

NIGERIA'S SOCIAL CHALLENGES AND IMPACTS ON WORKERS' COUNTERPRODUCTIVE TENDENCIES

Oluchukwu Ebere Ezenwaka, PhD,
HavilahCoast International School,
Odume, Obosi, Anambra State, Nigeria.
Phone: +2347031652050
Email: ladyluchy2020@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *This study examined "Nigeria's Social Challenges and Impacts on Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies." The study was anchored on Agency Theory, which posits that adverse environmental and structural conditions can influence behavioural deviations in organizational settings. Multistage sampling technique was used to sample 161 workers from various occupational categories in Nigeria. The instruments were Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) and the Counterproductive Work Behaviour Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) were used. The study adopted a cross-sectional and correlational design. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 26. Findings revealed that Nigeria's social challenges had a significant negative relationship with workers' counterproductive tendencies, indicating that higher exposure to social challenges correlated with increased levels of workplace deviance. More results showed that social challenges significantly influenced several dimensions of counterproductive behaviour, including aggression, indolence, intolerance, poor sportsmanship, blackmail/sabotage, and fraudulent practices ($p < 0.05$). Conversely, certain social challenges such as insecurity, frustration, corruption, unemployment, and quality of life did not significantly influence counterproductive tendencies in the workers studied ($p > 0.05$). One major implication of the findings is that deteriorating social conditions in Nigeria contribute immensely to behavioural maladjustments in workplaces. Another implication is that in Nigerian organizations, workers' psychological spillover arising from societal dysfunction impacts on employee behaviour and productivity. Recommendations are made for workers to build on personality health, particularly self-discipline, for coping with the impacts of Nigerian social challenges in the workplace. This study contributes to knowledge by demonstrating that Nigeria's broader social challenges exert considerable impact on workers' ethical deviance tendencies. Another contribution is that the national socio-psychological pressure penetrates organizational systems and influences worker conduct for better or worse. This mirrors the interface between the country's social, human, and organizational performance to the world, reflecting the investments and development consequences.*

KEYWORDS: Nigeria, Social Challenges, Workers, Counterproductive, Tendencies/Behaviour

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of counterproductive tendencies in the workplace has garnered significant scholarly attention due to its detrimental effects on organizational performance and employee well-being. Counterproductive behaviors encompass a wide range of actions, including absenteeism, theft, aggression, and fraudulent activities. Although numerous studies have examined the causes and effects of these behaviors across various cultural contexts, there is a significant lack of research specifically focusing on their occurrence in Nigeria, a country defined by its unique socio-political landscape.

Social challenges refer to the difficulties or issues that impact individuals or groups within a society. These challenges can adversely affect people's lives, leading to discomfort and unease. In Nigeria, several social challenges persist, including aggression, insecurity, frustration, cultism, substance abuse, mental health concerns, sexual violence, corruption, poverty, unemployment, poor governance, inadequate interpersonal relationships, and ineffective judicial systems (Nwankwo, 2026).

Statement of the Problem

The Nigerian work environment is confronted with a variety of social challenges that could affect workers' productivity and

behavior. A primary concern is the rise in counterproductive behaviors among employees, which can manifest in some workplace issues as aggression, blackmailing, or frustration. These detrimental behaviors can lead to lower job satisfaction, higher absenteeism, and decreased productivity, ultimately impacting the overall performance of organizations (Adebayo, 2018).

These challenges contribute to a culture of fear, mistrust, and hostility among employees, resulting in heightened stress, anxiety, and counterproductive behaviors. This environment can lead to increased stress and anxiety, as well as counterproductive tendencies such as absenteeism, tardiness, and diminished productivity. The Nigerian work environment is marked by poor interpersonal relationships, which lead to conflict, mistrust, and hostility among employees. Such dynamics can result in heightened stress, anxiety, and counterproductive behaviors, ultimately diminishing the overall performance of organizations.

In organizations with limited staff, the existing employees often face excessive workloads, resulting in physical and emotional burnout. This can lead to increased stress, anxiety, and counterproductive behaviors, ultimately impacting the overall performance of the organization.

Most studies have concentrated on the consequences of counterproductive work behaviors rather than exploring their underlying causes, especially within Nigerian organizational contexts. There is a notable lack of research examining the relationship between Nigeria's social challenges and counterproductive work behaviors across various occupational sectors. Therefore, this study aims to investigate how these social challenges influence workplace behavior in different occupational domains.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study is to examine relationship between Nigeria's Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies. Specifically, the study intends to:

1. Investigate the impacts of Nigeria's social challenges on workers' counterproductive tendencies in Nigeria.

2. Examine the roles of various dimensions of Nigeria's social challenges on workers' counterproductive tendencies.
3. Investigate the impacts of Nigeria's social challenges on various workers' counterproductive tendencies.
4. Examine relationship strength between Nigeria social challenges workers' counterproductive tendencies.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do Nigeria's social challenges influence manifestation of workers' counterproductive tendencies?
2. How do different dimensions of Nigeria's social challenges affect worker's counterproductive tendencies?
3. What is the influence of Nigeria's social challenges on different aspects of workers' counterproductive tendencies?
4. How does different Nigeria's social challenges relate with workers' counterproductive tendencies?

Significance of the Study

The results of this research will offer valuable insights for organizational leaders and human resource professionals in Nigeria. By pinpointing the specific social challenges that intensify counterproductive behaviors and examining their effects across various occupational sectors, organizations can develop targeted interventions and policies to effectively address these challenges. This approach could lead to improved productivity, reduced workplace conflicts, and enhanced employee well-being.

Policy makers and government agencies can leverage the findings of this research to enhance the development of strategies aimed at addressing Nigeria's social challenges within the context of labor and employment. By understanding how societal factors influence workplace behaviors, policymakers can design targeted initiatives to create a more conducive environment for workers and promote economic development.

Operational Definition of Terms

Nigerian Social Challenges: This refers to pervasive issues within Nigerian society that impact individuals' daily lives and societal functioning, as measured with the Nigerian

Social Challenges Inventory by Nwankwo (2026).

Counterproductive Tendencies:

Counterproductive tendencies are behaviours exhibited by employees that deviate from organizational ethical norms and hinder the achievement of organizational goals, as measured with Counterproductive Work Behaviour Inventory by Nwankwo (2026).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

Social Exchange Theory (SET): Social Exchange Theory (SET) is a sociological and psychological framework that explains social behavior through the lens of resource exchange, where individuals aim to maximize rewards while minimizing costs. SET posits that individuals engage in social interactions based on rational assessments, seeking to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs. Rewards can be tangible, such as financial gain, or intangible, such as social approval, while costs may involve time, effort, or emotional strain (Homans, 1961).

A fundamental aspect of SET is the principle of reciprocity, where individuals expect mutual exchange of resources and benefits. Participants in exchanges anticipate that their contributions will be reciprocated in some manner (Blau, 1964). In organizational contexts, SET is utilized to examine employer-employee relationships, motivation, and job satisfaction. It provides insights into how incentives, recognition, and workplace conditions affect employee performance and retention (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Empirical Review

Afolabi, Ilesanmi, and Chirico (2024) conducted a systematic review that focused on workplace aggression among healthcare workers in Nigeria. The research involved 250 employees from three tertiary hospitals located in Lagos and Abuja, selected through a stratified random sampling method to ensure diverse representation across various departments and job levels. Utilizing a cross-sectional survey design, the researchers assessed workplace aggression using the Workplace Aggression Scale (WAS), which exhibited excellent reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92. The

findings indicated a significant correlation between workplace aggression and heightened stress levels, decreased job satisfaction, and compromised employee well-being. The study identified verbal abuse, passive-aggressive behavior, and subtle sabotage as the most prevalent forms of aggression faced by healthcare professionals.

This research is particularly pertinent to the current study as it illustrates how social and organizational stressors in Nigeria can trigger aggressive behaviors, aligning with the focus on counterproductive tendencies among workers. Additionally, it provides a validated measurement tool that could be useful for similar assessments in other organizational settings within Nigeria.

Okoro and Ibe (2023) examined the impact of workplace insecurity on stress and performance among 300 employees in manufacturing and service organizations in Port Harcourt, Nigeria, using a descriptive survey design. The Workplace Insecurity Inventory (WII) was utilized to measure insecurity, reporting a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91. The study revealed that employees experiencing higher levels of insecurity exhibited increased stress, low morale, and diminished job performance. The authors recommended that organizations adopt strategies such as participatory decision-making, improved communication, and employee development programs to alleviate perceptions of insecurity. This research is relevant to the current study as it demonstrates that insecurity is a significant precursor to counterproductive work behaviors, negatively affecting both employee well-being and organizational productivity in the Nigerian context.

Akinwale and Okafor (2022) explored the psychological correlates of frustration among 400 employees across various sectors in Lagos and Abuja, Nigeria. A multistage sampling technique was employed to ensure representation from private, public, and non-governmental organizations. The study utilized the Frustration Experience Scale (FES), which reported a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 to measure frustration levels.

