

**PERCEPTION OF ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND DYSFUNCTIONAL
WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR AMONGST EMPLOYEES OF OREDO LOCAL
GOVERNMENT COUNCIL, BENIN CITY, EDO STATE, NIGERIA**

Amenze Erica Akenzua^{1*} and Dania Omoyebagbe Rosaline²

**^{1, 2}Department of Human Resource Management,
University of Benin, Benin city,
Edo State, Nigeria.**

***Corresponding Autor's Email: erica.eboigbe@uniben.edu**

ABSTRACT

Organizational injustice is prevalent in Nigerian organizations and several factors have been attributed to the dysfunctional behaviour of employees. The objective of this study is to determine the extent of significant relationship between procedural and interpersonal justice, and dysfunctional working behaviour of employees in Oredo Local Government Council, Edo State, Nigeria. The study employed survey research design, using copies of questionnaire to elicit information from respondents. Being a cross-sectional study, a sample size of 270 employees were randomly selected. Data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 20.0 to perform descriptive and inferential statistics. Result from the regression estimation technique revealed that there exists a significant relationship between procedural and interpersonal justice and dysfunctional work behaviour of employees with a low p-value, which was less than 0.05. The study further showed that there exist an uneven and unfair procedures in allocation of rewards and uneven sharing of rewards and or outcomes; and that counter-productive behaviour is as a result of perceived unfairness and that superiors are not honest with the information given to their subordinates with regards to procedures of sharing rewards/outcomes.

Keywords: *Organizational Injustice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice and Dysfunctional Behaviour*

INTRODUCTION

Dysfunctional workplace behaviors can be a reaction to the perceived unfairness experienced by employees in their workplace. Employee dysfunctional behavior is also labeled as employee deviant behavior, antisocial behavior, employee uncivil behaviors, employee misbehavior, employee aberrant behavior, employee sabotage behavior, and employee

counterproductive behaviors. These behaviors are regarded as the dark side of organizational behavior, perpetrated by employees to intentionally harm an organization, its employees, or stakeholders (Bennett & Robinson, 2003).

Several studies have categorized forms of employee dysfunctional behaviors to include:

production dysfunctional behavior, which involves withholding effort through a series of excuses, lateness to work, leaving work before the designated time, absenteeism, deliberate delays, ignoring customers, and intentionally flouting company rules; property dysfunctional behavior, which involves employees engaging in acts such as stealing, theft, accepting bribes (kickbacks), embezzlement, disclosing confidential information, and vandalism; political dysfunctional behavior, which involves engaging in social interactions that belittle individuals (including customers) through gossip, spreading rumors, and showing favoritism towards certain people; and personal aggression behavior, which is manifested in verbal abuse, cursing, and physical attacks (fighting) on customers and fellow employees (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Muafi, 2011).

Harris and Ogbonna (2006) have also provided insight into the economic, psychological, and social costs associated with employees' dysfunctional behaviors. Though these costs are difficult to estimate accurately, Harris and Ogbonna (2006) found that the direct costs of theft, intentional absenteeism, and withholding of information incurred by organizations in the United States of America (USA) were \$200 billion annually. These costs, according to Harris and Ogbonna (2006), do not include indirect costs such as loss of productivity, damage to reputation, and loss of customers resulting from such employee behaviors.

Akikibofori and Akikibofori (2014) opine that despite efforts by successive Nigerian governments to reform the civil service and eliminate poor work attitudes, many public organizations in Nigeria are still characterized by employees leaving early or arriving late to work, misuse of company property, personal use of stationery, verbal abuse, absenteeism, and bribery. According to the empirical findings of

Wurim (2013), these forms of dysfunctional behavior account for seventy-seven percent (77%) of the systematic variations in productivity loss.

While Fagbohunge et al. (2012) and others have provided useful insights into the nature and dynamic factors that account for dysfunctional work behaviors in Nigeria, these insights appear inadequate as prior studies have neglected and insufficiently considered other key factors. Ugwu et al. (2015) considered the impact of perceived procedural injustice on employees' retaliatory behavior, but few studies have addressed issues of perceived distributive, informational, and interpersonal justice and how they affect employees' dysfunctional behaviors in Nigeria. Additionally, most studies on dysfunctional work behaviors in Nigeria have focused on the banking industry (Joe-Akunne, Oguebe & Aguanunu, 2014), secondary schools (Onyishi & Onunkwo, 2015), the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC) (Ugwu et al., 2015), and the healthcare sector (Onuoha, 2013; Gabriel, 2016). However, this study aims to investigate the impact of procedural and interpersonal justice on employee behavior in Oredo Local Government Council of Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour

Behavior is deemed dysfunctional or deviant when an individual or group violates an organization's norms, policies, or internal values, and threatens the welfare of the organization. Human behavior is a function of the interaction between the person or individual and their environment (Nadler, Hackman, & Lawler, 1979), as cited by Kustinah (2013). Griffin and Lopez (2005) posited that bad

employee behavior refers to any form of intentional act that has the potential to adversely affect organizations and their employees. Griffin and Lopez (2005) consider this bad behavior as dysfunctional behavior.

