Tit for Tat: Perceived Procedural Injustice, Organisational Politics and Emotional Intelligence as determinants of Organisational Retaliatory Behaviour

Fabian O. Ugwu[†] and Samuel T. Anhange[‡]

[†]Department of Psychology, Federal University, Ndufu-Alike, Ikwo Nigeria
[‡]Department of Psychology, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria

Abstract

This study investigated the relationships between perceived procedural injustice, organisational politics, emotional intelligence and organisational retaliatory behaviour. The Perceived procedural, organisational politics, emotional intelligence and organisational retaliatory scales were used to elicit responses from participants. Hypotheses were tested among 141 public-service employees of the Federal Road Safety Commission (FRSC). Consistent with our hypotheses, results showed that perceived procedural injustice was positively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour. The results equally revealed that perceived organisational politics was positively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour and that emotional intelligence was negatively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour. The discussion was based on the social exchange theory. The result implies that organisational practitioners should desist from all acts that are capable of causing employees to hurt the organisation which in the long run will diminish its chances of realizing its goals.

Keywords: Procedural injustice, organisational politics, emotional intelligence, retaliatory behaviour

Introduction

Organisations are social systems and in every social system there is gathering of people from different backgrounds and orientations and these people are considered organisational assets. In such organisations there are interactions among employees and between employees and their employers without which the accomplishment of goals would be impossible. In the course of these interactions, people are bound to be offended, expectations are bound to be thwarted, promises are bound to be unfulfilled and in such situations retaliatory behaviours become inevitable.

Organisational retaliatory behaviours can have over-bearing influence in the overall performance of organisations. This may range from minor to serious damages to the organisations' property and image as well as injury to employees. Behaviours classified as retaliatory includes but are not limited to absenteeism, time wasting, gossiping, theft and sabotage, talking back to supervisor, spreading rumour, taking extended break, damaging equipment (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Skarlicki & Folger, 2004). These types of behaviours have significant monetary and emotional cost to the organisation and its employees (Fehr & Gächter 2000). As a result of these costs, organisational researchers have committed considerable amount of effort to understanding such employee behaviours that violate significant organisational norms and those that have the potentials to affect the well-being of individual employees and the viability of organisations (Aquino, Galperin, & Bennett, 2004; Bordia, Restubog, & Tang, 2008). We consider that it is important to examine organisational retaliatory behaviour and some of its antecedents. Researchers have conceptualised organisational retaliatory behaviours in different ways which include organisational misbehaviour (e.g., Ackroyd & Thompson, 1999), antisocial behaviour (e.g., Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), workplace sabotage (e.g., Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002; Harris & Ogbonna, 2006), workplace aggression (e.g., Baron & Richardson, 1994; Neuman & Baron, 1996). These behaviours are similar because they all violate significant organisational standards and thus do not threaten the success of an organisation only, but its members as well.

Although organisational retaliatory behaviours may be seen as sharing similar meaning with other negative reactions of employees that are often a direct response to organisations' transgression, Skarlicki and Folger (1997) admitted that the behaviours they describe as retaliatory overlap with other typologies such as counterproductive workplace behaviours, anti-social behaviour and, specifically, deviant behaviour (Spector & Fox 2002; Griffin & Lopez, 2005) and shares similarity with Baron and Neuman's (1996) dimensions of workplace

aggression. However, Skarlicki and Folger (1997) argues that the term retaliatory implies employees' behavioural response that is evoked by the organisation whereas terms such as anti-social or deviant can emerge as individual independent behaviour that is not a result of organisations' misbehaviour. Skarlicki and Folger also believe that the term deviant bears a negative connotation whereas retaliatory does not necessarily label the behaviour as negative or wrongful and, in fact, the behaviour could be argued to be good in some instances.

Research has indicated that retaliatory behaviour does not just occur in organisations; often times they are created by the management with the employees as targets which in turn tend to trigger retaliatory behaviour. Some of such behaviours include but are not limited to perceived injustice (Flaherty & Moss, 2007) and organisational politics. It has been suggested that individuals who engage in organisational retaliatory behaviours tend to be driven by negative emotions because such behaviours are enacted by dissatisfied employees due to perceived unfair treatment (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). It is usually aimed at the direct source of the maltreatment be it individuals or organisations.