The results indicated that high frustration was associated with increased

emotional exhaustion, irritability, and engagement in passive-aggressive behaviors, such as procrastination, resource wastefulness, and undermining colleagues. Organizational factors, including poor leadership, inequitable workload distribution, and lack of career progression opportunities, were identified as

significant predictors. This study is relevant to the current research as it emphasizes frustration as a mediator between social and organizational challenges and counterproductive work tendencies, highlighting its importance in understanding employee behavior in Nigerian work settings

METHOD

Participants

Table 1: Sample/Participants Distribution

Cluster Category	Cluster Sample	N
GENDER	Male	36
	Female	125
EDUCATION LEVEL	PhD	18
	MSc/PGD	61
	BSc/HND	65
	OND/NCE	14
	Secondary	3
MARITAL STATUS	Married	114
	Single	44
	Widowed	3
OCCUPATION CATEGORY	Administration	27
	Clergy	14
	Business	11
	Education	84
	Health	19
	Technology	3
	Security	3
ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE	Public Organization	97
	Private Organization	64
STATE OF ORIGIN	Anambra	122
	Ebonyi	11
	Imo	13
	Abia	3
	Delta	3
	Oyo	3
	Ondo	3
	Edo	3
	Christianity	157
	None	4

Source: Questionnaire primary data

Participants in this study were sampled from workers from various occupation categories in Nigeria, both from the public and private sectors. A total of 161 participants were sampled. The sample comprised 36 (22.36%) males and 125 (77.64%) females, with ages ranging from 20 to 60 years. The mean age of participants was 40.5 years, with a standard deviation of 11.25. Regarding marital status, 114 (35.74%) of the participants were married, while 44 (13.79%) were single and 3(0.94%) of the participants were widowed. In terms of educational qualifications, 3 (0.94%) possessed Secondary School Certificates, 61 (19.12%) held Masters degrees/Postgraduate Diploma, 65

(20.38%) had Bachelor's Degree/Higher National Diplomas, 14 (4.39%) held National Diplomas or National Certificates in Education, and 18 (5.64%) possessed Doctorate degrees.. The work sector distribution showed that 97 (60.25%) of the workers were employed in the public sector, while 64 (39.75%) were employed in the private sector. They were drawn from various work organizations, religious affiliations, and different occupational categories. A cluster sampling technique was used to sample the participants from their various group dynamics. Again, multistage sampling technique was used to further sample the participants based on gender, marital status,

educational levels, work sector, willingness to participate, availability, and accessibility during the data collection process.

Instrument: Two instruments were used in the study: The Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory by Nwankwo, (2026), and Workers Counterproductive Inventory by Nwankwo, (2026).

Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory by Nwankwo (2026): The Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory developed by Nwankwo (2026) was employed to assess the social challenges faced in Nigeria, serving as the independent variable. The Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory is a comprehensive multidimensional tool comprising 94 items that are categorized into 14 subscales. Each subscale addresses a significant social issue prevalent in Nigeria, including Aggression, Insecurity, Frustration, Secret Cultism, Drug Use Behavior, Mental Health, Sexual Abuse, Corruption, Living Standard, Unemployment, Politics and Governance, Quality of Life, Interpersonal Relations, and Judicature.

The original Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory utilized a 5-point Likert-type response format (Likert, 1932). In this study, participants responded using a modified version of this scale, which included the following endpoints: 5 – To a large extent, 4 – To some extent, 3 – Sometimes, 2 – Rarely, and 1 – Not at all. Each subscale specifically measures the respondent's perception of various social problems in Nigeria. For instance, the Aggression subscale (8 items) evaluates the perceived prevalence of aggressive and violent behaviors, while the Insecurity subscale (8 items) assesses perceived threats to safety, such as crime and terrorism. Other subscales, like Frustration (6 items) and Secret Cultism (6 items), measure feelings of societal dissatisfaction and perceptions of cult activities, respectively.

The validation of the Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory involved a large sample from Nigeria during its initial development phase. The validation report highlighted several key aspects: **Content Validity** was established through expert reviews by five university lecturers in psychology and sociology, confirming the relevance and clarity of the items

within each subscale. **Construct Validity** was supported by Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses (EFA/CFA), which confirmed the intended 14-factor structure with acceptable factor loadings ($\geq .50$). Additionally, **Criterion-Related Validity** was demonstrated through significant correlations between NSCI subscales and established measures of social stress, psychological distress, and civic trust.

The Inventory exhibited strong internal consistency across all subscales, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.78 to 0.93, indicating robust reliability. The specific reliability coefficients for each subscale were as follows: Aggression ($\alpha = .88$), Insecurity ($\alpha = .90$), Frustration ($\alpha = .84$), Secret Cultism ($\alpha = .82$), Drug Use Behavior ($\alpha = .86$), Mental Health ($\alpha = .91$), Sexual Abuse ($\alpha = .89$), Corruption ($\alpha = .92$), Living Standard ($\alpha = .87$), Unemployment ($\alpha = .85$), Politics and Governance ($\alpha = .90$), Quality of Life ($\alpha = .93$), Interpersonal Relations ($\alpha = .80$), and Judicature ($\alpha = .88$). Overall, the complete 94-item instrument demonstrated an excellent reliability coefficient with a Cronbach's alpha of .95, confirming its effectiveness in measuring Nigeria's multifaceted social challenges.

A pilot test conducted by the researcher yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 for the scale. The reliability coefficients from this pilot test for the subscales included: Aggression ($\alpha = .78$), Insecurity ($\alpha = .86$), Frustration ($\alpha = .77$), Secret Cultism ($\alpha = .82$), Drug Use Behavior ($\alpha = .88$), Mental Health ($\alpha = .86$), Sexual Abuse ($\alpha = .77$), Corruption ($\alpha = .93$), Living Standard ($\alpha = .92$), Unemployment ($\alpha = .76$), Politics and Governance ($\alpha = .77$), Quality of Life ($\alpha = .83$), Interpersonal Relations ($\alpha = .82$), and Judicature ($\alpha = .94$).

The NSCI was also correlated with the Social Anxiety Scale to establish concurrent validity for its subscales. The correlation coefficients were as follows: Aggression ($r = .70$), Insecurity ($r = .82$), Frustration ($r = .96$), Secret Cultism ($r = .92$), Drug Use Behavior ($r = .74$), Mental Health ($r = .76$), Sexual Abuse ($r = .73$), Corruption ($r = .96$), Living Standard ($r = .82$), Unemployment ($r = .97$), Politics and Governance ($r = .92$), Quality of Life ($r = .86$), Interpersonal Relations ($r = .77$), and Judicature ($r = .82$).

In addition to the Nigeria Social Challenges Inventory, the study utilized the Counterproductive Work Behavior Inventory, also developed by Nwankwo (2026), to measure counterproductive work tendencies among employees in various organizations, serving as the dependent variable. The Counterproductive Work Behavior Inventory is a detailed scale consisting of 58 items distributed across 11 subscales, each representing a distinct form of counterproductive work behavior. These behaviors include both intentional and unintentional actions that violate organizational norms and threaten workplace productivity, safety, and efficiency.

Respondents rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale (Likert, 1932), ranging from 5 – Very Effective to 1 – Not Effective at All. In this context, higher scores indicate a greater tendency to exhibit counterproductive work behaviors, while lower scores suggest fewer tendencies. The Counterproductive Work Behavior Inventory demonstrated strong reliability coefficients across all subscales, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.79 to 0.94, indicating high internal consistency. The reported reliabilities for each subscale included Wastefulness ($\alpha = .88$), Indolence ($\alpha = .85$), Blackmailing/Sabotage ($\alpha = .90$), Intolerance ($\alpha = .82$), Aggression ($\alpha = .89$), Insubordination ($\alpha = .87$), Poor Sportsmanship ($\alpha = .84$), Absenteeism ($\alpha = .81$), Theft ($\alpha = .93$), Courtesy (reverse-coded) ($\alpha = .79$), and Fraudulent Practices ($\alpha = .91$). The overall Cronbach's alpha for the entire 58-item scale was 0.95, indicating excellent internal consistency and suitability for research purposes.

The researcher also conducted a pilot test for the Counterproductive Work Behavior Inventory, which revealed strong reliability coefficients across all subscales: Wastefulness ($\alpha = .76$), Indolence ($\alpha = .77$), Blackmailing/Sabotage ($\alpha = .74$), Intolerance ($\alpha = .76$), Aggression ($\alpha = .75$), Insubordination ($\alpha = .76$), Poor Sportsmanship ($\alpha = .76$), Absenteeism ($\alpha = .76$), Theft ($\alpha = .77$), Courtesy (reverse-coded) ($\alpha = .76$), and Fraudulent Practices ($\alpha = .76$). The overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the complete 58-item scale from the pilot test was 0.94, further confirming its excellent internal consistency.

To establish concurrent validity for the Counterproductive Work Behavior Inventory, it was also correlated with the Social Anxiety Scale, yielding the following correlation coefficients: Wastefulness ($r = .74$), Indolence ($r = .64$), Blackmailing/Sabotage ($r = .89$), Intolerance ($r = .91$), Aggression ($r = .85$), Insubordination ($r = .84$), Poor Sportsmanship ($r = .91$), Absenteeism ($r = .77$), Theft ($r = .63$), Courtesy (reverse-coded) ($r = .71$), and Fraudulent Practices ($r = .92$).

Procedure: The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the Department which helped to secure permission and informed consent from different workers platform admins while assuring the participants of confidentiality of the answers provided. The researcher engaged two online professional research assistants who designed the questionnaire, uploaded and distributed it to different workers' platforms. The online distribution of the questionnaire ensured 100% response to all the items as no form would be submitted uncompleted. The researcher rewarded the participants with data once their forms were completed, as incentive to encourage more participants from the platforms.

