional justice on employee sabotage behaviour at $\beta = - .415$, $p > .05$ (N=347); although, negative relationship was ascertained between the variables, it did not reach significant proportions. However, in hypothesis IV, pay satisfaction significantly and negatively predicted employee sabotage behaviour at $\beta = - .532^*$, $p < .05$ (N=347). The finding implies that there is an inverse relationship which depicts an increase in employee sabotage behaviour as pay satisfaction decreases.

For the model summary, Table 4 reported that R square is valued at .531 whereas the value of Adjusted R² is .506 which accounted for 50.6% predictive influence of the predictors. At $F(1, 347) = .000$, $p < .05$, the model is accepted.

Discussion

This study examined perceived organizational injustice and pay satisfaction as predictors of employee sabotage behaviour. What were sought in the study were the predictive effects of the predictor variables (perceived distributive, procedural, interactional injustice and pay satisfaction) on the criterion variable (employee sabotage behaviour). After four tested hypotheses, statistical finding confirmed the following findings.

Distributive justice significantly and negatively predicted employee sabotage behaviour. The finding is supported with the works of Monanu, Okoli and Ibe (2015) which determined whether the effects of organizational fraud and other deviant behaviours are as a result of the way certain members of the organization are treated. Their result reveals that organizational injustice not only predicted sabotage behaviours but all other forms of workplace deviance seem to emanate from organizational injustice. Monanu, Okoli and Ibe (2015) study is in principle supported by General Strain theory by Agnew (2014) which offered explanation that sabotage may occur in an organization as a strain/stress-induced behaviour due to injustice which the employee is in effort trying to

redress with sabotage. But, although, there may be injustice in an organization, all forms of sabotage emanate from lack of self-control as theorized by Self-control theory by (Gouldner, 1960).

Both procedural justice and Interactional justice did not significantly predict employee sabotage behaviour. Although negative relationship was ascertained between the variables, it did not reach significant proportions. The finding can be explained based on the contention of Gouldner's (1960) Self-control theory which posits that internal control of humans is largely motivated by intrinsic factors rather than socio-cognitive factors such as human socialization. In line with this, although, there may be unfair processes and poor human interaction in an organization, using it as an excuse in the possibility of being caught and punished, may refrain employees from engaging in deviant behaviours such as organizational sabotage unlike when it is associated with resource distribution which is considered a tangible factor except however, where intention to leave the organization is already high.

The result further confirmed that pay satisfaction significantly and negatively predicted employee sabotage. Significant and negative predictive effect was ascertained between the predictor (pay satisfaction) and the criterion variable (employee sabotage behaviour). The finding is in consonance with a study conducted in Nigeria by Idiakheua and Obetoh (2012) on counterproductive workplace behaviours of Nigerians using Make-Up Theory in Ambrose Ali University Ekpoma in Edo State. The authors emphasize that the removal of fuel subsidy by government which is perceived as injustice which reduced the value of their pay and consequently based on this instance, workers' reactions in form of retaliation have been anything else than counterproductive; from lateness to work, to stealing and fraud in all forms. The authors based their theoretical assumptions (Make-up theory) on the current surge of organizational deviant behaviours soon after the government removal of petrol subsidy in Nigeria. The finding was also supported by Kanten and Ulker's (2013) findings which revealed significant and negative relationship between counterproductive (sabotage) behaviours and financial reward (pay satisfaction) as a dimension of organizational climate.

Implications of the study

Significant and negative predictive effects ascertained of distributive justice and pay satisfaction is indicative that organizations will be running the risk of injurious behaviours from their employees as a result of poor reward system. If equity is not enthroned to close the gap between high earners and low earners, feelings of inequity and injustice may fuel the prevalence of all forms of organizational vices such as employee sabotage behaviour and other workplace deviance. This will no doubt lay foundation for organizational anti-climax to the detriment of all and sundry.