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) was defined as “any intentional behavior on the part of an organizational member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests” (Sackett & De Vore, 2001). Counterproductive work behaviors are costly to both individuals and organizations. Such behaviors can be said to be “dysfunctional” because they almost invariably violate important organizational norms and harm organizations in several ways relevant to their goals, employees, procedures, productivity, and profitability (Aubé et al., 2009; Robinson, 2008). Employees who display counterproductive workplace behaviors are more likely to develop stress-related problems and to resign (O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), and to experience low self-esteem, increased lack of confidence at work, and physical and psychological pains (Griffin, O’Leary, & Collins, 1998).

Dysfunctional behavior is not just irrational human tendencies, but also a rational action against or a response to existing controls and processes (Hartmann, 2000, in Kustinah, 2013). The opinions of Griffin and Lopez (2005) in Ghozali and Setiawan (2006) define that dysfunctional behavior is motivated by an employee or group of coworkers who have negative consequences for the individual in the organization, the group of individuals in the organization, and/or the organization itself. At an organizational level, dysfunctions can waste huge amounts of time and energy as people—managers, employees, and departments—struggle to cope with dysfunctional behaviors and systems (Greenberg, 2010). At an individual level, dysfunctions drain morale, lower

individual productivity, and can drive away valuable personnel.

In the Nigerian workplace, Fagbohunge, Akinbode, and Ayodeji (2012) found theft, fraud, and sabotage, playing mean pranks, acting rudely, and arguing with co-employees and customers to be the most prevalent forms of dysfunctional workplace behaviors among Nigerian workgroups. Adejoh and Adejoh (2013) found giving minimal information to customers, using confrontational language, physically assaulting customers, being rude to supervisors, fellow employees, and customers, providing abrupt service, making fun of fellow employees and customers’ accents, lying to customers, fellow employees, and management, spreading rumors, withholding effort (putting little effort into work), arguing with fellow employees, customers, and supervisors, and absenteeism to be the most rampant forms of dysfunctional behavior among frontline employees in hotels and banks in Nigeria.

Organisational Justice

Organizational justice was coined by Greenberg (1990) and describes individuals’ (or groups’) perceptions of the fairness of treatment received from an organization and their behavioral reactions to such perceptions. According to Baldwin (2006), organizational justice refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions, and outcomes to be fair. These perceptions can influence attitudes and behavior positively or negatively, thereby impacting employee performance and the organization’s success. Foster (2010) defines organizational justice as individual perceptions of fairness within organizations.

Every employee desires justice in the working environment, including fair procedures for determining rewards, the distribution of rewards, and interactions with supervisors to enhance satisfaction and commitment to their work and

organization. According to Byrne and Cropanzano (2001), organizational justice is an area of psychological inquiry that focuses on perceptions of fairness in the workplace, illustrating fairness's function with direct effects not only on employee performance but also on workplace behavior. Organizational justice deals particularly with situations where employees form conclusions about their treatment in their jobs and how these perceptions affect their work-related performance (Moorman, 2009).

When employees perceive fair treatment overall within the organization, they are inclined to respond reciprocally with positive behaviors toward the organization. Creating and managing fairness are crucial for organizations as they impact productivity and employee behavior. The perception of fairness also affects individuals' relationships with peers, subordinates, and supervisors (Mohyeldin & Tahire, 2007). This study focuses on the procedural and interpersonal aspects of organizational justice as a follow-up to an earlier version that analyzed distributive and informational forms of organizational justice.

Procedural Justice

Poole (2007) defined procedural justice in terms of fair procedures, referring to them as just decisions resulting from fair procedures. Procedural justice pertains to participants' perceptions of the fairness of the rules and procedures that regulate a process (Nabatchi et al., 2007). It involves the means by which outcomes are allocated, rather than the outcomes themselves, and establishes principles governing the roles of participants within decision-making processes (Cropanzano et al., 2007).