Perceived unfairness has been identified as one important determinant of a wide array of negative behaviours, and it has generally shown that some individuals might react negatively to perceived unfair events in their organisations (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). According to Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001), the study of fairness in management began with Adams' (1965) equity theory, which emphasizes the perceived fairness of outcomes (i.e., distributive fairness). Equity has generally been conceptualised in terms of perceived fairness and operationalized as a three-dimensional construct: distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Wat & Shaffer, 2005). Cropanzano and colleagues (2007) argued that organisational justice is a sort of 'glue' that allows people to work together effectively. However, numerous studies have continued to link justice perceptions to a variety of organisational outcomes, including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, withdrawal, absenteeism and organisational citizenship behaviour (e.g., Schaufeli, 2002; Chen, Zhang, Leung, & Zhou, 2010). Cropanzano and colleagues (2007) argue that organisational justice has the potential to reposition organisations and create benefits for employees. If employees perceive that they are being treated fairly by their organisation, they will be more likely to reciprocate by holding positive attitudes about their work, their work outcomes and their organisation (Wat & Shaffer, 2005).

Among these three most researched aspects of justice, the focus of the present study is on procedural justice which refers to the perceived fairness of the means used to determine the amount of benefits (Folger & konovsky, 1989). The reason is because previous studies (e.g., Warner, Hegtvedt, & dan Roman, 2005) demonstrated that procedural justice often is more predictive of a variety of work attitudes, including organisational commitment. Besides this, the fairness of the decision-making process itself seems to be more important than the actual amount of compensation that is received by individuals (Teprstra & Honoree, 2003). Procedural justice deals with the procedures that the organisation uses to come to a decision. Organ (1988) refers to it as the way in which an organisation applies the relevant criteria to arrive at a decision. Muchinsky (2000) argued that a decision is procedurally just if it is consistent, "without personal bias, with as much accurate information as possible, and with an outcome that could be modified" (p. 277). As researchers are preoccupied with the task of establishing the antecedents and consequences of procedural justice, organisational politics and its perceptions surfaced and became of great concern to organisational management.

For more than two decades now, perceptions of organisational politics have been extensively studied and have emerged as a good predictor of many job outcomes (e.g., Vigoda-Gadot, 2003; Vigoda-Gadot & Drory, 2006). Of great interest is the negative effect that perceptions of politics seem to have on job outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, organisational commitment). Clearly, there are abundant evidence in literature that most studies on organisational politics were carried out in the United States and Europe (e.g., Hochwarter, Witt, & Kacmar, 2000; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999), and a few in Nigeria (e.g., Ugwu & Onyishi, 2013). Therefore the understanding of the role the construct plays in organisations runs the risk of being culturally biased if it is not given substantial attention in continents other than America and Europe. The current study is a step toward closing that gap and building up literature on these relationships by examining politics in the Nigerian work organisations.

However, many years of varying experiences have supported a general belief that behaviour in organisations is largely political (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). The concept has received an increasing research attention both in management literature and behavioural research. The direction of researches in this area has predominantly focused on the role of organisational politics in organisational outcomes. But despite that a variety of perspectives have been adopted to understand politics in organisations (Yukl & Tracey, 1992), it has been difficult although there is a common belief that political behaviour can be defined by the nature of the act or by people's perceptions of what is political (Vredenburgh & Maurer, 1984). The present researchers agree with Gandz and Murray (1980) who construed organisational politics as a subjective experience and, thus, as a state of mind. This understanding of organisational politics suggest that three factors additively provide the full essence of perceived organisational politics which are labelled general political behaviour (GPB), that includes the

behaviours of individuals who act in a self-serving manner to obtain valued outcomes; go along to get ahead (GAGA), which consists of a lack of action by individuals (e.g., remain silent) in order to secure valued outcomes; and pay and promotion policies (PPP), which involves the organisation behaving politically through the policies it enacts (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997).

Organisational politics has been variously defined. One of the earliest descriptions of organisational politics in the literature is from Pfeffer in 1981. Pfeffer (1981) stated that, "politics is the study of supremacy in act." Mintzberg (1983) defined it as "individual or group behaviour that is informal, ostensibly parochial, typically divisive, and above all in a technical sense, illegitimate - sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology, nor certified expertise (although it may exploit any one of these)" (p. 172). Witt, Hochwarter and Kacmar (2000) stated that it is a phenomenon in which organisational members attempt manipulate the behaviour of other members by any means not approved or prescribed standard in an effort to accomplish objectives of individual or group.

While the claims about the relationship between intellectual intelligence and positive workplace behaviour proliferates organisational research literature, studies into the relationship between emotional intelligence and negative workplace behaviours seem to have been neglected to date. Although evidence has continued to accumulate that emotional intelligence is a distinct mental ability that can be reliably measured (Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputi, & Roberts, 2001; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, &Sitarenios, 2003), the understanding of what emotional intelligence predicts is still not clear and needed to be given more empirical attention. Emotional Intelligence (EI) started gaining empirical research attention from the beginning of the 1990s when Mayer, DiPaolo, and Salovey (1990), Salovey and Mayer(1990) provided its definition as a set of social skills and abilities related to, but distinct from intellectual intelligence and traditional Intelligence Quotient (IQ) (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000). Since then, interest in emotional intelligence has continued to increase tremendously among scholars (e.g., Winkel, Wyland, Shaffer, &Classon, 2011; Sharma, 2011). Goleman (1995) claimed that emotional intelligence contributes up to 80% of individual success, and specifically to success in the workplace with only 20% attributed to intellectual intelligence. This is similar to Mayer and Salovey (1997) who agreed that general intelligence accounts for approximately 10 - 20% of life success, defined as academic achievement and occupational status. Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000) further confirmed this assertion when they outlined research findings that IQ correlates with various indicators of life success at about the r=.45 level. Similarly, they also noted that a single personality factor generally only explains a small proportion of life success.