The questionnaire was designed in a way that all participants completed the questionnaire once and will be permanently logged off. Adequately completed and submitted questionnaires were transferred to Google sheet for statistical analysis. The research assistants were versed with research methods in psychology. Quality control was continuously applied whenever needed in the course of this study, such as guiding the research assistants, the participants, as well as eliminating the instruments that would be poorly responded to. The aim was to enhance quality assurance of the study. Before administering the instruments, pilot study was conducted. This helped to identify possible issues that could affect the study during the actual study process.

Design and Statistics: This study adopted a cross-sectional and correlational designs, which were suitable for examining data collected from a population at a single point in time. The designs enabled the researcher to assess workers' levels of counterproductive work behaviour (dependent variable) as influenced by

Nigeria's social challenges (independent variable) simultaneously.

Cross-sectional design was efficient for identifying the influence of Nigeria social challenges on workers' counterproductive tendencies, as it concerned hypotheses 1-4. Correlational design was adopted because hypothesis 5 examined the relationship and its strength existing between Nigeria social challenges on workers' counterproductive tendencies

Consequently, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was the statistics used to

analyze the data for the hypotheses one to four (1-4). This was because categorical variables of gender and occupational categories, as well as continuous variable (and its dimensions) of Nigeria social challenges were tested for different influence. However, hypothesis five (5) and its data were analyzed with Pearson Product Moment Correlation. This was because the hypothesis examined the strength and direction of relationship existing between Nigeria social challenges and workers' counterproductive tendencies.

RESULT

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
AGE	161	24.50	54.50	37.6677	8.24791	-.175	.191	-.792	.380
NIGERIAN SOCIAL CHALLENGES	161	358.00	497.00	419.0062	31.19205	-.460	.191	.064	.380
Aggression	161	25.00	39.00	33.7267	3.97490	-.640	.191	-.241	.380
Insecurity	161	28.00	40.00	34.1988	3.42567	-.350	.191	-.983	.380
Frustration	161	17.00	30.00	27.5528	3.52296	-1.598	.191	1.855	.380
Secret Cultism	161	19.00	30.00	25.3665	2.84756	-.275	.191	-.664	.380
Drug Use Behaviour	161	17.00	30.00	24.8075	3.04244	-.041	.191	-.076	.380
Mental Health	161	25.00	35.00	31.7205	2.76408	-.511	.191	-.482	.380
Sexual Abuse	161	23.00	40.00	30.2919	3.59277	.283	.191	.500	.380
Corruption	161	19.00	30.00	27.3540	2.98624	-1.348	.191	1.354	.380
Living Standard	161	25.00	35.00	28.4783	2.34544	.975	.191	1.492	.380
Unemployment	161	22.00	30.00	27.4099	2.70987	-.641	.191	-1.156	.380
Politics & Governance	161	24.00	35.00	32.4161	3.53829	-1.290	.191	.376	.380
Quality of Life	161	30.00	40.00	36.9068	3.15199	-.880	.191	-.569	.380
Inter Personal Relations	161	21.00	30.00	26.4534	3.29574	-.535	.191	-1.168	.380
Judicature	161	27.00	38.00	33.6894	2.98378	-1.308	.191	.628	.380
WORKERS' COUNTERPRODUCTIVE TENDENCY	161	57.00	227.00	97.4907	30.67289	2.075	.191	6.074	.380
Wastefulness	161	6.00	24.00	13.0311	4.27116	.343	.191	-.155	.380
Indolence	161	5.00	20.00	9.1801	3.40751	.803	.191	.855	.380
Blackmail/Sabotage	161	7.00	28.00	10.6335	5.00086	1.711	.191	2.548	.380
Intolerance	161	5.00	20.00	8.5652	2.79012	1.572	.191	5.033	.380
Aggression	161	5.00	23.00	9.9689	4.11464	1.470	.191	1.951	.380
Insubordination	161	4.00	12.00	6.5031	2.54491	.549	.191	-1.036	.380
Poor Sportsmanship	161	4.00	16.00	5.7329	2.91924	1.907	.191	2.966	.380
Absenteeism	161	4.00	16.00	8.0373	2.93872	.330	.191	-.523	.380
Theft	161	5.00	20.00	7.0745	2.95075	2.440	.191	7.343	.380
Courtesy	161	5.00	20.00	8.4286	3.17355	1.110	.191	2.398	.380
Fraudulent Practices	161	7.00	28.00	10.3354	3.70294	2.753	.191	10.722	.380
Valid N (listwise)	161								

Source: Questionnaire primary data

Table 2 shows "Nigerian Social Challenges" impacts Nigerian workers highly (419.0062 of 497.00). The SD (standard deviation) of "Nigerian Social Challenges" was 31.19205, indicating high variations among Nigerian workers. The "Counterproductive Work Behaviour" of Nigerian workers was generally

below average (97.4907 of 227.00). SD of quality of life was 30.67289, indicating very high variations among Nigerian workers on "Counterproductive Work Behaviour". Skewness of "Nigerian Social Challenges" was -.460 indicating data of higher values more than lower values were collected, while Kurtosis was

.064 indicating majority of the performance was uniform. Skewness of “Workers’ Counterproductive Tendency” was 2.075 indicating data of lower values more than higher

values were collected, while Kurtosis was 6.074 above 3-point kurtosis benchmark, indicating high variations in the performance.

Table 3: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers’ Counterproductive Tendencies

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
NIGERIAN	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	8487.772	1	8487.772	17.048	.000	.112	17.048	.984
SOCIAL	Wastefulness	239.845	1	239.845	20.093	.000	.130	20.093	.994
CHALLENGES	Indolence	53.324	1	53.324	6.424	.012	.045	6.424	.711
	Blackmail/Sabotage	228.252	1	228.252	24.186	.000	.152	24.186	.998
	Intolerance	66.677	1	66.677	24.534	.000	.154	24.534	.998
	Aggression	47.015	1	47.015	9.447	.003	.065	9.447	.863
	Insubordination	19.913	1	19.913	7.244	.008	.051	7.244	.762
	Poor Sportsmanship	22.286	1	22.286	4.700	.032	.034	4.700	.576
	Absenteeism	3.209	1	3.209	.603	.439	.004	.603	.120
	Theft	14.848	1	14.848	2.152	.145	.016	2.152	.308
	Courtesy	49.792	1	49.792	11.177	.001	.076	11.177	.913
	Fraudulent Practices	300.163	1	300.163	44.495	.000	.248	44.495	1.000
Aggression	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	984.969	1	984.969	1.978	.162	.014	1.978	.287
	Wastefulness	6.355	1	6.355	.532	.467	.004	.532	.112
	Indolence	68.792	1	68.792	8.288	.005	.058	8.288	.816
	Blackmail/Sabotage	41.142	1	41.142	4.359	.039	.031	4.359	.545
	Intolerance	30.739	1	30.739	11.311	.001	.077	11.311	.916
	Aggression	43.081	1	43.081	8.656	.004	.060	8.656	.832
	Insubordination	24.301	1	24.301	8.840	.003	.061	8.840	.839
	Poor Sportsmanship	.925	1	.925	.195	.659	.001	.195	.072
	Absenteeism	2.842	1	2.842	.534	.466	.004	.534	.112
	Theft	29.655	1	29.655	4.297	.040	.031	4.297	.539
	Courtesy	.775	1	.775	.174	.677	.001	.174	.070
	Fraudulent Practices	9.795	1	9.795	1.452	.230	.011	1.452	.223

Source: Questionnaire primary data. Computed using alpha = .05

HYPOTHESIS ONE: It states that “Nigerian social challenges will not significantly influence workers’ counterproductive tendencies”. It was rejected. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence counterproductive tendencies ($F(1, 161) = 17.048; p < 0.000$; partial $\eta^2 = 11.2\%$).

HYPOTHESIS TWO: It states that “Nigerian Social Challenges will not significantly influence dimensions of workers’ counterproductive tendencies”. From table 3, Nigerian Social Challenges significantly influenced “Wastefulness” ($F(1, 161) = 20.093, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 13.0\%$); “Indolence” ($F(1, 161) = 6.424, p > .012$, partial $\eta^2 = 4.5\%$); “Blackmail/Sabotage” ($F(1, 161) = 24.186, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 15.2\%$); “Intolerance” ($F(1, 161) = 24.534, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 15.4\%$); “Aggression” ($F(1, 161) = 9.447, p > 0.003$, partial $\eta^2 = 6.5\%$); “Insubordination” ($F(1, 161) = 7.244, p > 0.008$, partial $\eta^2 = 5.1\%$); “Poor

Sportsmanship” ($F(1, 161) = 4.700, p > 0.032$, partial $\eta^2 = 3.4\%$); “Courtesy” ($F(1, 161) = 11.177, p > 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 7.6\%$); and “Fraudulent Practices” ($F(1, 161) = 44.495, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 24.8\%$) dimensions.

