NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. S.O. Adebayo

Managing Editor

B.E. Nwankwo Ph.D

Retaliatory Behaviour among Industrial Workers: The Role of Perceived Job Insecurity and Work Intimidation

*Okoro, Chinwendu M.**
Department of Social Sciences.
School of General Studies Federal Polytechnic Oko, Anambra State.

Eze, Adaobi C.
Department of Sociology/Psychology,
Godfrey Okoye University, Thinkers Corner, Enugu
&
Ezeanyim Uchechukwu[c]
Department of Sociology/Psychology,
Godfrey Okoye University, Thinkers Corner, Enugu
*Correspondence: *okorochinwendu77@gmail.com*

Abstract

The study investigated retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers: the role of perceived job insecurity and work intimidation. One hundred and one (101) industrial workers in Enugu State comprising of sixty-five (65) males and thirty-six (36) females with the age range of 20 to 60 years (M = 38.12; SD = 10.09) were sampled using a purposive sampling technique. Three instruments were used for data collection: Job insecurity scale by De Witte (2000), work intimidation scale by Jones and Pittman (1982) and organizational retaliation behaviour scale by Latham and Wexley (1994). Two hypotheses were tested. Result of Hierarchical multiple regression analysis showed that perceived job insecurity was not a significant predictor of retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers. Job intimidation had a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (β = .423, p< .001). Implications of these findings were highlighted and suggestions were made for further research.
Keywords: Retaliatory Behaviour, Industrial Workers, Perceived Job Insecurity, Work Intimidation.

Introduction

One of the main reasons people go to work is to achieve a sense of responsibility, respect and independence. So employees, before the resumption of duty, had created a set of expectations about their work and tend to make psychological contracts with their organizations to attain the above state. However, in the workplace, when these expectations are unspecified, the employee may perceive a psychological contract breach on the part of the employers (Chiu & Peng, 2008). Therefore, the employee may resort to retaliation in other to achieve a balance.

Retaliatory behaviours in the workplace have been giving several other names ranging from anti-social behaviour and dysfunctional behaviour to counterproductive behaviour. Skarlicki and Folger (1997) maintained that retaliation in the workplace is a form of counterproductive

work behaviour (CWB). Retaliation can take many other forms; including general deviance, sabotage, aggression, cheating, or stealing, to name a few (Barling et al., 2009; Greenberg, 2002; Holtz & Harold, 2013; Searle, 2003; Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006; Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, 2010). Interestingly these deviant acts, are often viewed by the perpetrator as a justified response to mistreatment (Bies & Tripp, 2001, 2004, 2012; Cropanzano & Moliner, 2013).

Retaliatory behaviours are, very often, intended to harm the organization either by targeting the organization or specific people in it (Fox & Spector, 1999; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Rotundo & Spector, 2010). These can be categorized based on whether they are directed at the organization (RWB-O) or specific individuals (RWB-I) within it (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Specifically, RWB-I is defined primarily by abusive behaviour toward others, RWB-O can include; production deviance (doing work incorrectly or slowly), sabotage (physical destruction of company property), theft (stealing property), and withdrawal (working fewer hours than required). So, workplace retaliatory behaviours might be viewed as a negative reciprocity orientation where an individual returns a negative treatment with a negative treatment (Mitchel & Ambrose, 2007).

Scholars view RWB as a response or retaliation to unfair treatment by the organization and its actors (e.g., executives) (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999). So, interpersonal conflict and perceived injustice are indicatives of poor treatment by the organization or members within it. Organizational justice, interpersonal conflict, and perceptions of mistreatment or inequity are related to RWB (Colquitt et al., 2001; Dalal, 2005; Greenberg, 1990; Penney & Spector, 2005; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Retaliatory behaviours cannot happen without action. Therefore, some variables will always come to play, and these may trigger retaliatory behaviours. The perception of job insecurity, for instance, can trigger retaliatory behaviours in the workplace because of its negative spillover effect, which can decrease job satisfaction and increase turnover intentions (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Sverke et al., 2002).