Also, Ciarrochi and colleagues (2000) stated that although with little empirical support, it is claimed that 'emotional intelligence may be the best predictor of success in life, redefining what it means to be smart' and that EI will bestow an advantage in any life domain (Goleman, 1995). The goal of this paper is therefore to extend our knowledge and understanding regarding perceived procedural injustice, organisational politics and emotional intelligence as determinants of organisational retaliatory behaviour.

The social exchange theory based on the principle of reciprocity fits into this model. The theory posits that two parties involved in a social exchange relationship adhere to norms specifying that good deeds should be reciprocated (Blau, 1964). Social exchange relationships are based on mutual trust and beliefs that the other party will uphold their obligations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). These norms are illustrated through the expression, "you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours." The employment relationship allows the employee to acquire vital resources and social goods, such as pay, fringe benefits, approval, trust, and prestige. After receiving these benefits, the norm of reciprocity required employees to repay the party who provided them those benefits (Gouldner, 1960). For example, individuals who are well treated are more likely to become affectively committed to the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997), display more organisational citizenship behaviours (Pillai, Schriesheim & Williams, 1999; VanYperen, van den Berg &Willering, 1999), and lower turnover intention (Chen, Aryee, & Lee, 2004). It's imperative to note here that reverse is also the case, when individuals are not well treated they are more likely to exhibit counterproductive work behaviour that are capable of undermining the realization of organisation's goals. Typically therefore, if employees perceive that justice and organisational politics are against them, they will be more likely to repay the organisations in their own coin.

Perceived Procedural Injustice and Organisational Retaliatory Behaviours

Cropanzano and colleagues (2007) argued that fair process lead to intellectual and emotional recognition, which in turn, creates the trust and commitment that build voluntary cooperation in task accomplishment. Procedural justice perspective focuses on the fairness of the evaluation procedures used to determine ratings (Greenberg, 1986). Folger and Konovsky (1989) found that opportunities for employees to express their feelings when evaluated predicted a measure of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. If the process is perceived as equitable, employees will more likely show stronger loyalty and more likely to behave in an organisation's best interest (Cropanzano *et al.,* 2007).

It is expected that fair procedures will likely make employees feel they will get a 'fair share' from the organisation and its representatives should they put up

good performance. Conversely, lack of organisational justice is one of the strongest predictors of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). Also Flaherty and Moss (2007) found that procedural injustice provoked counterproductive work behaviours. When employees perceive fairness in their organisation they tend to behave in a positive way that favours the organisation. Reverse seem to be the case when there is perception of injustice. This perception of injustice could propagate into engaging in organisational retaliatory behaviours. Therefore, we propose that:

Hypothesis 1: Perceptions of procedural injustice will positively and significantly be related to organisational retaliatory behaviour.

Perceived Organisational Politics and Organisational Retaliatory Behaviour

Previous studies have suggested that organisational politics have negative influence on both workers and the work environment (e.g., Ferris, Adams, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, & Ammeter, 2002; Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Specifically, research has shown that the perception of organisational politics affects job performance (Hochwarter, Witt, & Kacmar, 2000; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999; Vigoda, 2003); attendance (Gilmore, Ferris, Dulebohn, & Harrell-Cook, 1996); retention (Andrews, Witt, &Kacmar, 2003); turnover (Harris, James, & Boonthanom, 2005; Hochwarter, Perrewé, Ferris, & Guercio, 1999; Valle & Perrewé, 2000); satisfaction, stress, and attitudes (Bozeman, Perrewé, Hochwarter, & Brymer, 2001; Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997; Cropanzano & Li, 2006; Hochwarter, Kiewitz, Castro, Perrewé, & Ferris, 2003; Valle & Witt, 2001); and fairness (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Byrne, 2005). Since perceptions of politics have varying negative influence on these job outcomes, it is proposed that it may also impact on organisational retaliatory behaviour. Hence, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2: Perception of organisational politics will positively and significantly be related to organisational retaliatory behaviour.