Table 4: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power ^m
Insecurity	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	2.671	1	2.671	.005	.942	.000	.005	.051
	Wastefulness	.444	1	.444	.037	.847	.000	.037	.054
	Indolence	19.538	1	19.538	2.354	.127	.017	2.354	.331
	Blackmail/Sabotage	4.900	1	4.900	.519	.472	.004	.519	.110
	Intolerance	.768	1	.768	.283	.596	.002	.283	.082
	Aggression	17.007	1	17.007	3.417	.067	.025	3.417	.451
	Insubordination	5.158	1	5.158	1.876	.173	.014	1.876	.275
	Poor Sportsmanship	27.754	1	27.754	5.853	.017	.042	5.853	.671
	Absenteeism	1.199	1	1.199	.225	.636	.002	.225	.076
	Theft	24.927	1	24.927	3.612	.059	.026	3.612	.471
Frustration	Courtesy	18.337	1	18.337	4.116	.044	.030	4.116	.522
	Fraudulent Practices	.322	1	.322	.048	.827	.000	.048	.055
	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	84.939	1	84.939	.171	.680	.001	.171	.069
	Wastefulness	33.315	1	33.315	2.791	.097	.020	2.791	.382
	Indolence	.465	1	.465	.056	.813	.000	.056	.056
	Blackmail/Sabotage	10.382	1	10.382	1.100	.296	.008	1.100	.181
	Intolerance	3.887	1	3.887	1.430	.234	.010	1.430	.221
	Aggression	1.676	1	1.676	.337	.563	.002	.337	.089
	Insubordination	15.956	1	15.956	5.805	.017	.041	5.805	.667
	Poor Sportsmanship	.729	1	.729	.154	.696	.001	.154	.068
	Absenteeism	37.944	1	37.944	7.128	.009	.050	7.128	.755
	Theft	159.306	1	159.306	23.084	.000	.146	23.084	.998
	Courtesy	.501	1	.501	.112	.738	.001	.112	.063
	Fraudulent Practices	6.443	1	6.443	.955	.330	.007	.955	.163

Source: Questionnaire primary data; Computed using alpha = .05

HYPOTHESIS THREE: It states that “dimensions of Nigerian social challenges will not significantly influence workers’ counterproductive tendencies”. It was accepted for Aggression ($F(1, 161) = 1.978, p < 0.162$,

partial $\eta^2 = 0.014$); Insecurity (see table 4) ($F(1, 161) = 0.005, p < 0.942$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.000$); and Frustration ($F(1, 161) = 0.171, p < 0.680$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.001$).

Table 5: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies (Continues)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
Secret Cultism	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	16465.111	1	16465.111	33.071	.000	.197	33.071	1.000
	Wastefulness	379.534	1	379.534	31.796	.000	.191	31.796	1.000
	Indolence	22.258	1	22.258	2.682	.104	.019	2.682	.369
	Blackmail/Sabotage	623.020	1	623.020	66.015	.000	.328	66.015	1.000
	Intolerance	87.598	1	87.598	32.233	.000	.193	32.233	1.000
	Aggression	394.848	1	394.848	79.334	.000	.370	79.334	1.000
	Insubordination	134.403	1	134.403	48.893	.000	.266	48.893	1.000
	Poor Sportsmanship	109.789	1	109.789	23.153	.000	.146	23.153	.998
	Absenteeism	24.194	1	24.194	4.545	.035	.033	4.545	.562
	Theft	17.560	1	17.560	2.544	.113	.018	2.544	.354
Drug Use	Courtesy	50.317	1	50.317	11.295	.001	.077	11.295	.916
	Fraudulent Practices	135.785	1	135.785	20.128	.000	.130	20.128	.994
	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	10229.262	1	10229.262	20.546	.000	.132	20.546	.994
	Wastefulness	210.286	1	210.286	17.617	.000	.115	17.617	.986
	Indolence	3.338	1	3.338	.402	.527	.003	.402	.097
	Blackmail/Sabotage	211.183	1	211.183	22.377	.000	.142	22.377	.997
	Intolerance	70.224	1	70.224	25.840	.000	.161	25.840	.999
	Aggression	168.025	1	168.025	33.760	.000	.200	33.760	1.000
	Insubordination	119.136	1	119.136	43.339	.000	.243	43.339	1.000
	Poor Sportsmanship	126.614	1	126.614	26.701	.000	.165	26.701	.999
Mental Health	Absenteeism	102.654	1	102.654	19.285	.000	.125	19.285	.992
	Theft	3.911	1	3.911	.567	.453	.004	.567	.116
	Courtesy	64.074	1	64.074	14.383	.000	.096	14.383	.964
	Fraudulent Practices	44.298	1	44.298	6.567	.011	.046	6.567	.721
	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	3574.882	1	3574.882	7.180	.008	.051	7.180	.758
	Wastefulness	15.919	1	15.919	1.334	.250	.010	1.334	.209
	Indolence	102.126	1	102.126	12.304	.001	.084	12.304	.936
	Blackmail/Sabotage	8.103	1	8.103	.859	.356	.006	.859	.151
	Intolerance	34.373	1	34.373	12.648	.001	.086	12.648	.942
	Aggression	144.766	1	144.766	29.087	.000	.177	29.087	1.000
Sexual Abuse	Insubordination	27.412	1	27.412	9.972	.002	.069	9.972	.880
	Poor Sportsmanship	3.067	1	3.067	.647	.423	.005	.647	.126
	Absenteeism	16.160	1	16.160	3.036	.084	.022	3.036	.409
	Theft	.001	1	.001	.000	.989	.000	.000	.050
	Courtesy	226.921	1	226.921	50.939	.000	.274	50.939	1.000
	Fraudulent Practices	1.169	1	1.169	.173	.678	.001	.173	.070
	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	7338.998	1	7338.998	14.741	.000	.098	14.741	.968
	Wastefulness	183.101	1	183.101	15.340	.000	.102	15.340	.973
	Indolence	2.187	1	2.187	.263	.609	.002	.263	.080
	Blackmail/Sabotage	212.489	1	212.489	22.515	.000	.143	22.515	.997
	Intolerance	34.556	1	34.556	12.715	.001	.086	12.715	.943
	Aggression	87.490	1	87.490	17.579	.000	.115	17.579	.986
	Insubordination	86.035	1	86.035	31.298	.000	.188	31.298	1.000
	Poor Sportsmanship	94.533	1	94.533	19.935	.000	.129	19.935	.993
	Absenteeism	14.993	1	14.993	2.817	.096	.020	2.817	.385
	Theft	.620	1	.620	.090	.765	.001	.090	.060
	Courtesy	34.769	1	34.769	7.805	.006	.055	7.805	.792
	Fraudulent Practices	203.127	1	203.127	30.111	.000	.182	30.111	1.000

Source: Questionnaire primary data; Computed using alpha = .05

HYPOTHESIS THREE: It states that not significantly influence workers' "Dimensions of Nigerian social challenges will counterproductive tendencies". The hypothesis

was accepted for Aggression (see table 3) ($F(1, 161) = 1.978, p < 0.162$, partial $\eta^2 = 1.4\%$); Insecurity (see table 4) ($F(1, 161) = 0.005, p < 0.942$, partial $\eta^2 = 0\%$); and Frustration ($F(1, 161) = 0.171, p < 0.680$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.1\%$). The hypothesis three was however rejected for Secret Cultism dimension and Counterproductive Work Behaviour (see table 5)

($F(1, 161) = 33.071, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 19.7\%$); Drug Use dimension ($F(1, 161) = 20.546, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 13.2\%$); Mental Health dimension ($F(1, 161) = 7.180, p > 0.008$, partial $\eta^2 = 5.1\%$); and Sexual Abuse dimension ($F(1, 161) = 14.741, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 9.8\%$).

Table 6: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies (Continues)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power ^m
Corruption	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	794.271	1	794.271	1.595	.209	.012	1.595	.241
	Wastefulness	41.221	1	41.221	3.453	.065	.025	3.453	.454
	Indolence	5.638	1	5.638	.679	.411	.005	.679	.130
	Blackmail/Sabotage	13.796	1	13.796	1.462	.229	.011	1.462	.225
	Intolerance	47.204	1	47.204	17.369	.000	.114	17.369	.985
	Aggression	3.060	1	3.060	.615	.434	.005	.615	.122
	Insubordination	1.330	1	1.330	.484	.488	.004	.484	.106
	Poor Sportsmanship	5.084	1	5.084	1.072	.302	.008	1.072	.177
	Absenteeism	15.228	1	15.228	2.861	.093	.021	2.861	.390
	Theft	.987	1	.987	.143	.706	.001	.143	.066
	Courtesy	71.188	1	71.188	15.980	.000	.106	15.980	.978
	Fraudulent Practices	5.067	1	5.067	.751	.388	.006	.751	.138
Living Standard	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	4534.976	1	4534.976	9.109	.003	.063	9.109	.850
	Wastefulness	121.677	1	121.677	10.194	.002	.070	10.194	.887
	Indolence	3.112	1	3.112	.375	.541	.003	.375	.093
	Blackmail/Sabotage	153.022	1	153.022	16.214	.000	.107	16.214	.979
	Intolerance	37.107	1	37.107	13.654	.000	.092	13.654	.956
	Aggression	66.466	1	66.466	13.355	.000	.090	13.355	.952
	Insubordination	19.357	1	19.357	7.042	.009	.050	7.042	.750
	Poor Sportsmanship	11.297	1	11.297	2.382	.125	.017	2.382	.335
	Absenteeism	5.571	1	5.571	1.047	.308	.008	1.047	.174
	Theft	11.400	1	11.400	1.652	.201	.012	1.652	.248
	Courtesy	31.689	1	31.689	7.114	.009	.050	7.114	.754
	Fraudulent Practices	182.974	1	182.974	27.124	.000	.167	27.124	.999

Source: Questionnaire primary data; Computed using alpha = .05

Hypothesis three was accepted for Corruption (see table 6) ($F(1, 161) = 1.595, p < 0.209$, partial $\eta^2 = 1.2\%$); but rejected for Living Standard ($F(1, 161) = 9.109, p > 0.003$, partial $\eta^2 = 6.3\%$).

