

# INFLUENCE OF JOB STRESS ON COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR AMONG NON-TEACHING STAFF OF UNIVERSITIES IN BENUE STATE

Irene Torkwase Tingir<sup>1</sup>, Benjamin Osayawe Ehigie<sup>2</sup> & Anyalewa Ajonye<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2&3</sup>Department of Psychology, Benue State, Makurdi, Nigeria  
tingirtorkwase@gmail.com

## Abstract

Counterproductive work behaviours, (CWBs) as they are referred to, are not just behaviours that employees engage in that go against or hinder the attainment of organisational goals, but they are those that also negatively affect fellow employees. As part of research efforts towards understanding the antecedents of counterproductive work behaviours in the workplace, the present study investigated the influence of job stress on counterproductive work behaviours among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. The participants were 348 non-teaching staff selected from three different universities in Benue State. Data were collected using The New Job Stress Scale, and Counterproductive Work Behaviours Check List. Results of multiple linear regressions, revealed that job stressors (time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker support and work life balance) significantly predicted counterproductive behaviours of abuse, production deviance, sabotage and theft. However, the results indicated that anxiety stress, co-worker support and work-life balance did not predict withdrawal among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State. It was concluded that job stress factors, both independently and jointly are important factors in determining counterproductive work behaviours of non-staff of Universities in Benue State. Based on the findings, it was recommended that management of the Universities should evolve policies that aimed at training and retraining staff on appropriate coping strategies which will help in reducing job related stress and therefore reduces the incidence of counterproductive work behaviour among the staff.

**Keywords:** Job Stress, Counterproductive work behaviour, non-teaching staff, universities

## Introduction

Employee behaviour in the workplace is a major concern to organisations. Essentially, these behaviours can be categorized into those that benefit the organisation and those that are detrimental to its success. The organizational behaviours that are detrimental to the success of the

organisations are referred to as counterproductive work behaviours. Counterproductive work behaviours are behaviours of employees that undermine the goals and interests of the organisation. The university setting is geared towards achieving academic excellence. The teaching, learning and research

environments are intended for scholarship and community service. The structures put in place are to focus and further the institution towards maximum academic performance. Therefore, positive work place behaviour is pertinent to achieving the desired set goals. Non-teaching staff of universities fulfil a wide range of responsibilities that encompass administration, maintenance, security, library service, bursary and health care (clinic) among others. The administrative staff are tasked with the responsibilities of record keeping, scheduling correspondence, handling inquiries, hiring new staff, staff welfare, student's admissions and registration and also ensuring that staff and students comply with the rules and regulations of the university. Without their services running the university would be challenging, chaotic and twirly.

Counterproductive work behaviours, (CWBs), as they are referred to, are not just behaviours that employees engage in that go against or hinder the attainment of organisational goals, but they are those that also negatively affect fellow employees (Lawal et al., 2019). They are voluntary behaviours of organisational members that violate significant organisational norms and, doing so, threaten the wellbeing of the organisation and/or its members.

Counterproductive work behaviours are series of conducts that are harmful to the organisation by upsetting the organisation's

overall operations and the wellbeing of its employees, leading to depressed overall operational efficiency. They violate significant organisational norms and have strong potentials to directly or indirectly threaten the wellbeing of an organisation due to decreased productivity, increased cost and inefficient workforce. These negative behaviours at work are detrimental to both co-workers and the organisation.

Bennett (2016) explained that in various educational institutions, some workers display behaviours that are contrary to how they should behave in a professional setting; their behaviours violate organisational norms and are considered to be unethical. Some employees are known to engage in theft, fraud and other misdemeanors like absenteeism, verbal abuse and decrease in work time that detract from the actualisation of institutional aims and objectives. Due to these deviant behaviours exhibited by workers, educational institutions suffer a decrease in productivity, increase in cost, organisational ineffectiveness, inefficient work output, deteriorating status and bad reputation.

