

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

It is a sad truth that employees of every organization will occasionally encounter members who involve or engage themselves in unethical work behaviours this because in every organised institution or organisation there is a great tendency of having people of diverse background, ideas, experience, knowledge, beliefs, perception to things, educational training as well as different religion and family background. It is in view of these aforementioned factors among several others that unethical work behaviour needs to be defined. Unethical work behaviour is any behaviour that brings harm to, and that is either illegal or morally unacceptable to the larger community (Jones 1991). This may include lying, cheating, stealing or interpersonal aggression (Aquinas & Reed, 2002).

In Nigeria, Federal Road Safety Commission as the foremost and the leading Organization in road traffic management, preventing and minimizing accidents on the highways (FRSC Establishment) act 2007 but it would be an aberration for the member of the Federal road safety corps to exhibit work attitude and behaviour that undermine the integrity of the organization. This is so because they are civil servants, who act on behalf of, and in favour of citizens using the resources provided by the community (Lumijarvi & Vesterinen, 2006).

With this implicit understanding, the Nigerian public expected Federal road safety corps as law enforcement agents to project unfavourable disposition towards unethical work behaviour provides services with a caring attitudes and who will distinguished themselves in carrying out their day to day activities in the most acceptable and law-abiding manner.

With reference to FRSC Regulation on maintenance of Discipline 2005, unethical work behaviours include absence from duty without official authorisation, lateness to duty without genuine or reasonable excuse, breach of confidence, insubordination, dishonesty, bribery and corruption, damage of commission's properties supplied to the members of corps, disobedience to standing order, drunkenness, malingering, neglect of duty, improper conduct, shabbily dressing and unlawful or unnecessary exercise of authority constitute unethical work behaviour.

Despite these heavy ethical demands placed on the work of members of the corps and expressed in “(FRSC Establishment)act 2007” attitude towards unethical work behaviour of some members of Federal road safety corps in Nigeria is a departure from the expected and acceptable practice and norms. Complying and abiding with professional ethical norms may depend on individual's attitude toward these ethical norms. Attitude is a cluster of beliefs, feeling and behavioural intention toward an object (Eagly & Chicken 1993). Thus whether corps members conduct themselves in an ethical way or casting doubt/aspersion upon these ethical norms or even reject them entirely in the way and manner in which they carry out their assigned duties may depend on their attitude towards these ethical norms.

There are abundance of researches that considered several antecedents of unethical work behaviour, however very few researchers have looked at the locus of control and perceived effort-reward imbalance in the work place. At this juncture, an attempt will be made to explain what is meant by Locus of control and effort-reward imbalance.

The locus of control although relatively new (Rotter, 1954) has received considerable attention in the study of psychological differences (Lefcourt & Phares, 1976). Locus of control is a personality variable that indicates the degree to which an individual perceives to have controlled by his or her environment (Crabble, Brodzinski, Schererer, Jones,1994). O'Brien,(1986) defines locus of control as a “general expectancy about the extent to which reinforcement are under “internal or external control”.Locus of control refers to a person’s belief about control over life events(Findley & Cooper, 1993). Some people feel personally responsible for the things that happen to them. These people are labeled internals, other feel that their outcome in life are determined by forces beyond their control. These people are labeled externals (Findley & Cooper, 1983). Obviously, most people fall between these two extremes, forming a continuous distribution of locus of control beliefs. Locus of control is thought to be a relatively enduring dispositional characteristics, although certainly modifiable through experience (Findley & Cooper, 1983).

The concept of Locus of control concerns the extent to which people believe that what happens to them is dependent upon their own behaviour and therefore controllable,or alternatively,whether events are the product of non-contingent factors such as luck,fate or powerful others (Elliot, 1977).

People attribute the cause of events either to themselves or to their environments. Individuals with internal control believes that reinforcement are contingent on their own behaviour,attitude attributes or capabilities, skills,knowledge, discretion and experience. While individuals with external control believes that reinforcements are dependent on

fate,powerful forces, destiny others,chance,luck etc and other phenomena not under their control (Rotter,1966).

Rotter's definition which describes Internal-externals locus of control as a reinforcement that is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action,then in Nigeria culture ,it is typically perceived as the result of luck,chance,fate, destiny as under the control of powerful forces others,or as unpredictable and beyond human control because of the great complexity of the forces perceive to be surrounding him.When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual,we have labeled this a belief in external control(Rotter,1966).If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour/capabilities or his own relatively permanent characteristics,we have termed this a belief in internal locus of control(Rotter1966).

The concept of locus of control originated in the social learning theory developed by Rotter(1966).The fundamental principle underlying the social learning theory is that the unit of investigation for the study of personality is the interaction of individual and his or her meaningful environment (Maram,1996).Rotter (cited in Phares,1976) stated that to deal accurately with behaviour both personal and environmental determinants must be utilised.Social learning theory is divided into four classes of variables namely behaviour,expectancies, reinforcement and psychological situations (Rotter,1966). Expectancy refers to the probability that certain reinforcement will occur if a specific behaviour is selected in a situation (Maram,1996).Hence, Rotter (cited in Phares,1976) argued that the potential for behaviour to occur in a specific situation is determined not

just, by how badly we want a certain goal but also the extent to which we believe that a specific behaviour will lead to a particular objective.

Rotter (cited in Phares, 1976) further argued that behaviour is learned and dependent on the degree of success or failure people have enjoyed in the past.

According to Phares (1976), this concept was developed to explain the apparent tendency for some individuals to ignore potential reinforcers of behaviour and their failure to respond as predicted to various rewards and punishment. This failure was attributed to a generalised expectancy that their own actions would not lead to attainment of rewards or avoidance of punishment (Abrams 1995).

The Effort-reward imbalance, according to Siegrist (1966) Effort at work should be matched by appropriate rewards to promote feelings of self efficacy and self esteem among employees and to prevent distress. When this does not occur, there is an effort-reward imbalance (ERI), which Siegrist has linked to negative employee outcome. In his Effort-reward imbalance model, extrinsic effort refers to situational job demands and obligations. Rewards for efforts spent at work consist of money, esteem and status control (including promotion prospects and job security).

Siegrist argues that rewards are important factors in current work environments, since rewards in structure work setting are constrained by job instability, underemployment, redundancy and forced occupational mobility (Siegrist 1996). Siegrist emphasizes that assessment of effort-reward imbalance must also include intrinsic effort or overcommitment, an individual attribute reflecting an employee's characteristics pattern of coping with job

demands. High levels of overcommitment are manifested by excessive job involvement motivated by strong needs for approval and control (Siegrist&peter1999a).

Overly committed workers spend a lot of energy to meet work demands even under conditions of relatively low reward because the experience of being in control over a challenging situation is very satisfying for them.