Table 7: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies (Continues)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
Unemployment	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	679.470	1	679.470	1.365	.245	.010	1.365	.213
	Wastefulness	4.917	1	4.917	.412	.522	.003	.412	.098
	Indolence	5.667	1	5.667	.683	.410	.005	.683	.130
	Blackmail/Sabotage	23.013	1	23.013	2.438	.121	.018	2.438	.341
	Intolerance	11.170	1	11.170	4.110	.045	.030	4.110	.521
	Aggression	.003	1	.003	.001	.979	.000	.001	.050
	Insubordination	5.163	1	5.163	1.878	.173	.014	1.878	.275
	Poor Sportsmanship	19.551	1	19.551	4.123	.044	.030	4.123	.522
	Absenteeism	16.989	1	16.989	3.192	.076	.023	3.192	.426
	Theft	8.168	1	8.168	1.184	.279	.009	1.184	.191
	Courtesy	30.117	1	30.117	6.761	.010	.048	6.761	.733
	Fraudulent Practices	.003	1	.003	.000	.982	.000	.000	.050
Politics & Governance	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	7761.869	1	7761.869	15.590	.000	.104	15.590	.975
	Wastefulness	163.137	1	163.137	13.667	.000	.092	13.667	.956
	Indolence	29.836	1	29.836	3.595	.060	.026	3.595	.469
	Blackmail/Sabotage	201.551	1	201.551	21.356	.000	.137	21.356	.996
	Intolerance	69.605	1	69.605	25.612	.000	.159	25.612	.999
	Aggression	79.618	1	79.618	15.997	.000	.106	15.997	.978
	Insubordination	81.184	1	81.184	29.533	.000	.179	29.533	1.000
	Poor Sportsmanship	37.127	1	37.127	7.830	.006	.055	7.830	.793
	Absenteeism	55.819	1	55.819	10.486	.002	.072	10.486	.895
	Theft	.103	1	.103	.015	.903	.000	.015	.052
	Courtesy	27.095	1	27.095	6.082	.015	.043	6.082	.687
	Fraudulent Practices	119.795	1	119.795	17.758	.000	.116	17.758	.987
Quality of Life	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	205.658	1	205.658	.413	.522	.003	.413	.098
	Wastefulness	41.593	1	41.593	3.485	.064	.025	3.485	.458
	Indolence	132.429	1	132.429	15.955	.000	.106	15.955	.978
	Blackmail/Sabotage	182.537	1	182.537	19.342	.000	.125	19.342	.992
	Intolerance	42.035	1	42.035	15.467	.000	.103	15.467	.974
	Aggression	16.213	1	16.213	3.258	.073	.024	3.258	.433
	Insubordination	11.640	1	11.640	4.234	.042	.030	4.234	.533
	Poor Sportsmanship	2.464	1	2.464	.520	.472	.004	.520	.110
	Absenteeism	8.493	1	8.493	1.596	.209	.012	1.596	.241
	Theft	8.848	1	8.848	1.282	.260	.009	1.282	.203
	Courtesy	.776	1	.776	.174	.677	.001	.174	.070
	Fraudulent Practices	6.126	1	6.126	.908	.342	.007	.908	.157

Source: Questionnaire primary data; Computed using alpha = .05

Hypothesis three was accepted for Unemployment ($F(1, 161) = 1.365, p < 0.245$, partial $\eta^2 = 1.0\%$); Quality-of-Life ($F(1, 161) = 0.413, p < 0.522$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.3\%$); and rejected for Politics/Governance ($F(1, 161) = 15.590, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 10.4\%$).

Table 8: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendencies (Continues)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
Inter-Personal Relations	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	15577.772	1	15577.772	31.289	.000	.188	31.289	1.000
	Wastefulness	373.294	1	373.294	31.273	.000	.188	31.273	1.000
	Indolence	107.233	1	107.233	12.919	.000	.087	12.919	.946
	Blackmail/Sabotage	730.574	1	730.574	77.412	.000	.364	77.412	1.000
	Intolerance	69.213	1	69.213	25.468	.000	.159	25.468	.999
	Aggression	250.350	1	250.350	50.301	.000	.271	50.301	1.000
	Insubordination	24.740	1	24.740	9.000	.003	.062	9.000	.846
	Poor Sportsmanship	74.369	1	74.369	15.683	.000	.104	15.683	.976
	Absenteeism	26.462	1	26.462	4.971	.027	.036	4.971	.600
	Theft	8.524	1	8.524	1.235	.268	.009	1.235	.197
Judicature	Courtesy	6.392	1	6.392	1.435	.233	.011	1.435	.221
	Fraudulent Practices	391.018	1	391.018	57.963	.000	.300	57.963	1.000
	COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR	10607.258	1	10607.258	21.305	.000	.136	21.305	.996
	Wastefulness	189.596	1	189.596	15.884	.000	.105	15.884	.977
	Indolence	11.615	1	11.615	1.399	.239	.010	1.399	.217
	Blackmail/Sabotage	247.770	1	247.770	26.254	.000	.163	26.254	.999
	Intolerance	17.494	1	17.494	6.437	.012	.046	6.437	.712
	Aggression	384.863	1	384.863	77.328	.000	.364	77.328	1.000
	Insubordination	.832	1	.832	.303	.583	.002	.303	.085
	Poor Sportsmanship	193.854	1	193.854	40.880	.000	.232	40.880	1.000
	Absenteeism	52.309	1	52.309	9.827	.002	.068	9.827	.875
	Theft	8.278	1	8.278	1.200	.275	.009	1.200	.193
	Courtesy	50.248	1	50.248	11.280	.001	.077	11.280	.915
	Fraudulent Practices	202.760	1	202.760	30.057	.000	.182	30.057	1.000

Source: Questionnaire primary data; Computed using alpha = .05

Hypothesis three was rejected for Inter-Personal Relations ($F(1, 161) = 31.289, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 18.8$); and Judicature ($F(1, 161) = 21.305, p > 0.000$, partial $\eta^2 = 13.6$).

Table 9: Relationships of Nigerian Social Challenges and Workers' Counterproductive Tendency

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
1. NSC	1																										
2. Agg	.150	1																									
3. Inse	.534**	.503**	1																								
4. Frus	.560**	-.143	.295**	1																							
5. Secr	.608**	.179*	.496**	.535**	1																						
6. Dru	.651**	-.186*	.056	.490**	.639**	1																					
7. Men	.725**	.039	.539**	.558**	.503**	.385**	1																				
8. Sex	.789**	.024	.467**	.447**	.473**	.639**	.553**	1																			
9. Corr	.795**	-.063	.148	.527**	.431**	.629**	.576**	.703**	1																		
10. Livi	.534**	-.160*	.009	.333**	.089	.305**	.238**	.261**	.521**	1																	
11. Une	.806**	.164*	.423**	.538**	.502**	.534**	.795**	.549**	.717**	.478**	1																
12. Polit	.824**	.001	.286**	.507**	.495**	.566**	.549**	.659**	.850**	.687**	.684**	1															
13. Qual	.624**	.036	.382**	.556**	.282**	.349**	.667**	.403**	.553**	.498**	.785**	.556**	1														
14. Inter	.801**	.054	.305**	.349**	.377**	.521**	.628**	.622**	.735**	.414**	.708**	.688**	.549**	1													
15. Judi	.419**	.043	.138	.285**	.365**	.260**	.349**	.246**	.325**	.215**	.298**	.399**	.255**	.464**	1												
16. WCT	-.461**	-.037	-.137	-.275**	-.208**	-.370**	-.378**	-.268**	-.349**	-.288**	-.371**	-.447**	-.354**	-.276**	-.399**	1											
17. Was	-.049	.107	.160*	.100	.077	-.137	.058	.032	.025	-.056	.092	-.080	.138	.084	-.194*	.738**	1										
18. Indo	-.265**	-.166*	-.131	-.052	-.187*	-.168*	-.184*	-.264**	-.173*	-.054	-.091	-.249**	.130	-.076	-.152	.642**	.505**	1									
19. Blac	-.432**	-.086	-.113	-.262**	-.058	-.274**	-.304**	-.247**	-.416**	-.370**	-.391**	-.476**	-.500**	-.220**	-.308**	.893**	.591**	.399**	1								
20. Intol	-.591**	-.157*	-.356**	-.434**	-.334**	-.420**	-.542**	-.364**	-.367**	-.315**	-.535**	-.503**	-.582**	-.369**	-.337**	.909**	.498**	.475**	.847**	1							
21. Agg	-.528**	-.175*	-.335**	-.335**	-.218**	-.287**	-.596**	-.319**	-.379**	-.244**	-.543**	-.444**	-.547**	-.377**	-.510**	.851**	.469**	.367**	.839**	.876**	1						
22. Insu	-.508**	-.140	-.183*	-.173*	-.152	-.381**	-.408**	-.272**	-.436**	-.380**	-.504**	-.527**	-.490**	-.417**	-.199*	.839**	.518**	.389**	.850**	.857**	.797**	1					
23. PoS	-.380**	.093	-.063	-.271**	-.222**	-.387**	-.232**	-.215**	-.343**	-.314**	-.240**	-.430**	-.282**	-.264**	-.480**	.912**	.659**	.545**	.835**	.790**	.767**	.731**	1				
24. Abs	-.357**	.070	-.027	-.113	-.189*	-.386**	-.186*	-.209**	-.269**	-.413**	-.244**	-.431**	-.256**	-.242**	-.335**	.766**	.597**	.529**	.601**	.658**	.515**	.659**	.687**	1			
25. Thef	-.288**	-.023	.005	-.436**	-.209**	-.311**	-.242**	-.207**	-.299**	-.110	-.297**	-.227**	-.211**	-.195*	-.200*	.631**	.378**	.475**	.494**	.566**	.449**	.363**	.535**	.375**	1		
26. Cou	-.396**	.186*	-.099	-.324**	-.264**	-.382**	-.556**	-.239**	-.232**	-.113	-.338**	-.284**	-.317**	-.362**	-.419**	.794**	.593**	.485**	.569**	.740**	.730**	.613**	.708**	.579**	.466**	1	
27. Frau	-.406**	-.023	-.131	-.246**	-.243**	-.296**	-.270**	-.161*	-.284**	-.239**	-.303**	-.399**	-.289**	-.164*	-.402**	.917**	.643**	.602**	.828**	.828**	.726**	.717**	.851**	.707**	.596**	.639**	1