Job insecurity is based on the individual's perception and interpretation of the environment which explains which attitudes and behaviour employees develop, thereby influencing organizational effectiveness and resulting in workplace retaliation (Elias & Collins, 2014). Due to intensified competition in the global economy, organizations have various adaptive strategies to maintain a competitive advantage, such as outsourcing, restructuring, or even dismissal of staff. These might result in a sense of job insecurity (De Witte, 2005; Shoss, 2017). These trends in organizations have affected the global workforce (Probst & Lawler, 2006). So,

feeling threatened by job loss (i.e., job insecurity perception) has become a widespread and permanent phenomenon (Burchell, 2002) not only in developed economies (e.g., Finland) but also in developing economies (e.g., Nigeria). Because of its detrimental effects on employee well-being and organizational effectiveness, job insecurity has been considered one of the stressors in work and organizational psychology (Cuyper et al., 2008).

A multitude of previous empirical studies has shown that as a work stressor, job insecurity is associated with a negative employee outcome such as impaired mental health, decreased job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work involvement, and increased turnover intentions (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Sverke et al., 2002). For organizations, the effects of job insecurity are also pervasively negative. Contrary to popular belief, the worry of losing one's job does not act as a motivator. Instead, it might lead to poor work performance, retaliatory behaviours such as stealing, corruption, sabotage etc.

On the other hand, apart from feeling insecure, workers experience intimidation on daily basis on different fronts. This was evidenced in the growing number of workers who admit that they have been victims of bullying at work. By 2011, 50% of the people surveyed admitted to having been subjected to rude behaviour, at a minimum of once every week, which is an unprecedented increase of 25% since 1998 (Yamada, 2008). Workplace intimidation, also known as workplace bullying, occurs when a superior, peer or subordinate uses violence or blackmail to manipulate you or intentionally creates feelings of fear, inadequacy or awe. Workplace intimidation includes illegal sexual harassment and discrimination but is not limited to illegal behaviour. Such behaviour is destructive to the victim and the company (Bolino & Turnley, 1999).

One of the many proposed detrimental individual outcomes of workplace intimidation is the risk of exclusion from work (Leymann, 1992; Berthelsen et al., 2011). The term exclusion from work may reflect any illegitimate distance between an employee and the work schedules. If the intimidating situation, for example, is seen as a disciplinary problem by the employer, the victim may be discharged or internally relocated (Leymann, 1992; MacIntosh, 2005). In other cases, the victim of workplace intimidation may suffer health impairment with subsequent sick leave, rehabilitation or disability pension, or may choose to quit 'voluntarily' because of the adverse nature of the working conditions in which bullying occurs (Berthelsen et al., 2011). More so, workplace intimidation effects to the organization may involve; drop in productivity, teamwork suffers, good employees leave, and employers have increased medical and legal claims (Yamada, 2008.) Research has even shown that workplace intimidation has a more negative effect on employees than sexual harassment, perhaps because there are more procedures in place for dealing with sexual harassment nowadays (Bryner, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

In the world of work, the main reason people engage in work is to gain security and respect and to grow in responsibility both to self and the organization where he/she finds him/herself. It is the dream of every worker, to behave in such a way that the organization will be proud of and to be in a good relationship with fellow workers irrespective of age, position, wealth or experience. As such, no worker will like to retaliate negatively to an organization or co-workers who have been accommodating to him/her in a very negative manner.

However, it seems that the ideal work expectations of workers have been eroded by perceived job insecurity and workplace intimidation. From the foregoing, the increasing uncertainty of employees' workplace behaviour, without doubt, has come to the attention of researchers (Schat et al., 2006). Recently, a great percentage of workers in Nigeria are victims of job insecurity and workplace intimidation because of the economic hardship rocking the nation, which often results in the downsizing of staff and updating technology to maximize profit and reduce cost.

Job insecurity and intimidation are prevalent in the workplace, as most workers cannot quit because of responsibilities to be accomplished. But, once employee demands and expectations are not met, there are perceptions of injustice or the feelings of being intimidated in the workplace, the employee is likely to resort to retaliatory behaviour which is detrimental to the organization and its members. Based on the above, this research work theoretically and empirically aimed at investigating perceived job insecurity and workplace intimidation as predictors of retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers.