Emotional Intelligence and Organisational Retaliatory Behaviour

Some preliminary investigations suggest that lower EI scores is related to involvement in self-destructive behaviours such as deviant behaviour and cigarette smoking (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Rubin, 1999; Trinidad & Johnson, 2001), whereas higher EI scores is related to positive outcomes such as prosocial behaviour, parental warmth, and positive peer and family relations (Rice, 1999; Salovey, Mayer, Caruso, & Lopes, 2001). Petrides, Frederickson and Furnham (2004) found that EI was related to adolescents being excluded from school, which, presumably, is a result of those students' deviant

behaviour. Winkel and colleagues (2011) found that emotional intelligence significantly contributed to deviant workplace behaviours. Other studies have positive views about emotional intelligence. It has been found to be negatively related to emotional competence and five dimensions of executive burnout (e.g., Sharma, 2006). Also, negative relationship was obtained between the EI dimension of emotional maturity and all the five dimensions of executive burnout. More so, research has indicated that higher emotional intelligence is associated with less depression (e.g., Martinez-Pons, 1997), greater optimism (Schutte et al., 1998) and greater life satisfaction (Ciarrochi et al., 2000; Martinez-Ponz, 1997). Schutte and colleagues (2002) investigated the relationship between EI, self-esteem, and mood and found that higher EI was associated with positive mood and higher self-esteem. From the foregoing, it could be deduced that studies on emotional intelligence have yielded conflicting results. It is upon this premise that more research is necessary to assess the varying effects of emotional intelligence on work outcomes. Hence, it is proposed that:

Hypothesis 3: Emotional intelligence will be negatively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The study employed the cross sectional survey research design to sample a total of 141 employees of the Federal Road Safety Commission (FRSC), a public-service organisation in the North Central, Nigeria. The FRSC was chosen because as part of typical Nigerian civil service there has been high level of perception of various forms of injustice within the commission. The participants consisted of 87(61.7%) males. Their ages ranged from 25 to 53 years, with a mean age of 37.32 years. The employees' highest and lowest academic qualification is Master of Science (M. Sc.) degree and Ordinary National Diploma (OND) respectively. Their average organisational tenure is 6.65years, while their average job tenure is 5.85 years. All the participants for the study were volunteers. However, a total of 159 employees of the commission were sampled in their workplaces. Some copies of the questionnaire were dropped with administrative officers to deliver to staff on outside duty. Out of the 159 questionnaires administered, 151 copies of the questionnaire were responded to and returned representing 94.96% response rate. Out of this number,

10(6.62%) copies were discarded due to improper completion and only 141(93.37%) were subjected to analyses.

Instruments

Perceptions of Procedural Justice Scale

Five items from Colquitt *et al.* (2001) that assessed evaluations by respondents of the procedural justice they had experienced in their work group was adopted for the present study. These items were a direct measure of procedural fairness perceptions. Instructions preceding the items asked respondents to answer the following questions with respect to their current workgroup and the job they held within that work group at their organisation: (a) How would you rate the overall fairness with which issues and decisions that come up at work are handled? (1 = not fair at all to 6 = very fair); (b) Overall, how fair would you say decisions and processes are where you work? (1 = not fair at all to 6 = very fair); (c) How often do you feel that decisions are made in fairways at your job? (1 = rarely to 6 = very often); (d) Is there a general sense among employees that things are handled in fairways where you work? (1 = not at all to 6 = definitely); (e) How much of an effort is made to be fair to employees when decisions are being made? (1 = none to 6 = a lot).

Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale (POPS)

Perceptions of organisational politics were measured with the 15-item perceptions of organisational politics scale (POPS) that was developed by Kacmar and Carlson (1997). This scale identifies three dimensions of perceived politics, including: General Political Behaviour (2 items), Go Along To Get Ahead (7 items), Pay and Promotion Policies (6 items). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating a negative perception of organisational politics. Sample POP scale items for the three dimensions include: "People in this organisation attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down", "Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth", and "The stated pay and promotion policies have nothing to do with how pay raises and promotions are determined", respectively. The Cronbach's alpha for general political behaviour subscale is α = .77; go along to get ahead is α = .78; and pay and promotion policies is α = .73.

Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS)

Emotional intelligence scale developed by Schutte and colleagues (1998) was used to assess emotional intelligence. It is a 33-item scale and like most self-report measures, seems susceptible to faking good. Thus, the scale should probably not be used as a method for selecting individuals for jobs or other highly desired opportunities (Schutte *et al.,* 1998).The 33-item scale developed through factor analysis showed good internal reliability with two different samples with a 5-point Likert-type response format ranging from 1) strongly disagree to 5) strongly agree. Sample items includes: "I know when to speak about my personal problems to others" and "When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them". Cronbach's alpha of the scale for the present study is 0.88.