According to Siegrist and Peter (1999a), the degree of commitment influences perception of the balance of the efforts and reward at work. Overcommitted employees tend to perceive greater effort-reward imbalance because of the pressure they have put on themselves by taking on realistic demands in their work. That is, in addition to effort expended to meet objective job demands (extrinsic effort), these individuals also expend an inordinate amount of intrinsic effort, as a result of their predisposition to coping with job demands by overcommitting themselves to extra tasks in the jobs. Tsutsumi et al (2001) linked over commitment to a higher prevalence of depression among blue-collar and white-collar factory workers. Bosma&Colleagues(1998) found that overcommitment moderated the relationship between Effort-reward imbalance and health outcomes such as Emotional exhaustion.

It is plausible to posit that attitude towards unethical work behaviour among federal road safety corps is related to perception of effort-reward imbalance (that is, how well effort meets or exceeds outcome/expectations). For instance, if an officer or marshal perceives that he is putting more effort (performing harder) at safety tasks or beats but receiving fewer rewards or rewards received are not commensurate with the effort directed at performance. This perception may trigger negative reactions on the part of the affected officer or marshal

as the case may be and some of the negative reaction may include intent to leave the organization, low organizational commitment, neglect of organizational responsibilities, low self esteem, lack of a discausal attitude or approach to work, bad or negative influence on other workers negligent of duty and general lack of commitment towards achieving general organizational goals and objectives, sabotaging of organizational image and favourable disposition towards unethical work behaviour. However, if the individual perceives a balance between directed at job performance and the rewards receives, the individual is likely to have negative attitude towards unethical work behaviour.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In Nigeria today, many organizations where the incidence of unethical work behaviour is more prominent have little or no understanding of the causes and effects or consequences of unethical work behaviour in their various organizations. The limited or lack of understanding is due to the inadequacy of research on the subject matter and lack of proper records of empirical data indicating the loss incurred annually owing to unethical work behaviour in this part of the world.

Studies have shown that over 60% of employees have engaged in some form of unethical work behaviour at least once. Statistical evidences as to the prevalence of unethical work behaviour in Nigeria is not really available. The frequency and the severity of unethical work behaviour have had a significant impact on integrity and image of the organization.

The pertinent questions to be answered unequivocally in this study are underlisted as follows

- i. Do Locus of Control and Effort-Reward Imbalance independently and jointly predict Unethical work behaviour?
- ii. Do Sex,age,ethnic group,religion,marital status,highest level of education and years spent on the job independently and jointly predict Unethical work behaviour?
- iii. Is there sex difference in Unethical work behaviour?

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of this study in general is to examine the effect of locus of control and effort-reward imbalance on unethical work behaviour among members of federal road safety corps in Oyo state.

In many instances observations shows that Unethical work behaviour in all ramifications is eating deep into the fabrics of public and private organization in Nigeria. The study therefore investigated how Locus of control and Effort-reward imbalance affect unethical work behaviour among members Federal road safety corps

This study also aim at creating a channel for other researchers to carry out further study in this area.It is hoped that the finding of this would provide an answer to the ever recurring issue of the unethical work behaviour among the member of the federal road safety corps.

The specific objectives include the following:

- i. To know if Locus of control and Effort reward imbalance will independently and jontly predict unethical work behaviour.

ii. To examine if sex,age,ethnic group,religion,marital status,highest level of education and years spent on the job will independently and jointly predict unethical work behaviour.

iii. To investigate sex difference in unethical work behaviour.

1.4 RELEVANCE OF STUDY

This study provides useful background data and materials for those that are directly responsible for the management of the Federal road safety corps and other public service organizations.

Organizations should give much priority to the issue of work behaviour of employees.The core strength of an organization lies in the cooperation and citizenship behaviour of her manpower.An organization fares according to whether or not the behaviour of the workers are ethical or unethical.

In Nigeria,most organizations have little or no vivid idea of the estimation or how much the prevalence of unethical work behaviour cost because the understanding of workplace negative behaviour remain limited and much empirical research have not been tailored towards locus of control and perceived effort-reward imbalance predicts unethical work behaviour.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are many perspectives and models to explain theoretical framework of unethical work behaviour and the theoretical framework for locus of control and effort-reward imbalance are also discussed.

2.1.1 Stressor-Emotion model

The workplace is an environment that is rife with the experience and expression of strong emotion. It is the source of both physical (e.g. money) and psychological (e.g. esteem) needs and fulfilment. Individuals monitor workplace events and those deemed as particularly relevant for enhancing or hurting well-being will tend to induce emotion (Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, a situation that induce negative emotion will increase the likelihood that dysfunctional or unethical work behavioural responses will occur either as actively and directly attacking the agent of the situation (e.g. by avoid work or drunkenness).

Stress-Emotion model is based on prevalence approaches to emotion, the stress process in general and job stress in particulars. What counts in this model is not the objective work environment but rather, the individual's perception of environment challenges and appraisal of his/her ability to cope with these challenges (Lazarus, 1999; Perreive & Zellars, 1999). A negative appraisal triggers negative emotions. These emotions, in turn are linked to strain responses (Fox & Spector, 2005) in workplace. In specific application of the Stressor-Emotion model, the employee perceives and interpret objective job condition as

constraint, conflict or injustice that challenge his/her goal achievement or well-being and appraises his/her abilities to cope.

2.1.2 Theory of threatened Egotism and Aggression

Based on the inter-disciplinary review of research, came the emergency of the theory of threatened egotism and aggression as proposed by Baumeister, Smart and Boden (1996). The theory contends that the acts of aggression (in an organization) are often caused by the combination of high self-esteem and an ego-threat, which the proponent describes as any event that challenges or jeopardizes favourable view of the self. However, the theory does not suggest that all individuals with high-esteem would be prone to aggressive behaviour. Instead it proposes that a subset of individual with high-esteem, particularly those most vulnerable to ego-threats would be more likely to perpetrate aggressive behaviour (Baumeister, 1995).

The theorist posited that when the self appraisal is distorted by information that relate to the positive view of self, there is a corresponding behavioural reaction that is aggressive. Theory of Egotism suggests that those who hold high positive self-image would be extremely vulnerable to Ego threatening information (Baumeister, 1995) and would defend their Ego against unpleasant evaluative information, even if the information is factual and accurate (Penney & Spector). Encountering an Ego threat, therefore would arouse negative emotions, such as anger or frustration that in turn would lead to unethical work behaviour. This portion of the theory mirrors Spector's model of organizational frustration (Spector 1978, 1997). According to his model, an individual will experience frustration if he/she interprets an event or situation at work interfering with a goal.

2.1.3 Frustration-Aggressive model

Frustration-aggressive model has its roots in classic of Dollard-miller (1939). Frustration-aggression theory focusses on the interplay of affective and behavioural responses to certain types of work situation. The Dollard model views of aggression as a consequences of frustration.