Conclusion

This study investigated perceived organizational justice dimensions and pay satisfaction as predictors of employee sabotage behaviour. In line with both the conceptual and theoretical models, the following findings were made from four tested hypotheses; only distributive justice significantly and negatively predicted employee sabotage behaviour. Also, pay satisfaction was also found as negative predictor of employee sabotage behaviour.

In view of these findings, perceived organizational injustice and job insecurity have once again by the essence of this study highlighted the importance both intrinsic and extrinsic factors of motivators without which, no task may be accomplished in any organization. It is therefore, important to keep emphasizing the dangers of poorly motivated workforce either lacking in intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. It is a generally accepted norm that employees seek employment in order to certify certain needs. These needs according to several authors ought to fulfill major aspects of the employees' expectations especially as regards how fair he is treated and how well he is paid in order to forestall negative antecedents capable of ruining the organization such as employee sabotage behaviours.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York: *Academic*.
- Agnew, R. (2014). General strain theory. In *Encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice* (pp. 1892-1900). Springer, New York, NY.
- Chukwu, E.E. (2014). Perceived Organizational Scale: A Re-Examination *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 49(4), 827-851.
- Colquitt, J. Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. (2005) What Is Organizational Justice: A Historical Overview. In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, 3-56. London: Routledge.
- Crino, M. D. (1994). Employee Sabotage: A Random Or Preventable Phenomenon? *Journal of Management Issues*, 6, 311 – 330.
- Ejembi, I. A., & Issah, K. Z. (2012). Effects of Job Satisfaction And Organizational Frustrations On Employees' Sabotage Behaviours. *African Journal of Social Sciences*.
- Etodike, C.E., Ezeh, L.N., & Chukwura, E.N. (2017). Life satisfaction and social support as predictors of retirement stress among public service retirees. *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 6(2), 2300-2313.
- Ezeh, L.N. (2016). Organizational Justice, Job Security and Pay Satisfaction as Predictors of Turnover Intentions and Sabotage Behaviours among Bank Employees. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka*.
- Ezeh, L.N., Etodike, C.E., & Ike, P.R. (2017). Employee turnover intention: a predictive study of organizational politics, member-exchange and job insecurity. *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 6(2), 2294-2300.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*. 25, 161-178.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). *A taxonomy of organizational justice theory*. An academic directory. CA: Sage.
- Heneman, H. G., & Judge, T. A. (2000). *Compensation Attitudes*. In S. L. Rynes & B. Gerhart (Eds.), *Compensation in Organizations: Current Research and Practice*, 61 – 103, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- 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), 234-247.
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: Relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 30, 525-542.
- Kanten, P., & Ulker, F.E. (2013). The Effect of Organizational Climate on Counterproductive Behaviours: An Empirical Study on the Employees Of Manufacturing Enterprises. *A Multidisciplinary Journal of Global Macro Trends*, 2(4), 201-213
- Lawler, E. E. III (1981). *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness*. Reading, M.A: Addison-Wesley.
- Monanu, A., Okoli, I., & Ibe, C. (2015). Organizational Justice and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Journal of Business & Management Studies*, 4, 1-10.
- Ndukaihe, J.S.K. (2013). Re-Examination of Validity and Reliability of A New Pay Satisfaction Dimension. *Personal Psychology*, 55, 873-902.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as A Mediator Of The Relationship Between Methods Of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Moorman, R. H. (1993) Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Nweke, J. O. (2015). Post-retirement stress under non-contributory pension regime: A study of retired civil servants in Ebonyi State Nigeria. *Canadian Social Science*, 11(6), 109-117.
- Obikeze, G.N., Olukoye, P.K.A. (2004). Pay Satisfaction and Organizational Deviance: The Role of Pay Dissatisfaction, *Employee Relations*, 26(2), 76-89
- Oniye, A.O. (2015). Retirement Stress and Management Strategies among Retired Civil Servants in Kwara State: Kwara: Counselling.
- Starlicki, D.P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Taylor, F.W. (1911). Scientific Management. *Proceedings of the New England Rail Road Club*, 135-187.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

White, J. K., & Ruh, R. A. (1973). Effects of personal values on the relationship between participation and job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18, 506 – 514.