Organisational Retaliatory Behaviour Scale (ORBS)

Skarlicki and Folger's (1997) 17-item organisational retaliatory behaviour scale was used to assess retaliatory behaviour of employees. The scale requested peers to rate their co-workers by means of a behaviour observational scale. The behavioural observation scale used a 5-point Likert-type scale that asked the respondents to indicate the frequency that they observed their colleague engages in the behaviour over the past month. The scale ranged from 1 (never over the past month) to 5 (6 or more times over the past month). Sample items includes: "On purpose, damaged equipment or work process", and "Wasted company materials". Cronbach's alpha of the instrument for the present study stands at 0.88.

Results

The results of the correlational analysis revealed that marital status is negatively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour (r = -.30, p < .001); single employees reported higher scores on retaliatory behaviour than their married counterparts. Organisational tenure is positively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour (r = .13, p < .05); job tenure is positively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour (r = .19, p < .01). The results of the inter-correlation among study variables also indicated that procedural injustice is positively related organisational retaliatory behaviour (r = .14, p < .05); perceived organisational politics is positively related to retaliatory behaviour (r = .16, p < .05); and emotional intelligence is negatively related to organisational retaliatory behaviour (r = -.14, p < .05).

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and inter-correlations among study variables

	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Age	37.32	5.52	-									
2	Gender	1.43	0.5	0.1	-								
3	Marital status	1.52	0.5	-0.01	-.30***	-							
4	Education	1.45	0.5	-0.04	0.08	0.13	-						
5	Organisational tenure	6.65	1.76	0.11	.13*	-.14*	0.05	-					
6	Job tenure	5.85	1.72	0.11	0.02	0.04	.19**	.25***	-				
7	Procedural injustice	23.82	3.27	.14*	.13*	0.04	-0.06	0.08	.14*	-			
8	Perceived organisational politics	35.11	7.03	0.05	0.06	-0.04	0.12	0.07	.16*	0.11	-		
9	Emotional intelligence	61.24	8.48	0.06	0.05	0.07	-0.09	-0.04	-.14*	0.06	0.06	-	
10	Organisational retaliatory behaviour	32.84	12.29	.15*	0.12	0.04	-.16*	0.04	0.07	.20**	.30***	-.13*	-

Key: * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

Note: A total of 141 employees completed the survey. Gender (1 = Male, 2 = Female), Marital status (1 = Married, 2 = Single), Education (1 = high, 2 = Low). Age, Organisational tenure and Job tenure were entered as they were collected. Perceived politics, emotional intelligence and organisational retaliatory behaviour were coded, such that the higher the scores the higher the behaviours except procedural injustice where lower scores indicated perceived injustice.

Table 2: Hierarchical regression results

Variables	Step 1 (β)	Step 2 (β)	Step 3 (β)	Step 4 (β)
Age	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.15*
Gender	0.16	0.13	0.12	0.13
Marital Status	0.1	0.08	0.1	0.13
Education	-21**	-.18*	-.21**	-0.22
Org. tenure	-0.07	-0.06	-0.03	0.00
Job tenure	0.13	0.09	0.04	-0.02
Procedural injustice		.18*	0.16	0.17*
Perceived politics			0.29***	31***
Emotional intelligence				-.21**
R²	0.04	0.07	0.14	0.18
ΔR²	0.08	0.03	0.08	0.04
ΔF	1.97	4.64	13.02	6.72
F Value	1.97	2.4	3.92	4.38

Key: * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

Among the control variables studied, it was age and education only that are related to organisational retaliatory behaviour, age (r = .15, *p*< .05), education was negatively related to ORB (r = -21, p < .01). These variables accounted for 4.0% of the variance in organisational retaliatory behaviour. Perceived procedural injustice was positively related to ORB (r = .18, *p*< .05). It accounted for 6.6% of the variance in ORB above and beyond that of the control variables. However, perceived organisational politics was positively related to ORB (r = .29, p < .001). It contributed 14.3% of the variance in ORB above and beyond that of the control variables and perceived injustice. Emotional intelligence was negatively related to ORB (r = -21, p < .01). It contributed 17.9% of the variance in ORB above and beyond that of the control variables, procedural justice and perceived politics.

Discussion

The present study investigated perceived procedural injustice, organisational politics and emotional intelligence as determinants of organisational retaliatory behaviour amongst employees of the Federal Road Safety Commission (FRSC). As expected, perceived procedural injustice significantly predicted organisational retaliatory behaviour of employees. The reason for this result might be based on the fact that when employees of the FRSC perceive injustice in their workplaces, they retaliate in a way that will show their dissatisfaction with such unwelcomed behaviours of the management. There is abundance research evidence that have supported that unfairness is significantly related to a host of negative job behaviours and attitudes. Numerous studies have continued to associate justice perceptions to a variety of

positive organisational outcomes, including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, withdrawal and organisational citizenship behaviour (Colquitt *et al.,* 2001). Cropanzano and colleagues (2007) also argue that organisational justice has the potential to create powerful benefits for organisations and employees alike include greater trust and commitment. It is worthy to note in the present study that reverse is also the case. For instance, this result is consistent with that of Berry, Ones and Sackett (2007) which found that lack of organisational justice is one of the strongest predictors of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB).If employees perceive that they are being treated fairly by their organisation, they will be more likely to reciprocate by holding positive attitudes about their work, their work outcomes and their organisation (Wat& Shaffer, 2005). Therefore, the result of the present study could be explained using the social exchange theory, which postulates that whatever behaviour employees exhibit in the work place is usually a direct response of how they are treated in that organisation. Put differently, employees in most organisations reward good behaviour with good conduct, and bad behaviour with myriads of negative or counterproductive workplace behaviours.