Numerous researchers such as Ma and Li (2019), Meirsler et al (2020), have described counterproductive work behaviours as an emotional based response to stressful organisational conditions. This view suggests that employees monitor and evaluate events at their work environments,

some of which may be evaluated as job stressors, like role of conflicts and ambiguity, interpersonal conflict and situational constraints. These stressors induce negative emotional responses which could lead to counterproductive work behaviours. Job stress is identified as the cause of negative psychological, behavioural and physiological outcomes. It impedes motivation, morale and performance of employees in the workplace (Saleem, 2020). Job stress depletes an employee's energy resources and, when these resources are lost, and results to lower level of job performance. More so, when these resources are lost frustration sets in, which may further lead to engagement in counterproductive work behaviours (Ugwu, 2022). Working in the university can be quite stressful and can create frustration in employees, and when these occur, the employee may experience negative emotions which in turn may compel them to engage in counterproductive work behaviours.

### **Statement of Problem**

The university setting is geared towards achieving academic excellence. The teaching, learning and research environments are intended for scholarship and community service. The structures put in place are to focus and further the institution towards maximum academic performance. Therefore, positive work place behaviour is pertinent to achieving the desired set goals. There is need to curb counterproductive work

behaviours in Nigerian universities due to their negative impact. Even when individuals with these deviant behaviours constitute a minority, their actions can be extremely detrimental to the institution. More research on counterproductive work behaviours is required in Nigerian universities to try to understand the full extent of their impact on the running of the universities. Universities, as research centers, play a critical role to national development and issues relating to their effective functioning ought to be thoroughly examined. Many researchers like Farrastama et al. (2019), Oguebe et al. (2014), Yusufari and Bambale (2022) and Johan & Yusuf, (2022) have conducted research studies regarding the variables of interest to this research, which are job stress and counterproductive work behaviours, in different organisations in different parts of the world, but relatively few (if any) have been conducted and published on universities in Benue state.

## **Literature Review**

### **Job Stress and Counterproductive Work Behaviours**

This research work is anchored on The Fraud Triangle Theory by Cressey (1953). It identifies three (3) forces: Needs, Opportunity, and Rationalisation, that influence an employee's tendency to engage in unethical behaviours like, theft, abuse, withdrawal of efforts and other forms of counterproductive work behaviours.

According to this theory, when an employee is confronted with these three (3) forces, the odds of engaging in deviant behaviours become high.

The theory is relevant to this study especially in view of the economic downturn the country is experiencing. When employees are facing financial hardships, there is a high tendency for them to engage in on- the –job deviant behaviours for financial gain. Such behaviours may include, stealing, using the organisation's equipment for personal gains, collecting bribe and so on. Unpaid salaries, delay in payment of salaries and salary cuts are becoming uncontrollable in Benue state. The loss of these rights and privileges may result to financial stress and may propel employees to steal, commit fraud, collect bribe, and engage in other dishonest behaviours.

Spector et al, (2006) categorised counterproductive work behaviours into five facets namely, abuse against others, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. While Shukula and Srivastava (2016) identified five (5) potential job stressors which include: Time stress (when an employee is worried that there is insufficient time to complete a task); Anxiety stress (the feeling of fear, worry, nervousness or unease about work-related situations); Role expectation conflict, which occurs when there are incompatible demands placed upon a person relating to their job or position.

Co-worker support refers to co-workers assisting one another in their task when needed, and sharing knowledge and expertise as well providing encouragement and support to one another; and Work life balance, which is the state of equilibrium where a person equally prioritizes the demands of their personal life such as family, leisure activities and so on). All these work stressors are capable of stimulating negative emotions such as counterproductive work behaviours.