However, it suffices to say it could be the antecedence of unethical work behaviour. The key contribution of human aggression theory is the linkage between anger/frustration and aggression (e.g Anderson, Deuser & Deneve, 1995, Berkowitz, 1989, Dollard, Miller, Sears 1939). Dollard et al's (1939). Frustration-aggression hypothesis suggested that Frustration is defined as interference with a person's goal oriented behaviour can lead to aggression, depending on factors such as availability of alternative responses and perceived danger of punishment. Fox and Spector (1999) fleshed out this hypothesis in the domain of the workplace, looking at connections between Frustrations as an environmental condition (i.e organizational constraints), emotional reaction (usually anger) to such conditions, cognitive elements (e.g perceived control), personality and workplace aggression.

2.1.4 Attribution Theory

Locus of control is one of the most researched constructs in personality (Rotter, 1990). Since its conceptualisation, a number of studies have been conducted to test the validity of the locus of control construct. These studies have indicated that people tended to act differently according to their locus of control disposition. People with a greater effort to control their environment.

Attribution is concerned with how individuals interpret event and how this relates to their thinking and behaviour. Helder (1958) was the first to propose a psychological theory of attribution, but Werner and colleagues e.g Jones et. al; 1972, Wemer, (1974) developed a theoretical framework that has become a major research paradigm of social psychology. Attribution theory assumed that people try to determine why people do what they do, i.e. attribute causes to behaviour. A 3- stage process underlies an attribution

- 1.The person must perceive or observe the behaviour.
- 2.The person must believe that the behaviour was intensionally performed and
- 3.The person must determine if they believe the other person was forced to perform the behaviour. Werner focussed his attribution on achievement (1974). He identify ability, effort, task difficulty and luck as the most important factors affecting attribution for achievement. He classified attributions along three causal dimensions: locus of control, stability and controllability.

In the framework of Rotter's (1966) Social learning theory, internal-external locus of control refers to the degree which an individual perceives success and failure as being contingent upon person initiatives. That is,the extent which a person believes that his or her behaviour has a direct impact on the consequences of that behaviour. At the end of the internal-external continuum, are the highly internal. That is, those who perceives efforts to be largely instrument in attaining success. At the opposite end of the spectrum are the highly external i.e those who ascribe little or no value to initiative,since in the extreme case,success and failure are viewed as completely unrelated to ability and effort.Thus,commonly used

terms for designating the two ends of this continuum, are the belief in skill and the belief in chance.

As a general principle, "internal control" refers to the perception of positive and or negative event as being a consequences of one's own actions, and thereby under personal control. "External control" refers to the perception of positive or negative events as being unrelated to one's own actions in certain situations and therefore beyond personal control. An individual's locus of control is a measure of belief about whether his rewards and success (punishment or failure) can be attributed to internal or external causes.

Based on Rotter's 1966 definition, individuals who are internals believe that job performances and event that occur in the work setting are contingent on their own behaviour and are therefore under personal control because internals feel that they can control their environment, opportunities at work which may increase the probability of receiving rewards such as promotion, pay increase or recognition are particularly salient to these individuals. External believe that work outcomes are beyond control and therefore attribute the cause for work outcomes to luck, fate or the action of others.

According to Crowne and Liverant (1963) individuals with an internal locus of control disposition tend to conform less to other's behaviour than individual with an external locus of control disposition do and tend to be more conservative in their social, political and religious beliefs (Furnham & Gunter, 1984).

One of the main concerns with studies looking at locus of control and work constructs is the tendency to assume that internal orientation is the positive end while the external orientation represents the negative end. Hence successful development should be directed toward becoming more internal (Khan, 2003).

Folkman's (1984) study of locus of control and stress revealed that having an internal locus of control may not always be linked to positive results. The study revealed that a belief that an event is controllable may not necessarily lead to reduction in stress as the belief will lead to greater effort by the individual to remedy the situation which at times may lead to an increase in stress. In addition to this believing that things are beyond one's control may not necessarily intensify the experience of stress.

According to Siegrist (1996), an imbalance between efforts spent and rewards received results in a state of "Emotion distress characterized by autonomic arousal and strain reactions such as feeling of threat, anger, depression". This state is exacerbated when accompanied by job instability, force occupational change, downward mobility or lack of promotion prospects. Thus, a demanding unstable job with high expectations for achievement and few promotion prospects can lead to unethical work behaviour among employees particularly for individuals with high level of over commitment.

2.1.5 Theory of Equity

Adams (1965) equity theory summarizes individual's reactions to perception of effort-reward imbalance in work organizations. The theory hinges on the inputs (efforts) that organization members contribute into social exchange relationship and the outcomes (rewards) derivable from such relationship. Inputs (efforts) represent investments in the exchange relationship for which a worker expects some reciprocal return (rewards). Therefore, if an individual perceives an imbalance between efforts and the rewards accrued to the efforts, cognitively, this would create tension or dissonance within the individual (Festinger, 1957), the tension that arose from perception of effort-reward imbalance would motivate the

individual to reduce it. This is because a state of imbalance in the individual's cognition is not comfortable.

Adams (1965) provided three alternatives to restore balance, which are reduction of the individual's effort, increasing the individual's reward, and if these alternatives are not achievable, quitting the job to escape the situation of imbalance. However, due to unemployment and economic situation in Nigeria, reducing the individual's input and quitting the job are not feasible alternatives, therefore, the individual may stay on with the job and devise personal method of increasing job rewards, this could be through being unethical.

Perception of injustice (effort-reward imbalance) is associated with deviant behaviours such as employee retaliation behaviour, theft, dysfunctional organizations, counter productive work behaviour and vandalism (Aquino, Lewis & Bradified, 1999; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). According to Sommers, Schell and Vodanovich (2002). Perceptions of employee that those in position of authority in an organization have been treating them unfairly may resort to indirect and covert forms of retaliation. Similarly, Hollinger and Clark (1983) reported that when employees felt exploited by the organization, they were more likely to engage in acts against the organization such as theft as a mechanism to correct perceptions of injustice. Similarly Greenberg and Scott (1996) reported that employee theft was a reaction to underpayment inequality.

2.2 RELATED STUDIES

A prominent stream of literature has argued that when employee perceive an imbalance between effort and the reward accrue to the efforts, cognitively this would create tension or dissonance with the individual (Festinger, 1957). According to the literature, reasons why some individual have positive or negative attitude towards unethical work behaviour may

relate to a variety of factors self regulation, emotional intelligence (Ojedokun, 2008), age, gender, educational qualification (Adebayo, 2005).