Purpose of the Study

The major objective of this study was to investigate perceived job insecurity and workplace intimidation as predictors of retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers. Specifically, it aimed at;

- ✓ Determining whether perceived job insecurity will significantly predict retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State?
- ✓ Examining whether workplace intimidation will significantly predict retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State?

Literature Review

Conceptually, retaliatory work behaviour has dominated the literature over the years, even in our local dealings with each other, there seems to be traces of retaliatory behaviours towards

individuals or cooperate bodies. However, there is no smoke without fire, antecedent to any retaliatory behaviour abounds, especially in the world of work. For instance, Crawshaw et al. (2013), suggest that many personalities and attitudinal variables, such as, negative affectivity (Barsky et al., 2011), job satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001), organizational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2001; Crawshaw et al., 2012), and trust (Colquitt et al., 2001), that correlate with justice perceptions may influence their effect on subsequent behaviour. Furthermore, many of these same constructs, including, job attitudes, negative affectivity, and personality characteristics (e.g., conscientiousness), workplace intimidation (Quine, 1999), are predictive of retaliatory work behaviour (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Mount et al., 2006; Salgado, 2002). So, this study looked at the predictive nature of perceived job insecurity and workplace intimidation on retaliatory work behaviour among industrial workers.

Theoretically, there are arrays of theories to explaining the study variables, but this study was anchored on the theory of social exchange. The social exchange theory asserts that individuals tend to reciprocate treatment that he/she receives from others (Blau, 1964; Organ, 1988). When favourable treatment is received, individuals are likely to be cooperative and favourable in return (Tyler & Smith, 1998). Conversely, when unfavourable treatment is received, individuals are likely to retaliate via revenge (Bies & Tripp, 2001), legal action (Lind et al., 2000), stealing (Greenberg, 1997), and aggression (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998).

Although social exchange theory applies to any number of relationships, organizational scientists are interested in relationships that exist in the workplace (Petersen, 2015). This may include, for example, relationships between co-workers (e.g., Deckop et al., 2003), a supervisor and his/her subordinates (e.g., Liden et al., 1997), or even the organization and the employees (e.g., Moorman et al., 1998). Thus, social exchange theory provides a lens through which mistreatment or injustice in the workplace can be understood.

In the context of this study, the focus is on industrial workers perceived job insecurity and workplace intimidation as functions of their retaliatory behaviours. That goes to show how what is being exchanged between the organization and the workers determine their behavioural outcome either positively or negatively. So, social exchange theory proposes that each party in a relationship is expected to abide by a particular set of rules (Emerson, 1976). In the organizational and management literature, typically the rule of reciprocity is used as a framework (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Reciprocity can be viewed as an interdependent transaction between two parties (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). That is, when one party does something beneficial for the other, the second party should also provide the first with something beneficial. The parties exchange resources that could include, for example, money,

information, status, goods, or services. Indeed individuals are driven to maintain a perception of fairness.

Empirically, there are a couple of studies done on the study variables that guided this study. For instance; Xiao et al. (2018) study, using 263 participants from 40 firms in China. The empirical results showed that quantitative job insecurity reduced organizational deviance and increased interpersonal deviance, whereas qualitative job insecurity increased both organizational and interpersonal deviance. Moreover, internal locus of control weakened the positive relationship between job insecurity and workplace deviance. Therefore, qualitative job insecurity was more detrimental than quantitative job insecurity. In terms of workplace deviance, both were more detrimental to those who are of an external locus of control.

Also, Joe-Akunne et al. (2014) investigated job insecurity and how it can be explored to determine its relationship with counterproductive work behaviour and the result showed that job insecurity has a significant positive relationship with counterproductive work behaviour. However, in an empirical study by Reisel et al. (2010) on the relationship between job insecurity and retaliation behaviour in the workplace, analyses of both sets of data show that job insecurity is negatively related to retaliation in the organization.