Yusufari and Bambale (2022) examined the effect of job stress on counterproductive work behaviour among non-academic staff members of the university in Yobe state, Nigeria. The main objective was to examine the effect of job stress (time stress and job anxiety) on counterproductive work behaviour among non-academic employees of the university in Yobe state Nigeria. The study employed a survey research design, where questionnaire was used as the main technique of data collection. Out of 276 copies of questionnaire that were distributed, only 206 copies were completed and retrieved. Also, regression analysis method using SPSS version 20 was used to analysed the data. The result of the study showed that job anxiety significantly affects counterproductive work behaviour. Result also indicated insignificant relationship between time stress and counterproductive work behaviour. This study concluded that job stress is like a virus that attacks and kills

institution in totality. Job stress does more harm than good to universities in Yobe state, Nigeria and therefore, recommended adjustment of work schedule for accomplishment of day to day activities and reducing work load assigned to every individual employee; control and monitor employees counterproductive work behaviour and enhance organisational climate of the respective institution. However, their study focused only on time stress and job anxiety as stressor and never took into consideration the role that emotional intelligence could play in the influence of job stress and counterproductive work behaviours. The present study will also include job stressors like role expectation conflict, coworker support, and work-life balance and the role of emotional intelligence in the influence of job stress and counterproductive work behaviours among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state.

Ataria and Yusuf (2022) studied the effect of job stress on employee's counterproductive work behaviour: A case study of Deluxi Nigeria limited. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the general effects six hypothesised factors that contributes to job stress and subsequently productivity level in employees at Deluxi Nigeria Limited. The data utilised were through questionnaire method that consists of 72 participants which amount to more than 80% of total work force. The objective of this study is to delineate the

causes of job stress and their effect on productivity level. The methodology used was reflective approach that involves two basic phases; the measurements model phase and the structural model phase. The independent constructs included career development, work over load, role of ambiguity, job security, work family life, and personality, while job stress and productivity level were dependent variable.

Ugwu (2022) studied counterproductive work behaviour among Nigerian civil service. The objective of the study was to find out if self-control, perceived organisational support, and occupational stress affect counterproductive work behaviour. The study examined the predictive value of self-control, perceived organisational support (POS), and occupational stress on counterproductive work behaviours among employees in the Nigerian civil service organisations. A cross-sectional survey was adopted and data were collected from 367 employees through random sampling technique across seven (7) ministries within the south-East of Nigeria. Consistent with all speculations, the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicated that high self-control and POS significantly and negatively predicted counterproductive work behaviour. Occupational stress was a significant positive predictor of counterproductive work behaviour. However, the study focused on self-control (Regulation of Emotions) which is just one

dimension of emotional intelligence. The current study will include the other dimensions of emotional intelligence such as self-emotions appraisal (SEA), others' emotions appraisal (UOE) and use of emotions (UOE).

### **Research Question**

What is the influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker support and work life balance) jointly and significantly influence counterproductive work behaviour (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft and withdrawal) among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state?

### **Hypothesis**

There will be a significant influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker support and work life balance) jointly and significantly influence counterproductive work behaviour (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft and withdrawal) among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state.

### **Method**

#### **Design**

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey design to investigate the influence of job stress on employees' counterproductive work behaviour and the role of emotional intelligence among staff of universities in Benue State. In cross-sectional survey, data

collected are to make inferences about a population of interest (universe) at one point in time.

### **Sampling and Sample size**

To determine the sample size in this study the sample size figure from Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table was used. Multi-stage Sampling procedures were used for the study. Purposive sampling technique was used at the first stage. The researcher used purposive sampling technique in identifying individuals who were considered to be typical of the population (only non-teaching staff of universities from Federal, State and Private universities in Benue State) and selected them as study population (Akinsola, 2005). Finally, Proportional Sampling Technique was used at the third stage to ensure that, non-teaching staff of different universities and departments, units, cadre and sex who volunteered within the study area were all represented. Three hundred and forty-eight (348) non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State was sampled.

### **Participants**

The participants for this study were three hundred and forty-eight (348) non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State sampled through a multi-stage process. They comprised of 218 (62.6%) males and 130 (37.4%) females within the age range of 27 – 54 years. Distribution of respondents according to universities Benue state shows that 115 (33.0%) were working in Benue State

University Makurdi, 204 (58.6%) participated from Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi and 29(8.4%) non-teaching staff participated from University of Mkar, Mkar. With respect to the marital status of the respondents, the result indicates that 219(62.9%) staff were married, 67 (45(19.3%) were single staff, 32(9.2%) were separated, 10 (2.9%) were widowed and 20 (5.7%) of the respondents were divorced. Results further shows that the respondents of the study have stayed on their current job between 2- 8 years, while their job position shows that 108(31.0%) of the 348 participants were senior staff and 248(59.0%) were junior staff members of their respective universities in Benue State.