Literature review also suggests relationship between personality factors and attitude towards unethical work behaviour. For instance, Kreitner, Kinicki, and Beulens (2002) posited that a combination of personality characteristics values and moral principles influence ethical work behaviour. Moreover, anger, negativity affectivity (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Domagalski & Steelman, 2004; Hepworth & Towler, 2004), self control (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Markus & Schuler, 2004), emotional stability (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004; Salgado, 2002) narcissism (Penney & Spector, 2002) agreeableness (Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999), self esteem (Harvey & Keashley, 2003), and trait anxiety (Fox & Spector 1999) have all been linked to unethical work behaviour.

Researchers have studied the relationship between situational constraints and unethical work behaviour. Therefore, it seems reasonable that individuals who experience negative emotions more frequently and intensely should be more likely to engage in unethical work behaviour.

Another important factor is trait anger, the likelihood that individual perceives a wide range of situation as anger-provoking. Individuals high in trait anger are more likely to experience the emotional state of anger when they encounter frustrating and annoying conditions (Spielberger, Krasner & Solomon, 1998, Spielberger & Sydeman, 1994). Deffenbacher (1992) found that individuals high in trait anger reported experiencing more frequent and intense day-to-day anger across a wide variety of provocative situations, stronger tendencies to respond to provocations with physical and verbal antagonism, and lower instances of constructive coping. Thus, it suffices to say that individuals or employees high in

trait anger might be expected to respond to a wider range of organizational constraints with behavioural expression of anger.

In the studies of Spector and O'Connell (1999) in relation to locus of control and the behavioural responses to experienced frustration, they presupposed and found that locus of control may impact both the experience and frustration. Also Spector and O'Connell (1999) found that interests situational constraints refers to conditions at work that prevent individuals who are otherwise willing and capable of reforming a task, from successfully doing so. Often these situation are beyond the control of employees. For instances, not receiving needed materials on time or being given incorrect information. In general, research shows that situational constraints are associated with increased frustration and decreased job satisfaction (Chen & Spector 1992, Fox & Spector, 1999).

Additionally, individuals who experienced high levels of situational constraint reported engaging in unethical work behaviour than individuals who experienced low level of constraint (Fox and Spector, 1999)

Storms and Spector (1987) found some reasonable measure of support for the role of work of locus of control as a moderator in the frustration behavioural relationship, particularly for sabotage. Individuals with low perceived control (externals) are more likely to respond counterproductively to organizational frustration. Similarly, Perlow and Lathan (1993) found individuals with high level of externality were more likely to behave abusively towards clients at work.

In relation to work stress, a body of research has demonstrated that individuals with internal locus of control are better able to handle work stress. Kobasa (1979) found internal locus of control to moderate stress. Thoresen, Pucik and Welbourne (1979) found locus of

control (internality) to be correlated with both self and independent assessment of ability to cope with organization change. Internals perceive less stress (Anderson, 1977) and have demonstrated a preference for problem focussed (or task centered) coping over emotion-focused coping (Anderson, 1977, Judge et al, 1999). Thus, it might be expected hypothesized that internals would be likely than externals to engage in unethical work behaviour.

Based on the literature review, this study proposes that attitude towards unethical work behaviour is significantly related to locus of control and effort-reward imbalance.

2.3 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The following statements are the hypothesis this study seek to confirm

- (a) Locus of control (LOC) and effort reward imbalance (ERI) will independently and jointly predict unethical work behaviour.
- (b) Sex, age, ethnic group, religion, marital status, highest level education and years spent in job will independently and jointly predict unethical work behaviour
- (c) Sex will significantly influence Unethical work behaviour

2.4 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Unethical work behaviour: It is any behaviour that brings harm to and that is either illegal or morally unacceptable to the organization. It is measured using a 21 items scale designed to tap attitudes toward corrupt behaviour, use of unnecessary force or violence, accepting bribes as well as other ethical violations developed. It has response pattern in Likert type from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strong Agree). The total score obtainable on attitudes towards unethical work behaviour scale is derivable from addition of the scores for each item.

Locus of control: It refers to the extent to which people believe they control reinforcement. This study recognizes locus of control in the dimension of internality (attribution to event to personal control) and externality (attribution to event to luck and situational circumstances). It consisted 17 items which can be subsumed under two dimensions: Internality and Externality.

Effort-reward imbalance: It is when the effort at work does not match by appropriate rewards which leads to distress among employee of an organization. It was assessed using the 17 item shortened version of the 23 –item effort-reward questionnaire. Effort is measured using six items related to psychologically and physically demanding aspects of work environment. High scores indicate high efforts at work. Reward is assessed using eleven items that cover rewards received at work.

Extra role: It is an individual employee's willingness to try harder, complete more than they are expected to do and have a heightened desire to succeed.

Corps: Federal road safety personnel

Officer: a graduate member of the corps

Marshal: non- graduate member of the corps

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The design of this research study is ex-post facto research design owing to the fact that the researcher has no direct control over the manipulation of the variables of study. The independent variables are locus of control and effort-reward imbalance while the dependent variable is unethical work behaviour.

3.2 RESEARCH SETTING

The study was carried out in Federal road safety corps, Oyo sector command and its component units in Ibadan comprising of five commands, which are as follows: Oluyole, Egbeda, Mokola, Apata and Moniya unit commands. This research work could not cover the entire federal road safety formations due to time constraints and financial implication. Therefore, Oyo sector command is selected as a case study. The target audience are both Officers and Marshals of the command.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

The study was conducted using a total of two hundred (n=200) members of the Federal Road safety corps accidentally selected among Federal Road safety corps at the Sector command and the component Unit commands in Ibadan Oyo state Capital. They comprise of 147 males (73.5%) and 53 females (26.5%). The ethnic group involved are 18 Hausas (9.0%), 23 Igbos (11.5%), 140 Yorubas (70%) and others 19 (9.5%). Their ages ranged from 23 to 58 years with a mean of 34.69 and standard deviation of 7.995. Also, 57 (28.5%) of the participants were

single, 138 (69.0%) were married, 1 (0.5%) was divorced, 3 (1.5%) were separated and other is 1 (0.5%). Their number of years spent in the job ranged from 1 to 28 years with a mean of 8.28 and SD of 5.931. Some 38 (19.0%) participants were Senior secondary school certificates (SSCE) holders, 63 (31.5%) participants were National diploma/National certificates (ND/NCE) holders, 31 (15.5%) participants were Higher national diploma (HND) holders, 58 (29.0%) were Bachelor of science degree (BSc) holders and 10 (5.0%) were post graduate. Regarding their religion affiliation, 152 (76.0%) were Christians and 48 (24.0%) were Muslims.