Foster (2012) study with two hundred and nine (209) participants who were either employed by Kansas State University or were taking classes as non-traditional students at Kansas State University. The study found that a low-quality leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship predicted workplace intimidation, while workplace intimidation predicted retaliatory behaviour.

Chirasha and Mahapa (2012) measured intimidation in two universities in Zimbabwe. The authors, using research, sought to establish the prevalence of production, property and personal intimidation at the workplace and the impact they have on organizational performance. Findings revealed that indeed work intimidation, through its various forms, was overt in the universities. So, the two most common are production and property deviance through leaving early or coming to work late, misuse of company property, and verbal abuse. Furthermore, Brain et al. (2011) empirically examined impression management behaviour enactment. Their findings, based on responses from 144 full-time state workers, investigated severe significant relationships. They found out that acting in a threatening manner leads to workplace retaliation. On the contrary, Swarnalatha (2013) conducted research, and the regression analysis for the hypothesis showed that work intimidation/harassment was negatively related to organizational retaliatory behaviour.

The forgoing research has shown different positions on the study variables both locally and internationally. Hence, this study added to the theoretical database of the study variables, close the gap in knowledge concerning the study variables, especially in the study area and population, as it investigated retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State: The role of perceived job insecurity and workplace intimidation.

Hypotheses

Therefore it was hypothesized that:

- ✓ Perceived job insecurity will significantly predict retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State.
- ✓ Workplace intimidation will significantly predict retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State.

Method

Participants: One hundred and one (101) industrial workers drawn from Innoson, Juhel and Emenite industries in Enugu State comprising 65 (64.36%) males and 36 (35.64%) females between the ages of 20 to 60 years ($M = 38.12$; $SD = 10.09$) were sampled using purposive sampling technique. Information about participants' demographics such as gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, job position, employment condition and number of years in the organization were gotten using the demographic section in the questionnaire. Thus; sixty-five (65) males and thirty-six (36) females. Forty-one (41) were married, fifty-nine (59) were single and one (1) was a widow. Four (4) were FSLC holders, twenty-four (24) were WAEC holders, fourteen (14) were OND/NCE holders, nineteen (19) were HND holders, twenty-seven (27) were DEGREE holders, and twelve (12) M.SC holders while one(1) was missing value. For job position, seventy-one (71) were senior staff and thirty (30) were junior staff. Ninety-six were permanent staff and five (5) were contract staff.

Instrument: Three instruments were used in the study. They include; Job Insecurity Scale (JIS), Work Intimidation Scale (WIS) and Organizational Retaliatory Behaviour Scale (ORB).

Job Insecurity Scale: Job Insecurity Scale (JIS), developed by De Witte (2000) was used to measure Job Insecurity. The instrument was developed primarily to measure employee's perceptions about their jobs. It consists of 12 items arranged along a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The items of the questionnaire displayed a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.92 with high reliability. In the present study a Cronbach's alpha of .72 was obtained.

Work Intimidation Scale: Work Intimidation Scale (WIS), developed by Jones and Pittman (1982) was used to measure work intimidation in organizations. It is an 8 - items scale measuring employee work intimidation. Responses ranged from (1) (Never behave this way' to (5) often behave this way). Jones and Pittman (1982) reported the Cronbach's alpha reliability of .86 while in the present study a Cronbach's alpha of .96 was obtained.

Organizational Retaliatory Behaviour Scale: Organizational Retaliatory Behaviour Scale (ORB) developed by Latham and Wexley (1994) was used to measure retaliation behaviour. The ORB scale consists of 17 items. Responses ranged from (1) (Never over the past month) to 5 (6 or more times over the past month). Latham and Wexley reported a Cronbach's alpha of .95 while in the present study a Cronbach's alpha of .92 was obtained.

Procedure: The researchers with a letter obtained permission from the Managers of the industries used for the study. Afterwards, the researchers were assigned a staff as a guide in administering the questionnaires. The researchers created rapport with the participants, and they were equally assured that their responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality and that participation in the study was voluntary. Upon completing the questionnaires, out of one hundred and fifty (150) copies of the questionnaires administered, one hundred and twenty six (126) copies were returned. After cross checking the questionnaires, only one hundred and one (101) copies of the questionnaires were found to be properly filled and were used for data analysis.