Procedural justice can be understood as the perceived fairness of procedures, which determine outcomes and are considered as important as the actual outcome (Deconinck & Bachmann, 2005). It concerns the perceived fairness of the means determining outcomes, reflecting concerns about consistency,

impartiality, rationality, and employee participation (Cropanzano, 1997). Kalay and Turkey (2016) define procedural justice as employees' justice perceptions related to the methods and processes used in distributing organizational outcomes.

Procedural justice is the extent to which the dynamics of the decision process are judged to be fair. In other words, it involves perceptions of the fairness of organizational procedures by which outcomes are distributed or decisions are made (Srivastava, 2015). According to Greenberg (1990), procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of policies and procedures used to make decisions in the workplace. While distributive justice concerns the perceived fairness of outcomes, procedural justice relates to the perceived fairness of procedures used to make decisions, considering whether procedures are reliable, transparent, ethical, unbiased, accurate, correctable, and free from deception. Procedural justice demonstrates the neutrality of formal procedures and the rules governing a system (Nabatchi & Good, 2007). Employees perceive procedural justice when supervisors provide sufficient information about their decisions regarding procedures (Greenberg, 1987).

Whereas distributive justice suggests that satisfaction depends on outcomes, procedural justice suggests that satisfaction hinges on the process (Hasan, 2010). Traditional principles of procedural justice include impartiality, voice or opportunity to be heard, and justification for decisions (Bayles, 1990). Procedural issues such as the neutrality of the process, treatment of participants, and trustworthiness of decision-making authorities are crucial for enhancing perceptions of procedural justice. Extensive literature supports procedural justice theories of satisfaction (Hasan, 2010).

Hypothesis One: *There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour.*

Interpersonal Justice

Interpersonal justice includes various actions displaying social sensitivity, such as when supervisors treat employees with respect and dignity (Hasan, 2010). Interpersonal justice defines the nature of association between supervisors and subordinates (Mohyeldin & Tahire, 2007). It pertains to the behaviour of the organisation's managers and higher authorities in carrying out their decisions: that is, how they treat those who are subject to their authority, decisions, and actions. The major determinants of interpersonal justice include explanation, sensitivity, consideration, and empathy (Srivastava, 2015). Interpersonal justice emphasizes one-on-one transactions, employees often seek it from their supervisors (Cropanzano et al., 2007).

Interpersonal treatment is an important dimension of organisational relations. It includes interpersonal communication, truthful, courteous, and respectful behaviour, appropriate, honest, and timely explanations, and respect for rights (Nabatchi, Bingham & Good, 2007). Interpersonal treatment quality is indicative of interpersonal justice consisting of two distinct justice dimensions. First, interpersonal justice recognizes that people are interested in both outcomes they receive and procedures carried out, and the quality of the interpersonal treatment in executing procedures (Alder, et al., 2005). It refers to the degree to which authorities treat employees with sincere, polite, and respect in determining outcomes or executing procedures (Colquitt et al., 2006; Shafiro et al., 2007).

As an aspect of interpersonal justice, interpersonal justice points at the importance of kindness, respect and esteem in interpersonal relations, particularly in the relationships between employees and managers (Kalay & Turkey, 2016). It is basically about showing or having dignity for one another in the

organisation especially between employees and managers. Fairness creation and its management are very important for the organisation as it affects productivity and the behaviour of employees. The perception of fairness affects relationships with peers, subordinates and supervisors (Mohyeldin & Tahire, 2007).

Hypothesis Two: *There is no significant relationship between interpersonal justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour.*

Theoretical Framework

This study is premised on the Leader-Member Exchange Theory. An important aspect of employees' workplace perceptions is what is known as "Perceived Leader-member Exchange" (LMX), which relates to the quality of the relations between leaders and group members or superiors and subordinates. High quality LMX indicates high levels of information exchange, interaction, trust, respect, support, mutual influence, and rewards, while low quality LMX points to a low level of interaction, trust, formal relations, one-directional influence (manager-employee), limited support, and few rewards (Bauer & Green, 1996). LMX is said to affect employees' motivation in different areas of organisational functioning, increasing or decreasing opportunities, sense of empowerment, emotional support, and cooperative interactions, as well as loyalty, respect and obligation (Tziner et al., 2012).

Empirical Review

A study done by Rafiee et al. (2015) investigated the relationship of dysfunctional workplace behaviour with the organisational justice and staff development in the universities of Tehran. The descriptive-correlational research method had been used, while the data analysis had relied on the correlation and regression analysis. The research population had comprised all the staff of the selected universities in Tehran. Sampling had been conducted through stratified random

method, which resulted in a sample with 326 participants. In order to measure the deviant workplace behaviour and staff development, two researcher-made questionnaires had been used (reliability= 0.92 and 0.85, respectively), while the organisational justice had been measured using the Niehoff and Moorman (1996) (reliability= 0.87). The findings revealed that deviant workplace behaviour has a negative relationship with the staff development ($p=32$) and organisational justice ($p=22$). The results of the regression analysis delineated that staff development has a mediating role in the relationship between organisational justice and deviant workplace behaviour. That is, organisational justice sets grounds for staff development and in turn, staff development reduces the deviant workplace behaviours.