### **Instruments**

A set of questionnaire was used for data collection in this study. The questionnaire consists of the following:

**I. The New Job Stress Scale:** The new job stress scale developed by Shukla and Srivastava (2016) was used to assess perceived job stress. The new job stress scale has 22 items structured in a 5-point Likert response comprising (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree (3) undecided (4) Agree and (5) strongly agree. The new job stress scale also comprises 5 sub-scales:

- (1) Time stress consists of 4-items (1, 2, 3, 4).
- (2) Anxiety stress is measured by 5 items (5, 6, 7, 8, 9) on the new job scale.

- (3) Job-expectation conflict is measured by 5 items ranging from item number (10, 11, 12, 13, 14).
- (4) The co-worker support, measured by 4 items (15, 16, 17, 18).

The sub-scale is work-life balance is measured by 4 items (19, 20, 21, 22). A higher score in each of these sub-scales indicates a higher quality of perceived job stress experienced by the employee, and a lower score implies lower quality of perceived job stress.

### **ii. Counterproductive Work Behaviours**

**Check List:** The counterproductive work behaviours check list (CWB- C) (32-Items) version was developed by Spector and Fox (2006). It is used to determine the magnitude of counterproductive work behaviours. The responses are made on a five-point frequency scale ranging from 1 – 5, where 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 stands for Never, Once or twice, Once or twice per month, Once or twice per week and every day, respectively. This scale is divided into five sub-scales:

- (1) Abuse, measured by 17- items ( 8 , 9 , 1 4 , 1 5 , 1 9 , 2 0 , 2 1 , 2 3 , 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32).
- (2) Production Deviance, measured by three (3) items, item number 2, 10, and 12.
- (3) Sabotage, measured by three (3) items, item number 1, 5, and 6.
- (4) Theft, measured by five (5) items, items number 7, 16, 17, 18 and 22 and

- (5) Withdrawal, measured by four (4) items, items 3,4,11 and 13 on the counterproductive work behaviours check list.

**Psychometric properties of the instrument:** Anjum and Parvez (2013) reported the statistic reliability of the five dimensions of the counterproductive work behaviours checklist as follows: Abuse ( $\alpha = 0.771$ ), Sabotage ( $\alpha = 0.812$ ), Production deviance ( $\alpha = 0.836$ ), Theft ( $\alpha = 0.831$ ), and Withdrawal ( $\alpha = 0.883$ ). The overall reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the scale (all the 32 items) was reported as .84. which shows that the internal consistency is high and the scale is reliable. Among Nigerian samples, Lawal, Babalola, and Ordu (2019) reported internal consistency of 0.97, while Alpha coefficient of .90 was obtained.

### **Procedure**

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the Department of Psychology, Benue State University, Makurdi, and presented same to the Registry of the three Universities. Ethical clearance was sought and obtained, including information on the total number of non-teaching staff, which was given to the researcher.

A total number of 348 copies of questionnaires were proportionally issued to non-teaching staff of the three (3) universities in Benue State. J.S Tarka University Makurdi

204, Benue State University 116 and University of Mkar 28 non-teaching staff respectively. Informed consent, briefing and debriefing was done for ethical considerations. The researcher entertained questions by those who needed clarification on how to answer the questionnaires. After administering the questionnaires and the participants having responded to them, the instruments were retrieved, screened and imputed into the SPSS for analysis.

### **Data Analysis**

Data collected in the study were analyzed using computer software called Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 26. SPSS is a computer package used for rigorous statistical analyses mostly in the social sciences. During the pilot study, Cronbach's alpha, interitem-total correlation and factor analyses were performed on the four scales to determine the scale reliability, item-total correlation coefficient and component extraction respectively.