Design/Statistics: A cross-sectional survey design was adopted for the study. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data. Statistical package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was employed in the data analyses.

Results

The data obtained from respondents were analysed by computing the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables. To test the hypotheses, a Hierarchical Multiple Regression was conducted in which retaliatory behaviour was the dependent variable.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Retaliatory Behaviour	21.13	5.66	-	.16	-.30***	-.25**	-.11	.09	.03	-.12	.40***
2	Gender	1.36	.48		-	-.20*	.03	.11	.02	.15	.05	-.07
3	Age	2.08	.91			-	.52***	.22**	-.07	-.51***	.06	.14
4	Marital Status	1.61	.55				-	.12	-.09	-.30***	.21**	-.07
5	Educational Qualification	4.28	5.30					-	-.03	-.22*	.04	-.05
6	Condition of Employment	1.05	.22						-	-.05	-.15	.04
7	Job Position	1.30	.46							-	.14	-.14
8	Perceived job Insecurity	34.29	7.93								-	-.12
9	Work Intimidation	12.45	5.45									-

*Note: ***P< .001; **P< .01; *P< .05*

Result of correlation indicated that among demographic variables age ($r = -.30$, $p <.001$), and marital status ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$), had negative significant relationship with retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers; while gender ($r = .16$, $p > .05$), educational qualification ($r = .16$, $p > .05$), condition of employment ($r = .16$, $p > .05$), as well as job position ($r = .16$, $p > .05$) had non-significant relationship with retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers. For main variables, work intimidation ($r = .40$, $p < .001$) was positively significantly related to retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers. But perceived job insecurity ($r = -.12$, $p > .05$) had non-significant negative relationship with retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers. Gender was negatively significantly related to age ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$); but non-significantly related to marital status, educational qualification, condition of employment, job position, perceived job insecurity, and work intimidation. Age was significantly related to marital status ($r = -.52$, $p < .001$), educational qualification ($r = .22$, $p < .01$), and job position ($r = -.51$, $p < .001$). Marital status was significantly related to job position ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$), and perceived job insecurity ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). Educational qualification was significantly related to job position ($r = -.22$, $p < .05$).

Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression predicting retaliatory behaviour from perceived job insecurity and work intimidation

	R	*R²*	*R²Δ*	B	*B*	*t*
Step 1	.39**	.15**	.149**			
Gender				1.70	.15	1.44
Age				-1.65	-.27	-2.07*
Marital Status				-1.61	-.16	-1.37
Education Qualification				-.09	-.09	-.88
Condition of Service				1.16	.05	.47
Job Position				-2.33	-.19	-1.68
Step 2	.39	.15	.002			
Perceived Job Insecurity				-.03	-.045	-.449
Step 3	.56***	.32***	.167***			
Work Intimidation				.439	.423	4.746***

*Note: ***P< .001; **P< .01; *P< .05*

Demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, condition of service and job position) were entered in step 1 of the equation. The regression result showed that the demographic variables accounted for 39% variance as predictors of retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (ΔR^2 = .39, $p<$ .01). Among the demographic variables, age made a statistically significant negative contribution in predicting retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (β = -.27, $p<$ .05). Hierarchical multiple regression analysis also showed that perceived job insecurity entered in step two of the equation accounted for less than 1% non-significant variance as a predictor of retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (ΔR^2 = .002, $p>$ .05).

However, it made no statistically significant contribution in predicting retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (β = -.045, $p>$ .05). The inclusion of work intimidation accounted for less than 17% significant variance in predicting retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (ΔR^2 = .167, $p<$ .001), making a statistically significant and positive contribution in predicting retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers (β = .423, $p<$ .001). These finding tends to imply that the more industrial workers are intimidated at work place, the more likely they will engage in retaliatory behaviour.