Akullo's (2011) study examined the relationship between leadership behaviour, distributive justice, procedural justice and counterproductive workplace behaviour in the Uganda Police Force. Cross sectional survey design was used to clarify on the subject. Quantitative design was used to determine the frequencies and predominance of issues under study. The key finding was a positive relationship between Leadership Behaviour and Procedural Justice. However, acts of Counter-productive Workplace Behaviour still exist among the subordinates. The subordinate police officers appreciated the ability of their leaders in ensuring that procedural justices in determination of distribution of outcomes are a point of reference. The existence of Procedural Justice such as following procedure for selection for promotion, allocation of accommodation and further training led to fair distribution of those outcomes. The respondents were aware of the policies in place to determine the distribution of outcomes in the Uganda Police Force. The study recommends that the elements of leadership behaviour like active management by exception should be practised by the middle level managers for potential deviations from rules and standards by the subordinates and take corrective actions.

Sabeen (2012) explores the impact of leadership behaviour in stimulating the perceptions of

interpersonal justice. The behavioural elements of a leader's personality, such as integrity, consistency, communication and concern for others are studied for their influence upon the perceptions of interpersonal justice amongst the subordinates. Research conducted in the banking and telecom sectors of Pakistan, with a sample size of 777 gives a clear indication of a significant positive impact of the said group of leader behaviour's sub-variables upon the dependent variable.

Holtz and Harold's (2012) research suggest that employees who perceive interpersonal injustice in their workplace are more likely to engage in workplace deviance. However, researchers have seldom considered the role of personal values in shaping behavioural reactions to perceived injustice. The study investigates the moderating influence of justice-related values on reactions to perceived injustice. Results suggest that employees with strong interpersonal justice values, or justice orientations, are unlikely to engage in workplace deviance, regardless of their interpersonal justice perceptions. Results were consistent across two operationalizations of justice values and consistent across self-reported and coworker-reported workplace deviance.

Zoghbi-Manrique and Domingo Verano-Tacoronte (2014) focus in their study to test an explanation of how procedural justice (PJ) – a specific type of organisational justice that reflects how fairly organisational procedures are designed – may influence deviant workplace behaviour targeting at the organisation (DWB-O). The model proposes that PJ affects DWB-O through its influence on perceived normative conflict (PNC) with the organisation. This influence, in turn, would prompt employees to reciprocate with DWB-O. Data were collected from 270 (17.46 per cent) of the 1,547 teachers at a Spanish university by intranet. The paper finds that the structural equation modelling (SEM) results suggest that PJ is an antecedent to PNC, which fully mediates a confirmed direct – but weak – PJ relationship with DWBO.

Nasurdin, Ahmad, and Razalli (2014) aim is to test a proposed model linking organisational

politics and organisational justice (distributive justice and procedural justice) indirectly with deviant behaviour through stress. Data was gathered using self-administered questionnaires from a sample of 279 production employees within the electronics industry of Malaysia. The confirmatory factor analysis results illustrate that deviant behaviour is a unit-dimensional construct in the context of Malaysia. In addition, structural equation modelling procedure used in our model testing indicates that both organisational politics and organisational justice (distributive and procedural) affect deviant behaviour via the mediating role of stress. The results suggest the need for organisations to have clearly-defined policies and procedures in allocating work outcomes, treat employees in a fair manner, and encourage employee participation. Although some limitations have been acknowledged, the value of this study lies in its contribution in providing validation evidence of the applicability of research findings abroad to non-Western nations. In conclusion, the proposed model was supported whereby environmental elements (organisational politics and organisational justice) were found to affect an individual's behavioural response (organisational deviance) through his/her internal affective state (stress).

Zribi and Souaï's, (2013) central stake is to show that the explanation of workers' behaviour cannot be done without a multi-level analysis, accounting for the complexity of the human and organisational systems. The apprehension of deviant behaviour is henceforth done by combining organisational and individual factors. Based on the social exchange theory, this work aims at exploring the relationship between the injustice and the deviance through a psychological contract approach (mediating variable). In this work, they lay open the main results of a research combining two approaches: qualitative (based on a set of exploratory interviews of 12 Tunisian employees) and quantitative (conducted in two steps, exploratory and confirmatory using the structural equations model). The results of a survey of 340 Tunisian managers reveal the existence of significant

relationships between organisational justice and relational psychological contract break.