For the main study, the data collected were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. First of all, a preliminary analysis using frequencies, mean and standard deviations were performed to summarize the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Also, inter- correlations among the study variables were examined. The second statistical test that was used in this study was Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, to examine the influence of job

stress and its dimensions on dimensions.  
counterproductive work behaviours and its

**Table 1:** Multiple Linear Regression showing influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker support and work life balance on counterproductive work behaviour (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft and withdrawal) among non-teaching staff of the universities in Benue state

	Predictors	R	R <sup>2</sup>	df	F		t	P
<b>Abuse</b>	Constant						6.823	<.001
	Time Stress					.282	16.369	<.001
	Anxiety Stress					.196	8.787	<.001
	Role Expt Conflict	.991	.981	5,347	3566.667	.218	12.261	<.001
	Co-worker Sup					.093	5.862	<.001
	Work Life Bal					.312	22.697	<.001
<b>Prod.Dev.</b>	Constant						5.958	<.001
	Time Stress					.194	6.852	<.001
	Anxiety Stress					.273	7.426	<.001
	Expectation C	.974	.949	5,347	1276.729	.088	3.022	<.001
	Co-worker Sup					.103	3.935	<.001
	Work Life Bal					.423	18.755	<.001
<b>Sabotage</b>	Constant						1.710	.NS
	Time Stress					.314	9.218	<.001
	Anxiety Stress	.963	.925	5,347	861.822	-.184	-4.160	<.001
	Expectation Con					.924	26.263	<.001
	Co-worker Sup					-.167	-5.294	<.001
	Work Life Bal					.059	2.176	<.001
<b>Theft</b>	Constant						-5.129	<.001
	Time Stress					.468	10.002	NS
	Anxiety Stress					.885	14.581	<.001
	Expectation Con	.928	.861	5,347	424.095	-.402	-8.325	<.001
	Co-worker Sup					-.160	-3.695	<.001
	Work Life Bal					.115	3.095	<.001
<b>Withdrawal</b>	Constant				1027.910			
	Time Stress	.968	.938	5,347			3.870	<.001
	Anxiety Stress					.092	2.922	<.05
	Expectation Con					-.098	-2.411	NS
	Co-worker Sup					.193	5.961	<.001
	Work Life Bal					.661	22.764	<.001
<b>CWB</b>	Constant						7.951	<.001
	Time Stress	.980	.960	5,347			2.667	<.001
	Anxiety Stress					.607	24.182	<.001
	Expectation Con					.112	3.438	NS
	Co-worker Sup					.321	12.730	<.001
	Work Life Bal					-.034	-1.451	NS
						.006	.288	NS

**Key: CWB= Counterproductive Work Behaviour**

The results presented in Table 1 show that job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker support and work life balance) jointly and significantly influence counterproductive work behaviour (abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft and withdrawal) among non-teaching staff of

universities in Benue state [ $R=.991$ ,  $R^2=.981$ ,  $F(5,348)=3566.667$ ,  $p<.001$ ]. These results show that overall, job stress accounted for 98.1% of the total variance observed in counterproductive work behaviour among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. This implies that the more non-

teaching staff experience stress on their jobs the more susceptible they would be to CWB. Based on this finding, hypothesis one was confirmed.

Independently, the results presented in Table 4.2 show that time stress as a dimension of job stress has made significant positive contribution to counterproductive work behaviour among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.282$ ,  $t=16.369$ ,  $p<.01$ ). This means that increase in time stress experienced by a staff will leads to increase to CWB. Time stress contributed 28.2% of the total variance observed in CWB. The results also indicate that anxiety stress significantly and positively predicted CWB among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.196$ ,  $t=8.787$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Anxiety stress accounted for 19.6% of the total variance observed in CWB. This means that the higher anxiety- stress the higher the tendency of staff to be counterproductive at work.