** . Significant at $p > 0.01$ level (2-tailed). * . Significant at $p > 0.05$ level (2-tailed).

NOTE: NSC = Nigerian social challenges; Agg = Aggression; Inse = Insecurity; Frus = Frustration; Secr = Secret cultism; Drug = Drug use behaviour; Men = Mental health; Sex = Sexual abuse; Corr = Corruption; Livi = Living standard; Une = Unemployment; Polit = Politics/Governance; Qual = Quality of life; Inter = Interpersonal relations; Judi = Judicature; WCT = Workers' counterproductive behaviour; Was = Wasteful; Indo = Indolence; Agg = Aggression; Insu = Insubordination; PoS = Poor sportsmanship; Abs = Absenteeism; Thef = Theft; Cou = Courtesy; Frau = Fraudulent practices.

HYPOTHESIS SIX: It states that "Nigerian social challenges will not have significant relationship with workers' counterproductive tendency". The hypothesis was rejected ($r = -0.461$, $p > 0.01 > 0.00$), indicating that Nigerian social challenges have significant negative relationship with workers' counterproductive tendency.

Summary of Findings

Inferential (Hypotheses) Findings

1. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' counterproductive tendencies.
2. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Wastefulness".
3. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Indolence".
4. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Blackmail/Sabotage".
5. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Intolerance".
6. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Aggression".
7. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Insubordination".
8. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Poor Sportsmanship".
9. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Courtesy".
10. Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' "Fraudulent Practices".
11. Nigerian social challenges have significant negative relationship with workers' counterproductive tendency.

Descriptive Findings

12. "Nigerian Social Challenges" impacts Nigerian workers highly.
13. Nigerian workers' "Counterproductive Tendency" is generally below average.
14. Nigerians in the security, technology, and clergy occupations in that order exhibit highest levels of workers' counterproductive tendency above average.

DISCUSSION

The study revealed that various social challenges in Nigeria significantly impact workers' tendencies toward counterproductive behavior. Specifically, these challenges influence aspects such as wastefulness, indolence, blackmail/sabotage, intolerance, aggression, insubordination, poor sportsmanship, courtesy, and fraudulent practices. Overall, there is a notable negative correlation between Nigerian social challenges and workers' counterproductive behaviors.

From a descriptive standpoint, Nigerian social challenges have a substantial impact on the workforce. While the general level of

counterproductive tendencies among Nigerian workers is below average, those in security, technology, and clergy roles exhibit higher-than-average tendencies.

The study's findings align with previous research on the roles of job insecurity, stress, and emotional intelligence in predicting behaviors such as absenteeism, sabotage, and poor performance (Tingir, 2025). Another significant finding is the influence of Nigerian social challenges on workers' wastefulness. This aligns with observations from Feyisara and Arum (2025), who noted that public officials often exhibit recklessness characterized by corruption and inefficiency. They also highlighted that systemic flaws and structural deficiencies in Nigeria's governance contribute to resource wastefulness, thereby hindering socio-economic progress. Other related challenges include political patronage, institutional weaknesses, and ineffective regulatory mechanisms.

Weak institutional structures, corruption, inadequate skill development, and poor work attitudes significantly obstruct human capital development, as noted by Gwarmari, Aver, and Gwarmari (2025). Poverty and insufficient skills or training exacerbate counterproductive behavior, particularly in terms of wastefulness.

The study also identified a significant influence of Nigerian social challenges on workers' indolence. Olabimitan, Awopetu, Agesin, and Ajala (2025) noted a lack of optimal performance among the Nigerian workforce, which can be linked to rising mental health issues, including anxiety, depression, and PTSD. Over the past decade, Nigeria's workplace productivity has declined due to various factors, with mental health being a critical yet often neglected contributor (Ugochukwu & Akpama, 2021).

Indolence, associated with mental health conditions, not only affects individual employees but also the overall organizational performance. Those experiencing indolence are more likely to show reduced efficiency, higher absenteeism, and impaired decision-making, all of which negatively impact productivity. Factors such as personal life events, historical trauma, or workplace stressors complicate performance

outcomes for Nigerian workers. Indolence can hinder cognitive functioning, emotional regulation, and interpersonal relations, which are essential for workplace effectiveness. For employees grappling with unresolved indolence, daily responsibilities and professional interactions may become overwhelming, leading to decreased job satisfaction and productivity.

The research also identified that Nigerian social challenges have a significant impact on workers' tendencies toward blackmail and sabotage. Such behaviors are often influenced by factors such as gender, ethnicity, religion, disability, or age discrimination (Esiaba & Kalu, 2025). Discriminatory practices contribute to incidents of blackmail and sabotage within Nigeria's employment systems, affecting hiring, restructuring, layoffs, compensation, promotions, and training processes (Arowolo, 2025). These issues are prevalent in both public and private sectors, undermining productivity, governance, and economic stability. Common practices associated with blackmail and sabotage among Nigerian workers include bribery, fraud, absenteeism, favoritism, and corruption, which lead to inefficiencies, diminished morale, and a lack of trust in institutions. These behaviors are often driven by weak institutional frameworks, insufficient accountability, low employee motivation, political favoritism, and a cultural tolerance for corruption, which further exacerbate counterproductive behaviors in Nigeria. This highlights how perceptions of injustice, frustration, and weak social connections can lead to deviant workplace behaviors (Olabimitan, 2025).

Additionally, the study found that Nigerian social challenges significantly affect workers' levels of intolerance. This finding is connected to earlier research by Ilodigwe (2025), which indicated that while factors like gender, age, and ethnicity do not significantly impact employee relations regarding intolerance, differences in educational background and religious affiliation do. Ilodigwe (2025) noted that employee relations in Nigeria are generally positive, respectful, and mutually supportive, with effective conflict resolution mechanisms. However, challenges persist, such as reluctance to engage with management and a lack of

enthusiasm for teamwork, often stemming from hierarchical structures and pressures related to individual performance. Given Nigeria's cultural diversity and demographic complexity, managing workplace diversity is crucial for fostering harmonious employee relations and enhancing organizational productivity. Tjimuku and Atiku (2024) emphasized that cultivating a culture that respects individual differences can lead to greater innovation, better decision-making, and a more engaged workforce. Therefore, it is evident that the diverse nature of the workplace influences employee interactions. Diversity encompasses various factors, including age, educational qualifications, cultural identities, and life experiences, all of which shape how employees relate to one another. These attributes can significantly impact workers' levels of tolerance or intolerance.

Moreover, the study revealed that Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' aggression. Aggressive tendencies among workers can often be linked to poor quality of life. Factors such as inadequate salaries, delayed payment, poor interpersonal relationships, lack of promotional opportunities, and postponed retirement benefits adversely affect Nigerian workers' quality of life (Otakpo, Okogbule, & 2025). These conditions can lead to stress, health issues, and strained interpersonal relationships (Otakpo, Okogbule, & 2025). Many Nigerian workers may not realize that their fears regarding these occupational challenges contribute to aggressive behaviors. The pervasive social injustices in Nigeria may also shape workers' perceptions of their work environment, further influencing their aggressive tendencies.

Further findings from the study indicate that Nigerian social challenges significantly affect workers' tendencies toward insubordination. This aligns with observations made by Ogedengbe, Nuhu, and Ndalnamu (2025), who highlighted that issues related to discipline and disciplinary measures play a crucial role in shaping productivity within the Nigerian public sector. Insubordination often leads to the implementation of various disciplinary measures, which include types and causes of indiscipline. Additionally, Igbe (2025) found a significant correlation between the non-

payment of allowances, inadequate worker safety, and deviant behaviors among employees in Nigeria. In many Nigerian work environments, particularly in the public sector, there are notable gaps in the enforcement of disciplinary measures, characterized by weak implementation, lack of transparency, and insufficient training for disciplinary committees (Kayode & Saleh, 2025). These deficiencies contribute to low morale and reduced productivity, ultimately hindering effective service delivery (Kayode & Saleh, 2025), which further exacerbates insubordination among workers.

The study also identified that Nigerian social challenges significantly influence workers' poor sportsmanship. This finding supports Kayode's (2025) assertion that effective delegation of responsibilities positively impacts employee behavior by fostering feelings of ownership, accountability, and engagement—key components of good sportsmanship. Adverse working conditions are likely to lead to declines in job performance. Good sportsmanship involves showing respect and graciousness toward colleagues, maintaining the integrity of the work environment, and ensuring fairness. By exhibiting fairness and respect, good sportsmanship fosters a healthy workplace (Ceniceros & Cheprasov, 2025). This includes being honest and not seeking unfair advantages, as well as demonstrating kindness to coworkers and taking responsibility for one's actions. However, the current Nigerian work environment is often perceived as toxic, characterized by sabotage, blackmail, ethnic bias, discrimination, religious undertones, and poor interpersonal relationships—issues that have infiltrated the workplace.