METHODOLOGY

The research design used is the survey research design. The survey research design is adopted because this an empirical study with characteristics of a positivist approach. The research instrument is the questionnaire response format to be administered randomly to a sample size of 270 employees from a population of 600 in Oredo Local Government Council of Benin City, Edo State. The study is a cross-sectional study that will elicit information (primary data) from employees at a particular point in time. The questionnaire has two sections, A and B. Section A provides the respective socio-demographic variables, while section B provides Likert scale-type question aimed at obtaining information on both the dependent (dysfunctional workplace behaviour and independent variables (organizational justice). Their responses were measured using 5-point Likert scale ranging from '1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree'.

A pilot study was conducted to determine the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. 20 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to 20 employees in Oredo Local Government Council. Data obtained from the retrieved questionnaires were used to determine the reliability of the instrument using the Cronbach's alpha reliability index. The reliability coefficient ranges between 0 and 1. The analysis result showed that the Cronbach's Alpha reliability statistics for dysfunctional workplace behaviour, procedural justice and interpersonal justice are 0.832, 0.908 and 0.712 respectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The research data collected were analysed using the descriptive and the inferential statistics. With respect to the descriptive statistics, the mean, standard deviation as well as percentages of the items were taken. While for the inferential

statistics, the correlation and the multivariate analysis was performed to show the extent of relationship between variables.

Description of respondents' background information

This section contains the different background information of the respondents which include gender, age, tenure, educational qualification, and hierarchical level. The results are presented in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Demographic Variables of Respondents

Item	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	188	66.6
	Female	82	33.4
	Total	270	100
Age (Years)	16-25	26	9.6
	26-35	42	15.5
	36-45	73	27.04
	46-55	86	31.85
	56 and above	43	15.93
	Total	270	100
Tenure (Years)	1-5	34	12.60
	6-10	53	19.63
	11-15	72	26.67
	16-20	78	28.89
	21 and above	33	12.22
	Total	270	100
Educational Qualification	Primary	26	9.63
	Secondary	77	28.52
	OND	73	27.04
	HND/B.Sc.	70	25.93
	Postgraduate	22	8.15
	Total	270	100
Hierarchical Level	Senior Staff	94	34.81
	Junior Staff	176	65.19
	Total	270	100

Source: Researchers field work, 2022

Description of the Research Variables

The various variables are described using simple percentages and mean. The dependent variable is dysfunctional workplace behaviour, while the independent variables include distributive justice, informational justice, procedural justice and interpersonal justice. The mean is calculated by assigning 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 to strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree and strongly disagree

respectively and later divided by the total number of respondents. In interpreting the mean score, it is assumed that values that are above 3 shows that majority of the respondents “agreed” with the statements while values that fall below 3 shows that majority of the respondents “disagreed” with the statements.

Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour:

Respondents agreed with the items measuring dysfunctional workplace behaviour with the highest mean at 4.0 indicating that unfair procedures exist in determining allocation of rewards and the least mean at 3.56 indicating that supervisors are impolite and insensitive. On the average, the mean score for dysfunctional workplace behaviour is 3.98. It can therefore be concluded that the level of dysfunctional workplace behaviour in Oredo Local Government Council is high.

Procedural Justice: The respondents disagreed with most of the items measuring procedural justice. Of the nine items only four were agreed to. On the average, the mean score for procedural justice is 2.94. It can therefore be concluded that the level of procedural justice in Oredo Local Government Council is low.

Interpersonal Justice: The respondents agreed with seven out of the nine items measuring interpersonal justice. With the highest mean of 4.56 indicating that the perception of fairness affects relationship with peers, subordinates and supervisors and the least mean of 2.71 disagreeing that perceived injustice due to individual differences leads to deviant behaviour. On the average, the mean score for interpersonal justice is 3.59. It can therefore be concluded that the level of interpersonal justice in Oredo Local Government is high.

Correlation Analysis

Another objective of this study was to determine the relationship between dysfunctional workplace behaviour and organisational justice. In order to achieve this, the variables were examined using bivariate Pearson correlation coefficient which was conducted on the data for all the variables in the study. Table 5 shows the

Pearson correlation coefficients among research variables (**Appendix for full result**). The Pearson's correlation coefficients between each pair of variables are shown in Table 5. The result shows that dysfunctional workplace behaviour is positively and significantly related to procedural justice ($r=0.736$, $p < 0.05$) and interpersonal justice ($r=0.920$, $p < 0.05$).