The result of the present study equally indicated that perceived organisational politics is a significant predictor of organisational retaliatory behaviour. This result is in line with prior studies that have suggested that organisational politics have negative influence on both workers and the work environment (e.g., Ferris *et al.,* 2002; Kacmar & Baron, 1999). This result is also in agreement with studies that have revealed that the perception of organisational politics affects job performance (e.g., Hochwarter *et al.,* 2000; Randall *et al.,* 1999; Vigoda, 2003); attendance (e.g., Gilmore, et al., 1996); retention (Andrews *et al.,* 2003); turnover (Harris *et al.,* 2005); satisfaction, stress, and attitudes (e.g., Cropanzano & Li, 2006).

The results of the present study revealed that emotional intelligence was negatively related to organisational retaliatory behaviours. The reason may be that emotional intelligence has been viewed as a personal determinant of adaptive coping which affects one's coping behaviour (Epstein, 1998;Salovey et al., 1999), making employees that are emotionally intelligent to handle every negative perception successfully. For instance, those with high score on emotional intelligence are known to adapt their responses and tactics to fit the unstable circumstances and with a good measure of success respond to a wide range of emotional stimuli being evoked from inner self and the immediate environment. This result is in line with various prior studies that have indicated that higher emotional intelligence is associated with less depression (e.g., Martinez-Pons, 1997), greater optimism (Schutte*et al.,* 1998) and greater life satisfaction (Ciarrochi*et al.,* 2000;

Martinez-Ponz, 1997). It is also in agreement with that of Cameli (2003) which found that EI augments positive work attitudes, altruistic behaviour and work outcomes.

Implications of the Study

The study found that perceived injustice significantly predicted ORB. This implies that organisational practitioners that want to realise their set goal should as a matter of importance ensure to be fair in all their dealings so as to limit employees hurting the organisation in a manner that may diminish the organisation's chances in maintaining competiveness. The results of the present study also indicated that perceived organisational politics was a significant predictor of ORB. Although politics has been viewed as a fact of organisational life but owing to its found devastating effect on employees behaviour caution should be taken in playing this politics so as not to present the organisation in a bad light that will trigger destructive behaviours from the employees. Emotional intelligence was found to be negatively related to ORB. This means that emotionally intelligent employees are valued organisational assets who despite difficult situations maintain their poise to deliver on the goods. The present study broadens this research stream and our understanding that in the Nigerian context where the study was conducted by upholding that emotional intelligence is negatively related to ORB as opposed to numerous prior Western and European studies.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations of this study can be highlighted to help guide future research. One limitation is that all data were collected from single source and via self-report measures. This might have led to the problem of common method bias and inflation of the predictive relationships between the study variables. Therefore, common method bias cannot be ruled out in the explanation for the results. The second limitation is that although the authors investigated the viability of a number of control variables, they were unable to control for all variables that may be related to organisational retaliatory behaviour. For example, we did not control for self-control and other personality dispositions that may account for retaliatory behaviour. Some researchers (e.g., Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999) have stated that the impact of injustice on counterproductive work behaviour which retaliatory behaviour is one of its dimensions might depend on individual characteristics (e.g., personality). They revealed that the personality trait of agreeableness diminished the effect of injustice on organisational retaliatory behaviours. Similarly, negative affect which typically aligns with neuroticism and entails sensitivity to adverse events tended to amplify the impact of injustice. Future studies should endeavour to include such variables as control to be able to confidently state the incremental

variance of the predictive variables on the criterion variables. A third limitation is that all data were collected from civil service employees, so cautious must be observed in rendering conclusions regarding the generalizability of the results to profit-driven organisations. Forth, is the problem often associated with all survey research (cross-sectional design) of the study does not allow for causal inferences.

Suggestions for further researches

Future researches could endeavour to address the issues that limited the present study. First, they could examine this issue longitudinally to be able to establish causal relationship. Also since all data for the present study were collected from single source and via self-report measures, future studies could utilize other (multiple) sources of data to limit the problem associated with common method bias. Future studies could also consider various dimensions of personality such as self-control and some dimensions of the Big Five Personality that have been related to retaliatory behaviour (Skarlicki et al., 1999). As related to practitioners, in the workplace, this knowledge will re-position managers to begin to encourage behaviours that enhance both the individual's and the company's performance and discourage those behaviours that may breed retaliatory behavior that may in turn reduce performance.