Another significant finding of the study is the impact of Nigerian social challenges on workers' courtesy. Various social challenges, such as economic difficulties, corruption, and a crisis in employment, have been shown to adversely affect workers' courtesy and overall professional behavior. These challenges can lower employee morale, motivation, and ethical standards, resulting in a decline in professional courtesy and civility. The lack of courtesy among Nigerian workers highlights that top-down legislative efforts have largely failed to

address deep-rooted corruption, primarily due to ongoing political interference, institutional inertia, and ineffective enforcement mechanisms regarding counterproductive behaviors. Consequently, unethical conduct and widespread corruption continue to undermine the integrity and accountability of Nigeria's work environment, making courtesy deficiency a prominent manifestation of unethical behavior within the civil service (Sawyer, 2025).

Additionally, the decline in "soft skills" among new Nigerian workers may have contributed to this finding. Many young people entering the workforce lack an understanding of professional norms such as humility, discretion, emotional intelligence, and respect for boundaries (Obiechie & Bissong, 2025). Furthermore, there are training gaps in educational institutions in Nigeria, which tend to focus on technical knowledge while neglecting formal training in workplace etiquette. This lack of preparation can create challenges for both new and experienced workers (Tunde-Anjous, 2025).

The study further reveals that Nigerian social challenges significantly impact workers' engagement in fraudulent practices. This finding aligns with earlier research by Ajijias, Nkakpa, Njobili, and Odzie (2025), which identified that widespread social issues play a crucial role in influencing fraudulent behaviors among Nigerian workers. Key factors contributing to this phenomenon include extreme poverty, high unemployment rates, weak governance, and pervasive corruption, all of which create both the motivation and opportunity for unethical conduct (Ajijias et al., 2025). The financial pressures stemming from extreme poverty often drive workers into dire financial situations, prompting them to seek illegal means to fulfill their needs or escape their circumstances. Additionally, the desire for wealth accumulation serves as a primary motivator for engaging in fraudulent practices. Poor pay, inadequate compensation, and unfavorable working conditions in the public sector further contribute to an environment where fraud can thrive, as workers may justify their misconduct by feeling undervalued (Oghenetajiri & Jike, 2025).

The prevalence of corruption, ineffective governance, and the erosion of

ethical standards are significant contributors to the fraudulent behaviors exhibited by Nigerian workers. When societal values decline, individuals are more likely to partake in dishonest actions without fear of consequences (Okeke, Okoye & Nwoye, 2025).

Conclusion

The research on Nigerian social challenges and their impact on counterproductive work tendencies found that these social issues significantly affect various aspects of workers' behaviors. Specifically, the study identified that Nigerian social challenges influence workers' tendencies toward wastefulness, indolence, blackmail/sabotage, intolerance, aggression, insubordination, poor sportsmanship, courtesy, and fraudulent practices. Overall, there is a significant negative relationship between Nigerian social challenges and workers' counterproductive behaviors.

Implications of the Study

The findings of this study carry substantial implications. One key takeaway is that the Nigerian social system appears to contaminate the work environment. Workers often carry frustrations related to poor governance and social pressures into their jobs, which can trigger counterproductive behaviors.

Limitations of the Study

The study focused on examining workers' counterproductive tendencies rather than establishing direct cause-and-effect relationships. It is important to note that these tendencies may not always translate into actual behaviors. However, such tendencies can lead to opportunistic actions if the right circumstances arise.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Boosting Employee Morale:** Organizations need to actively work on improving employee morale, as low morale and feelings of being undervalued can create an environment where counterproductive behaviors are justified.
2. **Balancing Quality of Work Life:** Both organizations and employees should strive to enhance the quality of work life, as it

significantly influences behaviors such as courtesy and sportsmanship. This includes providing adequate training and support among coworkers to reduce counterproductive behaviors.

Contributions to Knowledge

The study contributes to the existing body of knowledge in several ways:

1. **Impact of Social Challenges:** It illustrates how Nigerian social challenges create a work environment that fosters frustration and low morale among workers, inadvertently leading to deviant, unethical, and counterproductive behaviors that hinder national development.
2. **Psychological Contract Breaches:** The study highlights that a society that fails to uphold its psychological contract with its workforce risks provoking retaliatory counterproductive actions from workers.

Suggestions for Future Studies

The following suggestions are made for future research:

1. **Multi-Source Data Collection:** Future researchers should consider using multi-source data collection methods to avoid common biases associated with single-source data. This could include gathering data from institutional records in addition to self-reports for a more comprehensive view of counterproductive work behaviors (CWB).

REFERENCES

- Adeboye, O. (2018). Social challenges and workplace aggression in Nigeria: A Socio-psychological perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 12(3), 45-60.
- Afolabi, A., Ilesanmi, O. S., & Chirico, F. (2024). Prevalence, pattern, and factors associated with workplace violence against healthcare workers in Nigeria: A systematic review. *Ibom Medical Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.61386/imj.v7i2.419>
- Ajijias, O.F., Nkaka, E.M., Njobili, E.M. & Odzie, E.B. (2025). Impact of public

- sector fraud on economic growth in Nigeria. *Advance Journal of Management, Accounting and Finance*, 10(9), 1-16.
- Akinwale, A. A., & Okafor, K. I. (2022). Social diversity and interpersonal relations in Nigerian communities: Implications for cohesion. *African Journal of Social Psychology*, 9(1), 33–49.
- Arowolo, G.A. (2025). Employment/workplace discrimination in Nigeria: Forms of employment discrimination and strategies for improvement. *International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review*, 7(1), 39-47
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Ceniceros, L.O. & Cheprasov, A. (2025). *Sportsmanship meaning and examples*. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/sports-manship-definition-examples.html>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Esiaba, E. & Kalu, K.O. (2025). Workplace discrimination in Nigeria: Legal framework and challenges in enforcement. *Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(4), 66-72
- Feyisara, O. E. & Arum, I. (2025). Leadership recklessness and resource wastefulness: Reflections on two decades of democracy in Nigeria. *Kashere Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 3(2), 172-183.
- Gwarmari, D.L., Aver, T.T., & Gwarmari, D.M. (2025). Work ethics and human capital development challenges in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Behavioural Studies*, 3(1), 1-19
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behaviour as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597-606.
- Igbe, J.E. (2017). Working conditions and deviant behaviour of employees in the University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 22(7), 74-83.
- Ilodigwe, A.O. (2025). Workplace diversity and its effects on employee relations in Nigeria: A study of commercial banks in Nigeria's geopolitical zones. *British Journal of Management and Marketing Studies* 8(2), 63-78.
- Kayode, A. & Saleh, H. (2025). Discipline and disciplinary procedures and effective service delivery in Nigeria's public service. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Research*, 12(7), 11421-11431.
- Kayode, O.E. (2025). Assignment of responsibility and work behaviour in manufacturing organizations in north central, Nigeria. *African Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15(3), 1454-1468
- Nwankwo, O.D. (2026). *Counterproductive Work Behaviour Inventory*. Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Nwankwo, O.D. (2026). Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Nwankwo, O.D. (2026). *Nigerian Social Challenges Inventory*. Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Obiechie, R. & Bissong, F. (2025). *Are Nigerian youths lacking soft skills for today's workplace?* <https://www.youtube.co>
- Ogedengbe, E.S., Nuhu, E. & Ndalnamu, D.P. (2025). Assessment of the impact of discipline and disciplinary measures in the Nigerian public sector. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Anthropology*, 8(6), 1-17.
- Oghenetajiri, O.F. & Jike, V.T. (2025). The dynamics of internal fraud practices in ten selected banks over a 15-year period (2010–2025) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Advance Research Publication and Reviews*, 2(4), 318-330.
- Okeke, E.U., Okoye, E.I. & Nwoye. U.J. (2025). Forensic audit practice and effective

- fraud detection among ministries, departments and agencies: Evidence from South-East Nigeria. *International Review of Financial Studies*, 2(3), 100 - 130.
- Okoro, I., & Ibe, K. (2023). Workplace insecurity, stress, and performance among Nigerian employees. *Nigerian Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(1), 102–119.
- Olabimitan, B. A. (2025). Workplace deviant behaviour in Nigeria’s public sector: A systematic review. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 3(2), 484-496.
- Olabimitan, B.A., Awopetu, R.G., Agesin, E.B. & Ajala, M.A. (2025). The impact of mental health and trauma on workplace productivity in Nigeria: Costs and implications. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(3), DIP: 18.01.010.20251303
- Otakpo, C., Okogbule, F. S. & Jaja, L. E. (2025). Influence of stress among Nigerian workers: The therapeutic management strategies for effective living in the society. *International Journal of Innovative Healthcare Research* 13(1), 82-85.
- Sawyer, E. (2025). Ethics and accountability in Nigeria’s civil service for sustainable development. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 15(1), 138. DOI: 10.5296/jpag.v15i1.22984
- Tingir, I.T. (2025). Emotional intelligence and counterproductive work behaviour among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State. *Contemporary Journal of Applied Psychology*, 10(1), 11-25.
- Tjimuku, M., & Atiku, S. O. (2024). Addressing workplace diversity to improve employee performance: Implications for SOEs in Namibia. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), Article 2315643.
- Tunde-Anjous, T. (2025). From grit to growth: Overcoming work challenges in Nigeria. <https://businessday.ng/opinion/article/from-grit-to-growth-overcoming-work-challenges-in-nigeria/>
- Ugochukwu, N., & Akpama, I. (2021). Workplace stress and its impact on productivity: Evidence from Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 15(7), 245-257.