Regression Analysis

Relationship between organisational justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour

In this section, regression analysis was performed to establish the relationship between organisational justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour. The tables represent the outputs of the regression analysis (**Appendix for full result**).

The regression result shows that when the independent variables: distributive justice, informational justice, procedural justice, and interpersonal justice were regressed on dysfunctional workplace behaviour, a coefficient of determination (R^2) value of 0.641 was obtained. Given the value of Adjusted R^2 of 0.489 indicates that the independent variables jointly explain 48.9% of the variation in the dependent variable. Importantly also, the Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.0128 reveals the absence of first order serial correlation.

The F-statistic of 17.174 is significant at $p < 0.05$. This means that there is a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables as a group.

The results reveal that dysfunctional workplace behaviour is positively and significantly related to procedural justice ($\beta = 0.769$; $p < 0.05$) and interpersonal justice ($\beta = 0.423$; $p < 0.05$) at 5% level of significance. The results in Table 8 show that the tolerance values ranged from 0.911 to 0.998, an evidence of substantial scores above the minimum threshold of 0.1. Additionally, the variance inflation factors (VIFs) ranging between 1.02 and 1.09 were below the maximum limit of 3 acceptability level.

Test of Research Hypotheses

The results in Tables 8 were used to test hypotheses one to three.

Hypothesis One: *There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour.*

From the result in Table 4.10, it shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice ($\beta = 0.769$; $p < 0.05$) and dysfunctional workplace behaviour. The t-statistic of 2.67 and p-value of less than 5% confirmed the result. Based on the result, we reject the null hypothesis. We therefore conclude that there is a significant relationship between procedural justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour.

Hypothesis Two: *There is no significant relationship between interpersonal justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour.*

From the result in Table 4.10, it shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between interpersonal justice ($\beta = 0.423$; $p < 0.05$) and dysfunctional workplace behaviour. The t-statistic of 3.846 and p-value of less than 5% confirmed the result. Based on the result, we reject the null hypothesis. We therefore conclude that there is a significant relationship between interpersonal justice and dysfunctional workplace behaviour.

Discussion of Findings

This study has attempted to investigate the impact of procedural and interpersonal justice on the behavior of employees in Oredo Local Government Council of Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. The study reveals that organizational injustice variables do have a positive and significant impact on dysfunctional workplace behaviors. By implication, organizational injustice brings about dysfunctional workplace behaviour among employees. This form of organizational injustice, according to Chirasha and Mahapa (2012), can lead to theft, unruly behavior, low productivity, sabotage, costs to the organization, and more deviant dispositions. This is consistent with the findings of Rafiee,

Hoveida, and Rajaeipoor (2015), who revealed that deviant workplace behavior has a negative relationship with organizational justice. However, the findings of Holtz and Harold (2012) contradict our findings on interpersonal justice and dysfunctional workplace behavior. That paper investigates the moderating influence of justice-related values on reactions to perceived injustice. Results suggest that employees with strong interpersonal justice values, or justice orientations, are unlikely to engage in workplace deviance, regardless of their interpersonal justice perceptions. Results were consistent across two operationalizations of justice values and across self- and co-worker-reported workplace deviance. Considering the findings of this research, we found that there exist uneven and unfair procedures in the allocation of rewards and uneven sharing of rewards and/or outcomes. Also, we found out that counterproductive behavior results from perceived unfairness and that superiors are not honest with the information given to their subordinates regarding procedures for sharing rewards/outcomes. Procedural justice and interpersonal justice strongly impact dysfunctional behavior among Oredo Local Government Council workers.

CONCLUSIONS ANDRECOMMENDATIONS

The world is changing, and so are public sector organizations around the globe. However, public sector organizations in Nigeria still largely experience dysfunctional workplace behaviors due to prevailing injustices. Primarily, superiors have been blamed for these injustices. There is a need to address this issue as it can lead to ineffective and redundant organizations. It is crucial to focus on reducing counterproductive behaviors among employees. Traditional control systems can confine employees to offices but cannot prevent them from exhibiting counterproductive behaviors. Employees are often considered the greatest asset of any

organization. A well-motivated and happy employee will perform at their best. Dysfunctional workplace behaviors would be unnecessary if rewards and outcomes were distributed fairly, and procedures were followed conscientiously without withholding crucial and honest information.