Discussion

Perceived job insecurity, work intimidation and retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu state were investigated in this study. The first hypothesis tested in this study stated that perceived job insecurity will significantly predict retaliatory behaviour in the workplace was rejected. This is because results of data analysis showed that perceived job insecurity failed to significantly predict retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State. This finding is not in consonant with any previous empirical research findings reviewed in this study. For example, it disagrees with the findings of Joe-Akunne et al. (2014), who investigated job insecurity and how it can be explored to determine its relationship with counterproductive work behaviour and concluded that job insecurity has significant positive relationship with counterproductive or retaliatory work behaviour.

The second hypothesis stated that work intimidation will significantly predict retaliatory behaviour in workplace was accepted. This was because work intimidation significantly and positively predicted retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State. This finding tends to imply that the more industrial workers are intimidated at workplace, the more likely they will engage in retaliatory behaviour. This finding is consistent with previous empirical findings. Foster (2012), found out that a low quality leader-member-exchange (LMX) relationship predicted workplace intimidation, while workplace intimidation predicted retaliatory behaviour. Brain et al., (2011), empirically examined form impression management behavior enactment. Their research pointed out the existence of negative relationships between intimidation behaviour and organizational retaliation in the workplace. They found out that acting in a threatening manner leads to workplace retaliation. However, this finding is also inconsistent with the study by Swarnalatha (2013), which stated that work intimidation/harassment was negatively related to organizational retaliatory behaviour.

The finding that work intimidation is a significant positive contributor in predicting retaliatory behaviour is supported by the Social Exchange Theory by Thibaut and Kelley (1959) which states that employees define their relationships with their organization and their supervisors in terms of social exchange using the norm of reciprocity. Thus employees engage in retaliatory behaviours to reciprocate unfavourable treatment received from the supervisor or organization. If employees believe the organization is looking out for their best interests or is fairly providing them with valued rewards, they will respond in kind by performing positive actions such as organizational citizenship behaviours. However, if employees believe the organization or supervisor is withholding rewards or punishing them unfairly, they will reciprocate by reducing

actions that benefit the organization or by performing actions that will hinder productivity in the workplace.

Practical Implications of the Study

The findings of this research have practical implications. Perceived job insecurity was not a significant predictor of retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers in Enugu State. The implication of this finding is that an employee who feels insecure about his/her job is not necessarily a potential retaliator in the workplace. Perceived job insecurity can be caused by various demographic and personal factors and does not always push its victim to take it out on his/her job. By assumption, people believe that individuals who experience job insecurity are most likely to indulge in retaliatory behaviours in the workplace due to the fact they have no guarantee they are to remain employed any longer than they are at a particular moment. The present study shows otherwise and this requires employers to treat such employees with care and consideration, rather than view them as potential threat.

The finding of this research also indicated that workplace intimidation positively contributed to the prediction of retaliatory behaviour. And this has practical implication. This finding is contrary to the assumption that intimidation in the workplace can only produce positive outcomes. The finding of this study shows that individuals who experience work intimidation are very likely to reciprocate with counterproductive/retaliatory behaviours. To reduce retaliatory behaviour in the workplace, employers should treat their employees fairly and set certain rules and regulations to ensure that co-workers treat each other fairly. Superiors and the organizational management should also listen to complaints of employees and actually do something about them.

Limitation of the Study

One major factor that affected this study was the inability of the researchers in extending this study to government owned industries. Only industrial workers from three private industries were involved in this study. Therefore, no comparison was made between these private industry workers and that of the government industries.

The data generated for this study came from self-report made by participants through the questionnaires and as such, the bias nature of self-reporting should be taken note of and generalization of result should be made with caution.

The researchers also experienced difficulty convincing workers to participate in the study as they were always preoccupied with work responsibilities and it took some of them more than the required time to complete the questionnaire.

Suggestions for Further Research

Following the above mentioned limitations in this study, the researchers suggested that, future researchers should carry out similar studies using participants from non-private companies and also industries from other locations in Nigeria. For further or future research, an increase in the number of participants should be considered. Researchers should embark on longitudinal studies in order to establish causal relationships.

Furthermore, in assessing retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers it is suggested that further research may involve other demographic variables like age, gender, educational qualification, ethnic group and personality type.