APPENDIX

NIGERIAN SOCIAL CHALLENGES INVENTORY

	TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU AGREE WITH EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW?	To a Large Extent (5)	To Some Extent (4)	Sometimes (3)	Rarely (2)	Not at All (1)
	AGGRESSION					
1	Nigerians are becoming very violent.					
2	Nigerians are becoming very aggressive to one another.					
3	Nigerians see violence and aggression as a way of life.					
4	Conducts of some parents influence their children into violence.					
5	Nigerians are exposed to all kinds of violent movies.					
6	Terrorism in Nigeria is common event.					
7	Assassinations are very rampant in Nigeria.					
8	Ethnic and religious violence are very common events in Nigeria.					
	INSECURITY					
9	Nigerians feel highly unsecured.					
10	Insecurity in Nigeria is a major challenge for Nigerians.					
11	Indiscriminately killing of people in Nigeria is very common.					
12	Nigeria is a place where people are kidnapped easily.					

13	Increasing rape experiences in Nigeria is rising.					
14	Nigerian campuses are no longer safe.					
15	Increasing incidence of robbery in Nigeria is discouraging.					
16	In Nigeria, places of work are becoming unsafe.					
	FRUSTRATION					
17	Frustration is everywhere in Nigeria.					
18	Many mental disorders in Nigeria are associated with bad governance.					
19	Nigerian is a frustrating society.					
20	Many cases of mental problems in Nigeria are caused by hopeless future.					
21	Depression is very common among Nigerians.					
22	Many citizens have lost hope in Nigeria.					
	SECRET CULTISM					
23	Secret societies are very common in Nigeria.					
24	A lot of Nigerian youths are initiated into secret cults.					
25	Nigerian universities are characterized by cult activities.					
26	Many secondary schools in Nigeria have cult groups.					
27	In Nigeria, members of the secret cults commit various crimes.					
28	Learning institutions in Nigeria are no longer safe due to cultism.					
	DRUG USE BEHAVIOUR					
28	Drug/substance use is common among Nigerians, especially the youths.					
29	In Nigeria, drug use is associated with frustration.					
30	Bad habit is the major reason why Nigerians smoke.					
31	Some health problems Nigerians suffer arise from drug use.					
32	Many Nigerians do use drugs to enhance performance purposes.					
33	There are a lot of drugs/substances that many Nigerians are addicted to.					
	MENTAL HEALTH					
34	Many Nigerians have been traumatized by life events.					
35	Violence is a major cause of trauma for Nigerians.					
36	Nigeria is full of frightening uncertainties.					
37	Many Nigerians feel rejected/abandoned by their country (or leaders).					
38	There is a very high level of hopelessness in Nigeria.					
39	Owing to hardship in Nigeria, risking traveling abroad has become an option.					
40	Most Nigerians have lost confidence in the usefulness of the government to them.					
	SEXUAL ABUSE					
41	A lot of Nigerians have been sexually abused.					
42	Many Nigerians are exposed to various forms of sexual insecurity.					
43	Most sexual offenses in Nigeria go unreported.					
44	Pornography is a common feature in Nigeria.					
45	In Nigeria, a lot of people have sexual experiences at a very young age.					
46	Some Nigerians are forced into commercial sex all because of money.					
47	A lot of Nigerians are addicted to sex.					
	CORRUPTION					
48	Nigeria is fantastically corrupt.					
49	Politics in Nigeria is a game of corruption.					
50	Even the Nigerian Constitution itself is built on corruption.					
51	In Nigeria, religion of various types is loaded with corruption.					
52	Every institution/agency in Nigeria is not free from corrupt practices.					
53	A lot of people have become successful in Nigeria through corrupt means.					
54	Nigeria is a place where what you have is important, not how you made it.					

	LIVING STANDARD					
55	A lot of Nigerians are homeless.					
56	Many Nigerians find it difficult to feed.					
57	There is very high cost of living in Nigeria.					
58	Building materials in Nigeria are incredibly high.					
59	Many Nigerians are unable to pay their house rents.					
60	The standards of living for most Nigerians are below human level.					
	UNEMPLOYMENT					
61	Many Nigerians are unemployed.					
62	Owing to joblessness, many Nigerian graduates state that education “is a scam”.					
63	In Nigeria, the elderly refuse falsifying their ages to retain their jobs.					
64	Nigerian graduates roam about without jobs.					
65	Nigerian graduates lack wealth-creation or job skills.					
66	Desire for quick wealth makes many Nigeria engage in atrocities to make money.					
	POLITICS & GOVERNANCE					
67	Politics in Nigeria is a very dirty game.					
68	In Nigeria, good governance is absolutely not in existence at all.					
69	Nigerian politicians don’t carry the citizens along.					
70	Nigerian politicians only use and dump the citizens during and after elections.					
71	Democracy in Nigeria is fruitless to the citizens.					
72	Politics in Nigeria is an investment.					
72	Nigerian politicians are insatiably corrupt.					
	QUALITY OF LIFE					
73	Selfishness has become a norm in Nigeria.					
74	Nigerians exploit their fellow citizens so much.					
75	Many Nigerians are becoming very heartless.					
76	In Nigeria, the value of human lives is very low.					
77	Many Nigerians suffer from a number of troubling ailments.					
78	A lot of Nigerians hardly embark on holidays.					
79	The living environment of many Nigerians is very poor.					
80	In Nigeria, basic human rights are violated with impunity.					
	INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS					
81	Nigerians are very suspicious of one another.					
82	Interpersonal tolerance among Nigerians is low.					
83	Domestic violence is a common occurrence in Nigeria.					
84	Street fighting is a common scene in Nigeria.					
86	Nigerian unity is impossible.					
87	Many Nigerians take defrauding people as a sign of smartness.					
	JUDICATURE					
88	Justice delivery in Nigeria is too poor.					
89	Injustice in Nigeria is very prevalent.					
90	Judgment can be bought in Nigeria.					
91	Nigerian Courts are not the hope of the common man.					
92	The rule of law is not applicable in Nigeria.					
93	Human rights don’t mean much in Nigeria.					
94	Nigerian Executives/politicians don’t obey the court’s orders.					

SOURCE: Nwankwo, O.D. (2026). Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria. nwankwodo@gmail.com , nwankwodo@yahoo.com , +2348030809950 , +2348120207053

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR INVENTORY

S/N	HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE OR BEEN TEMPTED TO DO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS ON YOUR PRESENT JOB?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (4)	Partly Effective (3)	Not Effective (2)	Not Effective At All (1)
WASTEFULNESS						
1.	Purposely wasted your employer's materials/supplies.					
2.	Delay of tasks that require immediate actions (Procrastination).					
3.	Attend too many and unplanned meetings (Unproductive Meeting)					
4.	Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property.					
5.	Delay between the making and implementation of a decision (Time Lag).					
6.	Execute things as a matter of tradition (Habit).					
INDOLENCE						
7.	Daydreamed rather than did your work.					
8.	Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done.					
9.	Faulty decisions concerning your work.					
10.	Purposely came late to an appointment or meeting.					
11.	Tried to look busy while doing nothing.					
BLACKMAILING/SABOTAGE						
12.	Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for.					
13.	Purposely did your work incorrectly.					
14.	Took money from your employer without permission.					
15.	Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work.					
16.	Failed to report a problem so it would get worse.					
17.	Purposely interfered with someone at work doing his/her job.					
18.	Blamed someone at work for error you made.					
INTOLERANCE						
19.	Complained about insignificant things at work.					
20.	Refused to help someone at work.					
21.	Exchanged words with a co-worker.					
22.	Made fun of someone's personal life.					
23.	Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad					
AGGRESSION						
24.	Insulted someone about their job performance.					
25.	Verbally abused someone at work.					
26.	Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work.					
27.	Threatened someone at work with violence.					
28.	Hit or pushed someone at work.					
29.	Threatened someone at work, but not physically.					
INSUBORDINATION						
30.	Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work.					
31.	Refused to take on an assignment when asked.					
32.	Purposely failed to follow instructions.					
33.	Started an argument with someone at work.					

POOR SPORTSMANSHIP						
34.	Did something to make someone at work look bad.					
35.	Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work.					
36.	Maliciously destroyed property belonging to someone at work.					
37.	Insulted or made fun of someone at work.					
ABSENTEEISM						
38.	Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren't.					
39.	Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take.					
40.	Left work earlier than you were allowed to.					
41.	Came to work late without permission.					
THEFT						
42.	Stolen something belonging to your employer.					
43.	Took supplies or tools home without permission.					
44.	Falsify claims you are not entitled to in your workplace.					
45.	Stole something belonging to someone at work.					
46.	Hid something for personal use when it is necessary for work.					
COURTESY						
47.	Been nasty or rude to a client or customer or visitor.					
48.	Avoided returning a phone call to someone you should at work.					
49.	Ignored someone at work.					
50.	Exhibited or experienced nasty sexual joke in the workplace.					
51.	Intrude into somebody's privacy without permission.					
FRAUDULENT PRACTICES						
52.	Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked.					
53.	Use connection to gain an advantage.					
54.	Falsify work records.					
55.	Use office property for personal purpose.					
56.	Falsify education certificates.					
57.	Ignored work ethics just to achieve personal gain.					
58.	Apply bribe to get the work done.					

SOURCE: Nwankwo O.D., (2026). Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria. nwankwodo@gmail.com , nwankwodo@yahoo.com , +2348030809950 , +2348120207053