1. Procedures should be clear and strictly followed. Organizations should ensure there is a well-organized structure with procedures that are transparent to all employees regarding policies and plans. Organizations should establish mediation units where employees who feel victimized can voice their grievances.
2. Organizations should also foster an atmosphere of trust. When employees distrust their superiors, any attempt at fair distribution of outcomes will not be perceived as such.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267–299. New York: Academic Press.<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0065260108601082>
- Adejoh, M. A., & Adejoh, L. L. (2013). Handling negative deviant behaviour of frontline employees in service organisations. *International Journal of Current Research and Review*, 5(4), 23-30. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/82703775/1410_pdf-
- Akikibofori, J. S. & Akikibofori, M. (2014). The causes and impart of deviant behaviour in the work place. *American Journal of Social Sciences, Arts and Literature*, 1(2), 1-11.
- Akullo, G. (2011). Leadership behaviour, distributive justice, procedural justice and counterproductive work place

- p>behaviour in the Uganda Police Force: A case study of Kampala extra region. n/261359721_History_of_organizational_justice_The_founders_speak
- Alder, G. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2005). Towards understanding fairness judgments associated with computer performance monitoring: An integration of the feedback, justice, and monitoring research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 15(1), 43-67.
- Aubé, C., Rousseau, V., Mama, C., & Morin, E. (2009). Counterproductive behaviours and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24, 351-361.<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10869-009-9113-5>
- Baldwin, S. (2006). *Organisational Justice*. Brighton, UK.https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/43193223/Organizational_Justice-libre.pdf?1456745523=&response-content-
- Bauer, T. N., & Green, S. G. (1996). The development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1538-1567. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/257068>
- Bayles, M. D. (1990). *Procedural Justice: Allocating to Individuals*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). *The past, present and future of workplace deviance research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-02890-007>
- Byrne, Z. S., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). The history of organisational justice: The founders speak. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice*, 2, 3-26. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261359721_History_of_organizational_justice_The_founders_speak
- Carrell, M. R., & Dittrich, J. E. (1978) Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations and new directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 3, 202-210.<https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMR.1978.4294844>
- Chirasha, V. & Mahapa, M. (2012). An analysis of the causes and impact of deviant behaviour in the workplace. The case of Secretaries in State Universities. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)*, 3(5), 415-421.<https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.10520/EJC127679>
- Colquitt, A., Scott, B., Rodell, J., Long, D., Zapata, C., Conlon, D., & Wesson, M. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 199-236.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organisational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48.<https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895338><https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-06399-001>
- Deconinck, J., & Bachmann, D. (2005). An analysis of turnover among retail buyers. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 874-882.<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0148296304000049>
- Fagbohunbe, B. O, Akinbode G. A., & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organisational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(5), 207-213.
- Foster, R.D. (2010) Resistance, justice, and commitment to change. *Human*

- Resources Development Quarterly, 21, 3-39.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hrdq.20035>
- Gabriel, J. (2016). Supervisors' toxicity as predictor of subordinates' counter-productive work behaviour in Nigerian public hospitals Ph.D., Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, 32 (5), 67-73.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organisational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9-22.
<https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amr.1987.4306437>
- Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). Bad behaviour in organisations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31, 988–1005.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0149206305279942>
- Griffin, R. W., O'Leary, A. M., & Collins, J. (1998). Dysfunctional work behaviours in organisations. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organisational Behaviours* (65-82). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/38bf9031f7583e44c8930a0f6e8db565/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47893>
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2006). Service sabotage: A study of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (4), 543-558.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1177/0092070306287324>
- Hasan, Ali (2010). A study of relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9fe4/05306fe20de01c36dde9b13475e6a8da1c60.pdf>
- Holtz, B. & Harold, C. (2012). Interpersonal justice and deviance: The moderating effects of interpersonal justice values and justice orientation.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0149206310390049>
- Joe-Akunne, C. O., Oguebe, T. M. & Aguanunu, R. (2014). Exploratory study of job insecurity and entrepreneurial intention as correlates of counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(5), 41-50.
- Kalay, F. & Turkey, V. (2016). The impact of organisational justice on employee performance: A survey in Turkey and Turkish context. *International Journal of Human Resource*, 6(11), 1-20.
<https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/44100931/8854-33291-2-PB->
- Kustinah, S. (2013). The influence of dysfunctional behaviour and individual culture on audit quality. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*. 2(5), 118-125.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=384556c6bf96c6bca089b43c1e783d56acebf664f>
- Moorman, R. H., & Byrne, Z. S. (2005). How does organisational justice affect organisational citizenship behaviour? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organisational justice* (355-380). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
<https://api.taylorfrancis.com/content/chapters/edit/download?identifierName=doi&identifierValue=10.4324/9780203774847-17&type=chapterpdf>
- Muafi, J. (2011). Causes and consequences of deviant workplace behaviour. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(2), 123-126.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publicatio>