Conclusion

Every organisation expects their employees to be creative, innovative and result-oriented in order to help it achieve its objectives; similarly employees expect their organisation to show good commitment in their welfare to be able to deliver on their mandate. When such situation of mutual respect is in place in any organisation, such organisation is bound to experience viability. However, in some organisations there are numerous or diverse behaviours of the management that impact negatively on the psyche and subsequent behaviour of employees which impact may affect the well-being of the organisation and its employees. In the present study for instance, perceived injustice and organisational politics were identified as some of the management behaviours against the employees and such behaviour further caused them to exhibit counterproductive work behaviour in the form of retaliation against the organisation that did not treat fairly or with respect in the first place. To the employees, in as much as one good turn deserves another, certainly one bad turn should also be reciprocated.

References

[1]. Ackroyd, S., & Thompson, P. (1999). *Organizational misbehavior.* Sage Publications Ltd.

[2]. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2), pp. 267–299. New York: Academic Press.

[3]. Ambrose, M., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 89,* 947 - 965.

[4]. Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K.M. (2001). Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22,* 347–357.

[5]. Andrews, M. C., Witt, L.A., & Kacmar, K.M. (2003). The interactive effects of organizational politics and exchange ideology on manager ratings of retention. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62,* 357–369.

[6]. Aquino, K., Galperin, B.L., & Bennett, R.J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*(5), 1001-1029.

[7]. Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J.H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior, 22,* 161-173.

[8]. Baron, R.A, & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human aggression.* New York: Plenum.

[9]. Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 410–424.

[10]. Bordia, P., Restubog, S. L. D., & Tang, R. L. (2008). When employees strike back: Investigating mediating mechanisms between psychological contract breach and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1104 -1117.

[11]. Bozeman, D., Perrewé, P., Hochwarterand, W. & Brymer, R. (2001). Organizational politics, perceived control, and work outcomes: Boundary conditions on the effects of politics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31,*486-503.

[12]. Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003). Convergent, discriminant and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 1147–1158.

[13]. Byrne, Z. (2005). Fairness reduces the negative effects of organizational politics on turnover intentions, citizenship behavior and job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20,*175–200.

[14]. Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A. Y., & Bajgar, J. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31,* 1105-1119.

[15]. Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28,* 539-561.

[16]. Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A. Y. C. Caputi, P., & Roberts, R. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence (EI). In J. Ciarrochi, J.P. Forgas & J. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life: A scientific inquiry.* Philadelphia, PA, US: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

[17]. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 86(2),* 278–321.

[18]. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at themillennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 425–445.

[19]. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E. & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational Justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives,* 34-48.

[20]. Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18,* 159–180.

[21]. Cropanzano, R., & Li, A. (2006). Organizational politics and workplace stress. In E. Vigoda-Gadot & A. Drory (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational politics* (pp. 139–160). Cheltenham, UK:Edward Elgar.

[22]. Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (2000). Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments. *American Economic Review, 90,* 980-994.

[23]. Ferris, G. R., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ammeter, A. P. (2002).

[24]. Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions. In F. J. Yammarino & F. Dansereau (Eds.), *Research in multi-level issues: The many faces of multi-level issues* (pp.179–254). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

[25]. Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal ofManagement, 18,*93–116.

[26]. Ferris, G. R., Russ, G. S. & Fandt, P. M. (1989). Politics in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 143–170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[27]. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reaction to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(1), 115 – 30.

[28]. Gandz, J., & Murray, V. V. (1980). The experience of workplace politics. *Academy ofManagement Journal, 23,* 237–251.

[29]. Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[30]. Gilmore, D. C., Ferris, G. R., J. H. Dulebohn, J. H., & Harrell-Cook, G. (1996). Organizational politics and employee attendance. *Group & Organization Management, 21,* 481–495.

[31]. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

[32]. Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(2), 340-342.

[33]. Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). "Bad behavior" in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management. 31*(6), 988-1005

[34]. Harris, K.J., James, M., & Boonthanom, R. (2005). Perceptions of organizational politics and cooperation as moderators of the relationship between job strains and intent to turnover. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 17*(1), 26-42.

[35]. Harris, L. C., & Ogbanna, E. (2002). Exploring service sabotage: The antecedents, types and consequences of frontline, deviant, anti service behaviors. *Journal of Service Research, 4,* 163–183.

[36]. Harris, L.C., & Ogbonna, E. (2006). Initiating strategic planning. *Journal of Business Research, 59,* 100-111.

[37]. Hochwarter, W., Kiewitz, C., Castro, S., Perrewé, P., & Ferris, G. (2003). Positive affectivityand collective efficacy as moderators of the relationship between perceived politics and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 1009-1035.