3.4 SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Having designed a questionnaire to be administered to the members of the federal road safety corps and the permission had been sought and given by the relevant authority. Data collection was done during the weekly in-house training. The researcher distributed the questionnaires personally and assisted in clarifying any problem the respondents encountered in completing them. Participants were accidentally selected from the different commands of federal road safety corps in Ibadan. The researcher explained the purpose of study to the member of corps and with the assistance of head of administration and human resources department, the researcher administered the instrument for data collection for the participants. The questionnaires were administered under the condition of anonymity. Some of the questionnaires were collected immediately after completion but others were retrieved after a week through the head of administration and human resources department.

Two hundred and fifty questionnaires were administered by the researcher to the participants, only two hundred questionnaires (80%) were adequately completed and returned and these were considered adequate for data analysis.

3.5 INSTRUMENTATION

The Researcher adopted survey using well constructed questionnaire to collect data on Locus of control, Effort –reward imbalance and attitude towards unethical work. The questionnaire consisted of four (4) sections (ABC&D)

Section A consisted of demographic variables such as sex, ethnic group, age, religion affiliation, marital status, highest level of education and years spent in job.

Section B measured Locus of control. The scale was developed by Craig, Franklin & Andrew (1984). It consisted 17 items which can be subsumed under two dimensions: Internality and Externality. The following included items were reversed: 2,3,4,6,9,10,11,12,14&17. Craig, Franklin & Andrew (1984) reported internal consistency (Alpha coefficient) of .79. This study reported alpha coefficient of .78

Section C measured of Effort-reward imbalance. It is model used by Siegrist (1996) was assessed using the 17 item shortened version of the 23 –item effort-reward questionnaire developed by Siegrist, Starke, Chandola, Marmot, Niedhammer and Peter (2004). Effort is measured using six items related to psychologically and physically demanding aspects of work environment. High scores indicate high efforts at work. Reward is assessed using eleven items that cover rewards received at work and offered to the worker as part of social exchange process in the form of monetary remuneration, social approval and esteem, job security and career opportunities. Siegrist et al (2004) reported Cronbach coefficient alpha 0.72, an alpha coefficient of 0.71 was obtained in this study.

Section D measures of Unethical work behaviour. It is measured using a 21 items scale designed to tap attitudes toward corrupt behaviour, use of unnecessary force or

violence, accepting bribes as well as other ethical violations developed by Hyams (1990). It has response pattern in Likert type from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strong Agree). Items 3, 15 and 20 have reversed scores. The total score obtainable on attitudes towards unethical work behaviour scale is derivable from addition of the scores for each item. Krejci, Kvapil and Smrad (1996) reported alpha coefficient of .72 for the scale. However, Adebayo (2005) has reported a coefficient alpha of .89 for the scale. An alpha coefficient of 0.88 was obtained in this study.

3.6 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Multiple Regression analysis was used to test for hypothesis one because the hypothesis stated was to determine independently and jointly prediction of independent variables (Locus of control and Effort-Reward Imbalance) on the dependent Variable (Unethical work behaviour).

Multiple regression analysis was used to test for hypothesis two because the hypothesis stated was to determine independently and jointly prediction of demographic factors (Sex, Age, Ethnic group, Religion, Marital status, Highest level of Education and years spent on job) on the dependent Variable (Unethical work behaviour).

T-test for independent measure was used to test for hypothesis three because the independent variable only exists in two levels i.e Sex (male and female) and this was compared on levels of unethical work behaviour of participants.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULT

This chapter is concerned with the presentation of result and statistical analysis of data to test the hypotheses of this study to be able to obtain comprehensive information. The predictor variables- locus of control, Effort- reward imbalance, sex, age, Highest level of education, ethnic group, marital status and year spent in job were correlated with Unethical work behaviour.

HYPOTHESIS ONE:

Locus of control (LOC) and effort reward imbalance (ERI) will independently and jointly predict unethical work behaviour. This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression. The result is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: A Multiple Regression Table Showing Independent and Joint Prediction of Unethical work Behaviour

Predictors	β	t	P	R	R^2	F	P
LOC	.422	7.292	<.05	.602	.362	55.881	<.05
ERI	.358	6.182	<.05				

As shown in the Table 4.1, the multiple regression results shows that Locus of control (LOC) and Effort reward imbalance (ERI) jointly predicted unethical behaviours ($F(2,197)=55.88$; $P<.05$ with $R= .60$ and $R^2= .36$). This suggests that Locus and control (LOC) and Effort reward imbalance (ERI) accounted for 36% variation in unethical behaviour of the member of corps.

Similarly, locus of control (LOC) and effort –reward imbalance independently predicted unethical work behaviour ($\beta=0.42$; $t=7.29$; $P< 0.05$) and $\beta= .36$; $t=6.18$; $P< .05$) respectively. Therefore, the stated hypothesis was confirmed.

HYPOTHESIS TWO

Sex, age, ethnic group, religion, marital status, highest level education and years spent in job will independently and jointly predict unethical work behaviour. The hypothesis was tested using multiple regression. The result is presented in Table 4.2

Table 4.2 Multiple regression table showing joint and independent prediction of sex, age, ethnic group, religion, marital status, highest level of education and year spent in job on unethical work behaviour.

Predictors	β	t	P	R	R^2	F	P
Sex	-.005	-.065	>0.05	.308	.095	2.672	>0.05
Age	-.086	-.672					>0.05
Ethnic gr	.113	1.509					>0.05
Religion	.133	1.739					>0.05
Marital status	-.097	-1.241					>0.05
Level of education	-.250	-3.265					<0.05
Year spent job	.130	1.019					>0.05

From the table 4.2,the multiple regression shows that all the demographic factors jointly predict unethical work behaviour ($F(7,179)= 2.672$; $P<.05$ $R^2=.095$). However only highest level of Education ($\beta=-.250$; $t=-3.265$; $P<.05$) independently predicts unethical work behaviour.

But Sex ($\beta= -.005$; $t= -.065$; $P>.05$), age ($\beta= -.086$; $t= -.672$; $P>.05$), ethnic group ($\beta= .116$; $t=1.509$; $P>.05$), marital status ($\beta= -.097$; $t= -1.241$; $P>.05$) and year spent in job ($\beta= .130$; $t= 1.019$; $P>.05$) did not independently predict unethical work behaviour respectively. Then stated hypothesis was partially confirmed.

HYPOTHESIS THREE

The hypothesis stated that sex will independently predicts Unethical work behaviour.

T-test for independent variable was used to analyse the data because sex only exists in two level (male and female).

Table 4.3 A summary table showing the difference between male and female member of corps on unethical work behaviour.