Recommendations

The researchers recommended that, management of organizations should be involved as well as committed in setting rules and regulation as well as setting up programmes to improve organizational culture and conduct of employees in the workplace. More so, organizations interested in creating work environments that is free of retaliatory behaviours should look into the problem of intimidation in the workplace and implement strategies to combat it. Managers should always look out for emotional and physical welfare of their workers as failure to do so will always have a devastating effect on the organization. Socialization among workers should also be encouraged.

Conclusion

This study investigated the retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers and the predictive roles of perceived job insecurity and work intimidation. The results revealed perceived job insecurity failed to predict retaliatory behaviour among industrial workers but work place intimidation did. To this end, it was concluded that workplace intimidation should be a major focus of management of organizations and not job insecurity in order to increase and protect the production and existence of their organisations as worker friendly organisations.

References

Barling, J., Dupré, K. E. & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 671–692.

Barsky, A., Kaplan, S. A., & Beal, D. J. (2011). Just feelings? The role of affect in the formation of organizational justice judgments. *Journal of Management, 37*, 248–279.

Berthelsen, M., Skogstad, A., Lau, B. & Einarsen, S. (2011). Do they stay or do they go? A longitudinal study of intentions to leave and exclusion from working life among targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of Manpower, 32(2)*, 178–193.

Bies, R. J. & Tripp, T. M. (2001). A passion for justice: The rationality and morality of revenge. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (pp. 197–208). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bies, R. J. & Tripp, T. M. (2004). The study of revenge in the workplace: Conceptual, ideological, and empirical issues. In S. Fox & P. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 65–81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bies, R. J. & Tripp, T. M. (2012). Negotiating the peace in the face of modern distrust: Dealing with anger and revenge in the 21st century workplace. In B.M. Goldman & D.L. Shapiro (Eds*.), Negotiations in the 21st century workplace: New challenges and new solutions* (pp. 181–210). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Ones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods, 2,* 187-206.

Brain, N., Micki, K. & Ken, H. (2011). Dispositional and Situational Factors as Predictors of Impression Management Behaviours. Institute of behaviour and Applied Management.

Bryner, J., (2008). Workplace Bullying 'Epidemic' Worse Than Sexual Harassment. Live Science. http://www.livescience.com/health/080308-workplace-bully.html.

Burchell, B., Ladipo, D., & Wilkinson, F. (Eds.). (2005). *Job insecurity and work intensification*. Routledge.

Cheng, G. H. L., & Chan, D. K. S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology*, *57*, 272–303. https://**doi**.org/**10.1111/j.1464- 0597.2007.00312**.x

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*, *3*(5), 415.

Chiu, S. F., & Peng, J. C. (2008). The relationship between psychological contract breach and employee deviance: The moderating role of hostile attributional style. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*(3), 426-433.

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

Crawshaw, J. R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C. M., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Organizational justice: New   insights from behavioural ethics. *Human Relations, 66*, 885-904.

Crawshaw, J. R., Van Dick, R., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2012). Opportunity, fair process and relationship value: Career development as a driver of proactive work behaviour. *Human Resource Management Journal, 22,* 4–20.

Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*, 874-900.

Cropanzano, R. & Moliner, C. (2013). Hazards of justice: Egocentric bias, moral judgments, and   revenge-seeking. In S. M. Elias (Ed.), *Deviant and criminal behavior in the workplace*   (pp.155–177). New York, NY: University Press.

Cuyper, N. D., Bernhard-Oettel, C., Berntson, E., Witte, H. D., & Alarco, B. (2008). Employability and Employees' Well-Being: Mediation by Job Insecurity 1. *Applied Psychology*, *57*(3),   488-509.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241- 1255.

De Witte, H. (1999). Job Insecurity, and psychological well-being: review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(2)*, 155-177.

De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 31*(4), a200. https://doi.org/cg89

Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C., & Andersson, L. M. (2003). Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 47,* 101-114.