[38]. Hochwarter, W., P., Perrewé, G., Ferrisand, R., Guerico, (1999). Commitment as an antidote tothe tension and turnover consequences of politics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55,* 277-297.

[39]. Hochwarter, W., Witt, L., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). Perceptions of organizational politics as a moderator of the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,*472-478.

[40]. Kacmar, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (1999). Organizational politics: The state of the field, links torelated processes, and an agenda for future research. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research inpersonnel and human resources management* (Vol. 17, pp. 1–39). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

[41]. Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of Management, 23,* 627–660.

[42]. Martinez-Pons, M. (1997). The relation of emotional intelligence with selected areas of personal functioning. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 17,* 3-13.

[43]. Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, M., & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*(3&4), 772-781.

[44]. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

[45]. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test User's Manual.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

[46]. Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion, 3,* 97-105.

[47]. Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations.*Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[48]. Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24,* 391–419.

[49]. Organ, D. W. (1988)(1st ed.). *Organizational citizenship behavior - The good soldier Syndrome.* Lexington, Massachusetts/Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company.

[50]. Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N. & Furnham, A. (2004). The role of trait emotional intelligence in academic performance and deviant behavior at school. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36,* 277–293.

[51]. Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organization.*Pittman, Boston.

[52]. Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20,* 159– 174.

[53]. Rice, C. L. (1999). *A quantitative study of emotional intelligence and its impact on team performance.* Unpublished master's thesis, Pepperdine University.

[54]. Rubin, M. M. (1999). *Emotional intelligence and its role in mitigating aggression: A correlational study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and aggression in urban adolescents.* Unpublished dissertation, Immaculata College, Pennsylvania.

[55]. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination Cognition and Personality, 9,* 185-211.

[56]. Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Lopes, P. N. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence as a set of mental abilities with the MSCEIT. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology assessment.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

[57]. Schutte, N., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J., Golden, C. & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25,*167-177.

[58]. Sharma, R. R. (2006). Consequences of burnout in various professions. *Indian Journal of Training and Development, XXXVI*(4), 143–159.

[59]. Sharma, R. R. (2011). An empirical investigation into the role of EQ/emotional intelligence competencies in mental well-being. *Vision, 15*(2), 177-191.

[60]. Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 434–443.

[61]. Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (2004). Broadening our understanding of organizational retaliatory behavior. In R. W Griffin & A. O'Leary (Eds.), *The dark Side of organizational behavior.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[62]. Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal, 42,* 100–108.

[63]. Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behaviour:

[64]. Some parallels between counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) and organizationalcitizenship behaviour (OCB). *Human Resources Management Review, 12,* 269_292.

[65]. Terpstra, D. E., & dan Honoree, A. L. (2003). The relative importance of external, internal, individual and procedural equity to pay satisfaction. *Compensation and Benefits Review, 35*(6), 67-74.

[66]. Thoits, P. A. (1983). Dimensions of life events that influence psychological distress. An evaluation and synthesis of the literature. In H.B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Psychological stress: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 33-103). New York: Academic.

[67]. Trinidad, D. R., & Johnson, C. A. (2001). The association between emotional intelligence and early adolescent tobacco and alcohol use. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32,* 95-105.

[68]. Ugwu, F. O., & Onyishi, I. E. (2013). *Exploring the relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and work engagement: An investigation in the Nigerian university context.* Proceedings of the INTED2013 conference, 4-6 March, Valencia, Spain.

[69]. Valle, M., & Perrewé, P. L. (2000). Do politics perceptions relate to political behaviours?:Tests of an implicit assumption and expanded model. *Human Relations, 53*(3), 359-386.

[70]. Valle, M. P., &Witt, L. A. (2001).The moderating effect of teamwork perceptions on the organizational politics-job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(3), 379-388.

[71]. Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2003). *Developments in organizational politics: How political dynamics affect employee performance in modern work sites.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

[72]. Vigoda-Gadot, E., &Drory, A. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of organizational politics.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

[73]. Vredenburgh, D. J., & Maurer, J. G. (1984). A process framework of organizational politics.

[74]. *Human Relations, 37,* 47-66.

[75]. Warner, J. C., Hegtvedt, K. A., & dan Roman, P. (2005). Procedural justice, distributive justice: How experiences with downsizing condition their impact on organizational commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 89-102.

[76]. Wat, D., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Development and test of a social exchange model of OCB: The mediating role of trust in supervisor and empowerment. *Personnel Review, 34,* 406-422.

[77]. 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,* 78-94.

[78]. Witt, L. A., Hochwarter, W. A., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). Perception of organizational politics as a moderator of the relationship between conscientious and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology 85*(3), 472–478.

[79]. Yukl, G., & Tracey, C. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss.*Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 525–535.