Sex	N	Mean	SD	Df	t	P
Male	147	62.0204	14.84969	198	0.81	>0.05
Female	53	60.0943	14.56585			

The result from analysis as summarily shown in the table ($t= 0.81$; $df=198$; $p>0.05$).The result can be observed in the means,where male respondents ($X= 62.02$) were not significantly different in unethical work behaviour compared to female respondents ($X=60.09$). This suggests

that sex did not influence unethical work behavior. Therefore the above stated hypothesis was not confirmed and the hypothesis was rejected.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 DISCUSSION

The main purpose of embarking upon this study is to examine the “ locus of control and perceived effort-reward imbalance as predictors of unethical work behaviour”. From the statistical analysis, results vividly reveals that locus of control and perceived effort reward imbalance have significant relationship with Unethical work behaviour.

This study found significant relationship between locus of control and unethical work behaviour. However, this finding is consistent with finding by Fox and Spector (1999). They found out that Locus of control and trait anxiety correlate with frustration at work. Also is consistent with Storms and Spector (1987) finding which support for the role of work of locus of control as a moderator in the frustration behavioural reaction relationship, particularly for sabotaging.

It is also consistent with Perlow and Lathan (1993) findings which says individuals with high levels of externality were more likely to behave abusively towards clients at work.

The findings also revealed that effort –reward imbalance contributed significantly to unethical work behaviour which is related to those of Aquino, Lewis and Bradfield (1999), Skarlicki and Folger (1997) which reported that perception of injustice (effort-reward imbalance) is associated with deviant behaviours such as employee retaliation behaviour, dysfunctional organizational behaviours, vandalism, theft and counter productive working behaviour. This findings is also consistent with Hollinger and Clark (1983) reported when employees felt

exploited by the organization, they were more likely to engage in acts against the organization such as theft, as a mechanism to correct perception of injustice.

This findings is in conformity with Greenberg and scott (1996) reported that employee theft was a reaction to underpayment inequity. Similarly those of Sommers, Schell and Vodansvich (2002) who reported that when employees perceive that organizational management treat them unfairly, the perception may motivate and resort to indirect and covert forms of retaliation.

Lastly, the findings also consistent with Adam (1965) theory of inequality. According to the theory, participant who perceives inequality (effort-reward imbalance) whether or not it exists objectively, would be motivated to ameliorate it using several alternatives, which may include dysfunctional work attitude and behaviours.

5.1 CONCLUSION

When comparing the predictor variables Locus of control and Effort – reward imbalance on unethical work behaviour, findings indicated that jointly and independently both variables are important predictors of unethical work behaviour.

Moreso, the demographic factors are jointly important in predicting the Unethical work behaviour but only the level of education is independently important to Unethical work behaviour.

In conclusion, Locus of control and effort-reward imbalance played significant roles in understanding Unethical work behaviour among federal road safety corps.

5.2 IMPLICATIONS

The issue addressed in this study relates how locus of control and effort-reward imbalance predict Unethical work behaviour. This findings has produced evidence that individual who perceives internal locus of control reported being less unethical while that individual who perceives external locus of control reported being less ethical.

Effort-reward imbalance is positively related to unethical work behaviour and this findings has produced additional evidence that individuals who perceives imbalance between efforts directed at work and organizational rewards may be more prone to unethical work behaviour due to negative emotional reaction to a state of inequality. This findings contributes to the inequality theory literature by its applicability in a Nigeria public organization.

Also, findings of this study have practical implication for reviewing the recruitment and training processes of the member of federal road safety corps.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the outcome of the study, the following recommendation are made:

Organization's management should endeavour to provide a working situations devoid of constraints which could limit or affect on the job performance of the corps.

Management should endeavour to promote members of the corp as at when due, training and re-training i.e there should be adequate motivation and incentives given to corps member as when due and also encourage them to go for further studies.

Psychological tests should be made a requisite for recruitment, selection and placement in federal road safety commission.

Organization's management should not only punish the member of corps who involves in unethical work behaviour but should also reward those that are ethical in performing their duties.

Government should improve the quality of working life of public servants and these workers should be given a sense of responsibility and better working conditions.

Management should endeavour to be given the member of corps some allowances and bonuses such as extra duties allowance, hazards allowance etc.

Organizations in their bid to continue to survive should invest more in adventures that will enhance employees citizenship behaviour.

More research should be carried out to broaden the knowledge base of human resource development (HRD) practitioners future study should be geared towards implicating the influence of other psychological constructs such as self efficacy, emotional intelligence, personal trait, self control etc.

5.4 LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

During the process of carrying out this research work, researcher encounter some difficulties. Some of the limitation encountered are:

The individual respondents responding in a socially desirable was a limitation that must be acknowledged. It is perceived that employees in our sample may have underreported their detrimental behaviours at work, a limitation observed in most studies of this nature.

Although the researcher cannot rule out the underreporting and possible measurement error, but it is believed that they are unlikely to be a sufficient magnitude to compromise the validity of this findings.

Measure of attitude towards unethical work behaviour among federal road safety corps was assessed and not real or others rating of unethical work behaviour. Thus, it is difficult to establish whether this attitude lead to unethical work behaviour or not.

Also the findings of this study are not generalize to other sector commands or security agencies in Nigeria because data collection was restricted to only one location.

Other constraints encountered by the reseacher is that of time and resources. All of theses contribute to the limitation of this study.

There is also the problem of initial reluctance on the part of the respondents towards responding to the questionnaires which makes the reseacher to make use of persuasive means to get the right responses from the respondents.

Another limitation that was observed by the researcher during this research work is that of attaching importance to the handling of the research instrument by some of the respondents who handled the questionnaire giving to them nonchallantly and with a pinch of salt and and thus rendering the questionnaire given to such categories of respondents to be invalid and irrelevant to the objectives of the research work and this make the researcher to go for the reproduction of the questionnaires so rendered invalid and this amount to waste of productive time, money, energy and effort of the researcher.

However, the above mentioned limitations are not adequately capable enough to render this project work from measuring what it was meant to measure and significantly in achieving the aims and objectives of the research work.

REFERENCES

- Adam, J.S (1965). Injustice in social Exchange, In Berkowitz, L (ed.) Advance in Experimental social psychology Academic press. Abridged in steers, R. M and Porter L.W. Motivation and Work Behaviour, (2nd ed.), N.Y: McGraw –Hill, pp 107 – 124.
- Adebayo, D.O. (2005). Gender and Attitudes toward Professional Ethics: A Nigeria Police Perspective, African security Review, 14,(2).
- Anderson, C.A., Deuser, W.E., & DeNeve, K.M. (1995); Hot Temperature, Hostile Affect, Hostile Cognition, and Arousal: Tests of a General Model of Affective Aggression. Personality and social Psychology Bulletin 21, 434- 448.
- Anderson, C.R (1977). Locus of Control, Coping Behaviour and Performance in a Stress Setting: A Long Structural Study. Journal of Applied Psychology. 62. 446 – 451.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M.U.,& Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice Constructs, Negative Affectivity, and Employee Deviance: A Proposed Model and Empirical Test, Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 20(7),1073-91.
- Aquinas,K., & Reed, A, II. (2002). The Self –importance of Moral Identity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83, 1423-1440.
- Bandura, A (1986); Social Foundation of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Baron, R.A. &Neuman, J.A (1998); Workplace Aggression – The Iceberg Beneath the Tip of Workplace Violence: Evidence of its Forms, Frequently and Targets. Public Administration Quarterly, 21, 446-464.
- Berowitz, L. (1989); Frustration Aggression Hypothesis: Examination and Reformation. Psychological Bulletin 106, 59-73.