Elias, K. K., & Collins, B. A. (2014). Perceived job insecurity and psychological Distress: The moderating role of work values. *International Journal of Management, Economies and Social Science, 3(1)*, 18-35.

Emerson, R. M. (1976). *Social exchange theory. Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1998). A popcorn metaphor for workplace violence: In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violent behaviours in organizations* (43-81). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Foster, P. L. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bulling: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work; Leader– member- exchange and the workplace bully. Management communication quarterly. Retrieved on February 17, 2018 from http://MCQ.Sagepub.com/Sagepublication.

Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 20,* 915-931.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 561-568.

Greenberg, J. (1997). A social influence model of employee theft: Beyond the fraud triangle. In R.J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations.* (pp. 29–51). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Greenberg, J. (2002). Who stole the money, and when? Individual and situational determinants of employee theft. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 89,* 985–1003.

Hartley, J., Jacobsson, D., Klandermans, B. & Van Vuuren, T. (1991). *Job Insecurity.* London: Sage Publications.

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., ... & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 228-238.

Holtz, B. C. & Harold, C. M. (2013). Interpersonal justice and deviance: The moderating effects of interpersonal justice values and justice orientation. *Journal of Management, 39*, 339– 365.

Joe-Akunne, C. O., Oguegbe, 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 – 52.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S., (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self- presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self* (pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1994). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Leymann, H. (1992). From bullying to expulsion from working life. *Stockholm. Publica. Stockholm, Sweden.*

Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G.F. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 47-119). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lind, E. A., Greenberg, J., Scott, K. S., & Welchans, T. D. (2000). The winding road from employee to complainant: situational and psychological determinants of wrongful termination claims. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 557–590.

MacIntosh, J. (2005). Experiences of workplace bullying in a rural area. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 26(9),* 893–910.

Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1159-1168.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behaviour? *Academy of Management Journal, 41,* 351-357.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationships of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 591-622.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Penney, L. M. & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 26,* 777-796.

Petersen, N. L. (2015). Retaliatory behaviour as a response to executive compensation. A Doctor of Philosophy dissertation submitted to the Graduate *College of Bowling Green State University.*

Probst, T. M., & Lawler, J. (2006). Cultural values as moderators of employee reactions to job insecurity: The role of individualism and collectivism. *Applied Psychology*, *55*(2), 234-254.

Quine, L. (1999). Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: staff questionnaire survey. *Biomedical Journal, 318(7178),* 228-232.

Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M, Chia, S. L., Maloles, C. M., & Konig, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on Job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, Deviant Behavior and negative Emotions of Employees. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 40(1),* 74-91.

Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 555-572.

Rotundo, N. & Spector, P. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior and withdrawal. In J.L. Farr & N.T. Tippens (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp.489-511). Routledge: Taylor & Francis.

Salgado, J. F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviours. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 10, 117-125.

Schat, A. C. H., Frone, M. R. & Kelloway, E. K. (2006). Prevalence of workplace aggression in the U.S. workforce. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Y. Barling, & J. J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Violence* (pp. 47-89). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management,* 43, 1911–1939. https://doi.org/cg9c

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

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

Sverke, S. P., Hellgren, W. D., & Naswall, S. N, (2002). Job insecurity and negative outcome in industrial setting. *Academy Management Review, 52,* 208-220.

Swarnalatha. S. (2013). Workplace harassment and job satisfaction: An empirical study among employees of automotive industries in India. *Tactful Management Research Journal, 1(5),* DOI : 10.9780/2319-7943/152013/19

Thibaut, J. W. & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Treviño, L.K., Weaver, G.R. & Reynolds, S.J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management, 32,* 951–990.

Tyler, T. R. & Smith, H. J. (1998). Social justice and social movements. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 595–629). Boston: McGraw– Hill.

Xiao, Z., Wu, D., & Liao, Z. (2018). Job insecurity and workplace deviance: the moderating role of locus of control. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 46(10), 1673-1686.

Yamada, D. (2008). The Healthy Workplace Bill. http://www.bullyinginstitute.org.

Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, P. (2010). Do unfair procedures predict employees' ethical behaviour by deactivating formal regulations? *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 411–425.