- n/323392841_Causes_and_consequence_deviant_workplace_behavior
- Nabatchi, T., Bingham, L. B., & Good, D. H. (2007). Organisational justice and workplace mediation: A six factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18, (2), 148-176. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/10444060710759354/full/html>
- Nasurdin, A., Ahmad, N., & Razalli, A. (2014). Politics, justice, stress, and deviant behaviour in organisations: an empirical analysis. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 15(2), 235 – 254. <https://www.ijbs.unimas.my/repository/pdf/Vol15-no2-paper3.pdf>
- O’Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organisation-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 225-253. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amr.1996.9602161571>
- Onuoha, (2013). Counterproductive work behaviour among employees in emotionally demanding jobs: the roles of perceived organisational support, job burnout, and age. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 2(1), 105-114.
- Onyishi I, E & Onunkwo, C.B. (2015). Counterproductive work behaviour among school teachers: the contributions of psychological contract breach and job stress. *Journal of the African Educational Research Network*, 6(7), 43-50.
- Poole, W. (2007). Organisational justice as a framework for understanding union management relations in education. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ780801>
- Rafiee, M., Hoveida, R., & Rajaeipoor, S. (2015). The relationship of the deviant workplace behaviour with the organisational justice and staff development in the universities of Tehran. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(1), 126-140.
- Robinson, S. L. (2008). Dysfunctional workplace behaviour. In J. Barling & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organisational behaviour* (pp. 141-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. <https://www.torrossa.com/gs/resourceProxy?an=4913718&publisher=FZ7200#page=166>
- Sabeen, Z. (2012). Managerial leadership and interpersonal justice perceptions: An exploratory study. *African Journal of Business Management* 6 (45), 11213-11220. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9da7/861e554c0711c2be819ce514f69b44e96fb0.pdf>
- Srivastava, U. (2015). Multiple dimensions of organisational justice and work-related outcomes among health-care professionals. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 5, 666-685. <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=61194>
- Tziner, A., Fein, E., & Oren, L. (2012). Human motivation and performance outcomes in the context of downsizing. In C. L. Cooper, A. Pandey, & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *Downsizing: Is Less Still More?* (1st ed., pp. 103-133). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ugwu, F.O & Anhang S.T & Ndufu-Alike, I. (2015). Tit for Tat: perceived procedural injustice, organisational politics and emotional intelligence as determinants of organizational retaliatory behaviour. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*, 3(5), 46-50. <http://ijmcr.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Paper21513-522.pdf>

- Wurim, B. P. (2013). Employee dysfunctional behaviour and the costs of running business in manufacturing companies of central Nigeria. *International Journal of Management & Business Studies*, 3(2), 101-111.
- Zoghbi-Manrique, L. & Verano-Tacoronte, D. (2014). Investigating the effects of procedural justice on workplace deviance: Do employees' perceptions of conflicting guidance call the tune? *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(8), 715 – 729. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/01437720710835183/full/html>
- Zribi, H., & Souaï, (2013). Deviant behaviours in response to organisational injustice: Mediator test for psychological contract breach—the case of Tunisia. *Journal of Business Studies*, 4(4), 1-25. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=20b015449681e86ba39b68b9c9383a1c7270bc81>

APPENDIX

Table 5: Pearson correlation coefficients among research variables

		Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour	Distributive Justice	Informational Justice	Procedural Justice	Interpersonal Justice
Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	270				

	N	270	270	270		
Procedural Justice	Pearson Correlation	0.736	0.662	0.026	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	0.027	0.783		
	N	270	270	270	270	
Interpersonal Justice	Pearson Correlation	0.920**	0.623	0.334	0.041	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.021	0.763	0.985	
	N	270	270	270	270	270

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Researchers field work, 2022.

Table 6: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.853 ^a	0.641	0.489	0.63241	2.0128

a. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice, Informational Justice, Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice

b. Dependent Variable: Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour

Source: Researchers field work, 2022

Table 7: ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	18.754	4	4.689	17.174	0.000 ^b
Residual	16.937	62	0.273		
Total	35.691	66			

a. Dependent Variable: Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour

b. Predictors: (Procedural Justice, Interpersonal Justice)

Source: Researchers field work, 2022.

Table 8: Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	-0.613	0.833		0.736	0.969		
Procedural Justice	0.769	0.288	0.601	2.67	0.022	0.916	1.021
Interpersonal Justice	0.423	0.288	0.322	3.846	0.009	0.911	1.019

Source: Researchers field work, 2022.