- Bies, R.J. & Tripp, T.M (2004). The Study of Revenge in the Workplace: Conceptual, Ideological, and Empirical Issues.
- Bruursema, K.; & Spector, P.E (2005); Leadership Style and the Link with Counterproductive Work Behaviour. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for industrial and organizational psychology, Los Angeles, April 15-17.
- Chen, P.Y. (1989); Relationship of frustrators with Affective, Behavioural and Physical Reactions: The Effects of potential Moderators. Matters Thesis, University of South Florida. Lampa Florida.
- Chen, P.Y. & Spector, P.E. (1992) Relationship of Work Stressors with Aggression, Withdrawal, Theft and Substance Use: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychological* 65, 177-184.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L.A., & Barrick, M.R. (2004). Interactive Effects of Personality and Perception of the Work Situation on Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599-609.
- Craig, A.R., Franklin, J.A. and Andrews, C.(1984), A Scale to Measure Locus of Control of Behaviour. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 57, 173-180.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L.W., Miller, N.E., Mowrer O.H. & Sears, R.R. (1939), *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven. Yale University Press.
- Douglas S.C., & Martinko, M.J. (2001). Exploring the Role of Individual Differences in the Prediction of Workplace Aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 547-559.
- Eagly, A.H., & Chaiken, S.(1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Forth Worth, TX:Harcourt Brace Johanovich.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston,IL: Row, Peterson.

- Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A Model of Work Frustration-Aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20, 915-931.
- FRSC Establishment act,2007.
- Gibson, D.E., & Barsade, S.G. (1999). The Experience of Anger at Work: Lessons from the Chronically Angry. In R.R. Callister (Chair), *Anger in Organizations: Its Causes and Consequences*. Symposium Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management Conference, Chicago.
- Goh A., Bruursema, K., Fox, S. & Spector, P.E. (2003, April). Comparisons of Self and Coworkers Reports of Counterproductive Work Behaviour. Poster Session at the Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee Theft as a Reaction to Underpayment Inequity: The Hidden Cost of Pay Cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 5,561-568.
- Greenberg, J. & Scott, K.S. (1996). Why do Workers Bite the Hand that Feed them? Employee Theft as a Social Exchange Process. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 18, 111-156.
- Harvey, S.,& Keashely, L. (2003). Predicting the Risk of Aggression in the Workplace: Risk Factors, Self Esteem and Time at Work. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 31, 807-814.
- Hepworth, W., & Towler, A. (2004). The Effects of Individual Differences and Charismatic Leadership on Workplace Aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9,176-185.
- Hollinger, R.C. (1986). Acts Against the Workplace: Social Bonding and Employee Deviance. *Deviant Behaviour* 7,53- 75.
- Hollinger, R. C, & Clark, J. P. (1983). Formal and Informal Social Controls of Employee

- Deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23, 333-343.
- Hyams, M. T. (1990). *The Relationship of Role Perception and Narcissism to Attitudes toward Professional Ethical Behaviour among Police Officers. A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty of the School of Human Behaviour. United States Int. University, San Diego, Cal.*
- Jones, T. M. (1991). *Ethical Decision Making by Individuals in Organizations: An Issue-Contingent Model. Academic Management Review*, 16, 366-395.
- Kelloway, E.K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J., Nault, A. (2002). *Self Reported CWB and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: Separate but Related Constructs. International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 10,143-151.
- Kobaja, S.C.(1979); *Stressful Life Events, Personality and Health: An Inquiry into Hardiness. Journal of personality & Social Psychology*. 37,1-11
- Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A., & Beulens, M. (2002). *Organisational Behaviour (Second European Edition).* London: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
- Krejei. P., Kvapil, J., & Smrad, J. (1996). *The Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job Frustration and Narcissism and Attitudes towards Professional Ethical Behavior among Police Officers* http://www.Nejrs.org/policing/rel_1461.htm (accessed on 10/10/2006).
- Lazarus R.S.(1999); *Stress and Emotion: A New Synthesis*, NY: Springer Publishing co.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science*, New York: Harper.
- Lumijärvi, I., & Vesterinen, L. (2006). *Discussions and Documentations of Values as Means in Decreasing Unethical Behaviour and Violations of Integrity- A Case Study of Finnish Local Police Units. Paper Presented at 3rd Regional International Conference of the*

International Institute of Administrative Sciences, Monterrey, Nuevo Leon (Mexico),
16-20 July.

Marcus B., & Schüler, H. (2004). Antecedents of Counterproductive Behaviour at Work: A
General Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 647-660.

Martinko, M.J., Gundlach, M.J. & Douglas S.C. (2002), Counterproductive Workplace
Behaviour: A Causal Reasoning Perspective. *International Journal of Selection and
Assesment*, 10,36-50.

McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2000). *Organisational Behaviour: Emerging Realities for
the Workplace Revolution*, N.Y: McGraw-Hill

Miles, D.E., Borman, W.E., Spector, P.E. & Fox, S. (2002). Building an Integrative Model Of
Extra Role Work Behaviour Comparison of Counterproductive Work Behaviour with
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assesment*
10, 51-57.

Nueman, J.H. & Baron, R.A. (1997). Aggression in the Workplace, In R.A Giacalone & J.
Greenberg (Eds). *Antisocial Behaviour in Organizations* (pp.37-67). Thousand Oaks,
CA: Sage.

Neuman,J.H. & Baron, R.A. (1998). Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence
Concerning Specific Forms Potentials Causes, and Preferred Targets. *Journal of
Management* 24, 391-419.

O’Leary-Kelly, A.M. Griffin, R.W & Collins Organization-Motivated Aggression. A Research
Journey of *Academy of Management Review* 21,225-253.

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, the Good Soldier Syndrome*,
Lexington, M.A: Lexington Books.

- Ojedokun, A.O. (2008). Attitude towards Unethical Work Behaviour among Police Personnel. Ibadan Journal of the Social Sciences, 6(1), 13-21.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P.E. (2002). Narcissism and Counterproductive Work Behaviour: Do Bigger Egos Mean Bigger Problems? International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10, 126-134.
- Perlow R. and Latham, L.L (1993); "Relationship of Client Abuse with Locus of Control and Gender of Longitudinal Study in Mental Retardation Facilities". Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,831,834.
- Regulations on Maintenance of Discipline,2005 of Federal Road Safety corps
- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviours: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 555-572.
- Salgado J. F. (2002). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Counterproductive Behaviours. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10, 117-125.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The People Make the Place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 437 - 453
- Siegrist, J. (1986). Soziale Krisen und Gesundheit (Social crisis and health) Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse Health Effect of High- Effort /LowReward Conditions. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1, 27-41.
- Siegrist, J. (2002). Effort-reward Imbalance at Work and Health. In P. Perrewe, & D. Ganster (Eds.), Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being (pp. 261-291). New York: JAI Elsevier.
- Siegrist, J., Peter, R., Junge, ?, Cremer, P., & Seidel, D. (1990). Low Status Control, High Effort at Work and Ischemic Heart Disease: Prospective Evidence from Blue-Collar Men, Social Science & Medicine, 31(10), 1127-1134.

- Siegrist J, Starke D, Chandola T, Godin I, Marmot M, Niedhammer, I; & Peter, (2004). The Measurement of Effort- Reward Imbalance at Work: European Comparisons. *Social Science Medicine*, 58, 1483-99.
- 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. *Academic Management Journal*, 42, 100-108.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. & Near, P.J. (1983); Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Sommers, J. ?, Schell, T. L., & Vodanovich, S. J. (2002). Developing a Measure of Individual Differences in Organizational Revenge, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(2), 207-22.
- Tsutsumi A, Kawakami N: A review of empirical studies on the model of effort-reward imbalance at work: reducing occupational stress by implementing a new theory. *Soc Sci Med* 2004, 59:2335-2359.

APPENDIX

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire seeks to examine prevailing situations in work places and the finding would be used strictly for research purposes. You are NOT required to write your names and Personal Identification number (PIN) on the forms to guarantee the confidentiality attached to the expected responses. There are no right or wrong answers. Be accurate and candid as best as you can in your response.

SECTION A

Please, tick each of the following as applicable to you

1. Male: a. () b. Female ()

2. Age: -----

3. Ethnic Group: a. Hausa/Fulani () b. Yoruba () c. Igbo () d. Others (pls specify) -----

4. Religion: a. Christianity () b. Islam () c. Others (pls specify) -----

5. Marital Status: a. Single () b. Married () c. Divorced () d. Separated () e.

Others-----

6.Highest level of Education: a. SSCE () b.ND/NCE ()c. HND ()d.BSc () e. Postgraduate ()

7.How many year(s) have you spent in your present Job?-----

SECTION B

Using the scale below,please indicate the level of your agreement with the following items by choosing the option that best represents your views,using this response format, SA=Strongly agree, A=Agree, U=Undecided,D=Disagree,and SD=Strongly Disagree

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1	I can anticipate difficulties and take action to avoid them.					
2	A great deal of what happens to me is probably a matter of chance.					
3	Everyone known that luck or chance determine one’s future.					
4	I can control my problem(s) only if I have outside support.					
5	When i make plans,I am almost certain that i can make them work.					
6	My problem(s) will dominate me all life.					
7	Becoming a success is a matter of hard work;luck has little or nothing to do with it.					
8	My life is controlled by outside action and events.					
9	My mistakes and problems are my responsibilities to deal with.					
10	People are victims of circumstances beyond their controls.					
11	To continually manage my problems,I need professional help.					

12	When I am under stress,the tightness in my muscles is due to things outside my control .					
13	I believe a person can really be master of his life.					
14	It is impossible to control my irregular and fast breathing when I am having difficulties.					
15	I understand why my problems vary so much from the occasion to the next.					
16	I am confident of being able to deal successfully with future problems.					
17	In my case, maintaining control over my problem(s) is due mostly to luck.					

SECTION C

Please,for each item,just tick the appropriate column that reflects your perception using the following code: A = Agree, D = Disagree

		A	D
1.	I have constant time pressure due to a heavy work load		
2.	I have many interruptions and disturbances in my job		
3.	I have a lot responsibility in my job		
4.	I am often pressured to work overtime		
5.	My job is physically demanding		
6.	Over the past years,my job has become more and more		

	demanding		
7.	I receive the respect I deserve from my superiors		
8.	I receive the respect I deserve from my colleagues		
9.	I experience adequate support in difficult situations		
10.	I am treated unfairly at work		
11.	I have experienced or i expect to experience an undesirable change in my work situation		
12.	My job promotion prospects are poor		
13.	My job security is poor		
14.	My current occupational position adequately reflects my education and training		
15.	Considering all my effort and achievements, I receive the respect and prestige I deserve at work.		
16.	Considering all my efforts and achievements, my work prospects are adequate.		
17.	Considering all my efforts and achievements, my salary/income is adequate		

SECTION D

Please, for each item, just tick the appropriate column that reflects your answer or perception using the following code:SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, Neutral=N, Disagree=D, Strongly Disagree=SD

		SA	A	N	D	SD
1	It is not wrong for an officer to accept small gifts from the public					
2	An officer must sometimes use prohibited means to accomplish enforcement of the law or make an arrest.					
3	I would take definite action if I know of misconduct on the part of the officer, even if he is a friend.					
4	Transporters or Business owners give discounts or free items because they like the road safety corps					
5	An officer cannot be consistently productive unless he or she bends or breaks the rule from time to time					
6	I would probably use prohibited means if I thought it was the only way that I could do so.					
7	Unless it is an extremely serious matter, officers should protect each other when misconduct is alleged.					
8	It is sometimes necessary to be verbally disrespectful or abusive to a person because that is the only way they will understand or comply.					

9	“Professional courtesy”, excusing a fellow officer for minor violations of the law is okay.					
10	Most supervisors agree that rules must be broken or bend to get the job done, but they don’t admit it.					
11	I know numerous officers who have broken or bent the law to enforce the law.					
12	Exaggerating probable cause to get a crook off the street is sometimes. O.K.					
13	Sometimes, it is necessary for an officer to lie a little in court or on the report in order to get a conviction.					
14	Road safety work is like a game. As long as it appears that the rules are followed, anything done to win is O.K.					
15	I would not lie to save my job.					
16	My personal life is my business, and my organization mostly couldn’t care what I do long as I do my job					
17	Taking care of personal business while working is usually O.K.					
18	It is generally not wrong for an officer to accept free or discount meals or items from businessmen.					
19	Some people should receive “Street justice” after hurting a road safety corps because that is the only real punishment that they will get.					
20	I would never strike no matter how unfair I perceived					

	working conditions or wages.					
21	I would lie to save another officer's job, especially if he or she is a friend.					