Similarly, the results in Table 4.2 above show that role expectation conflict positively predicted CWB among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.218$ ,  $t=12.261$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Role expectation conflict as a dimension of job stress positively accounted for 21.8% of the total variance in CWB among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. The results are indicating that co-worker support significantly predicted CWB among non-

teaching staff of Universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.093$ ,  $t=5.862$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Co-worker support contributed 9.3% of the total variance observed in CWB. Finally, on the dimensions of job stress, results in Table 4.2 show that work life balance significantly predicted CWB among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.312$ ,  $t=22.697$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Work Life Balance positively accounted for 31.2% for the total variance observed in CWB among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. This means that, all the five factors of job stress positively contributed to CWB of non-teaching staff.

The result further showed that, there was a significant influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, expectation conflict, co-worker stress and work life balance on abuse, dimension of CWB among non-teaching staff of the universities in Benue state [ $R=.936$ ,  $R^2=.925$ ,  $F(5,347)=861.822$ ,  $p<.01$ ]. Overall, job stress explained 92.5% of the total variance observed in abuse among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state.

As regards the dimensions of job stress on abuse the results in Table 4.2 indicated that, there was a significant influence of time stress on abuse among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.194$ ,  $t=6.852$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Similarly, the results indicate that anxiety stress contributed significantly to abuse among non-teaching staff of

universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.273$ ,  $t=7.749$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The results as presented in Table 4.2 also show that role expectation conflict positively and significantly predicted abuse among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.088$ ,  $t=3.022$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Co-worker support was also found to significantly predicted abuse among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.103$ ,  $t=3.935$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Finally, on the abuse as a dimension of CWB, results presented in Table 4.2 indicate that work life balance also made a significant contribution to abuse among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.423$ ,  $t=18.755$ ,  $p<.01$ ). This implies that these five key job stress factors serve as primary triggers for abuse among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State.

Similarly, the results presented in table 4.2 showed that, there was a significant influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker stress and work life balance on deviance, a dimension of CWB among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state [ $R=.963$ ,  $R^2=.925$ ,  $F(5,347)=861.822$ ,  $p<.01$ ]. The findings revealed that job stress positively accounted for 92.5% of the observed total variation in deviant behaviour among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State.

As regards the dimensions of job stress on production deviance the results in table 4.2 indicate that, time stress significantly

predicted deviance among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.314$ ,  $t=9.218$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Results in Table 4.2 also show that anxiety stress significantly but negatively predicted production deviance among non-teaching staff in Benue State ( $\beta=-.184$ ,  $t=-4.140$ ,  $p<.01$ ). This implies that as time stress decreases deviance increases and vice versa. Similarly, role expectation conflict significantly and positively predicted deviance among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.924$ ,  $t=26.263$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The results further indicate that co-worker support significantly but negatively predicted deviance among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=-.167$ ,  $t=-5.294$ ,  $p<.01$ ). This implies that as co-worker support increases deviance reduces and vice versa. Finally, on the production deviance as a dimension of CWB, the results in Table 4.2 indicate that work life balance had significant influence on CWB among Non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue ( $\beta=.059$ ,  $t=2.176$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

Furthermore, the results in table 4.2 showed that, there was a significant influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, expectation conflict, co-worker stress and work life balance on sabotage a dimension of CWB among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state [ $R=.928$ ,  $R^2=.861$ ,  $F(5,347) = 424.095$ ,  $p<.01$ ]. This means that the higher the stress among the staff the higher the behaviour of sabotage. This further shows that job stress contributed 86.1% in the total

variance observed in sabotage among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State.

Independently, the results in table 4.2 showed that anxiety stress significantly and positively predicted sabotage ( $\beta=.885$ ,  $t=-10.002$ ,  $p<.01$ ), implying that staff with perception of anxiety stress are likely have negative feeling that will lead to sabotage work as a strategy to reduce the emotionally unpleasant condition. The results in Table 4.2 also indicate that work life balance significantly and positively predicted sabotage among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.115$ ,  $t=3.095$ ,  $p<.01$ ). However, role expectation conflict significantly but negatively predicted sabotage among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=-.402$ ,  $t=-14.581$ ,  $p<.01$ ). This implies that as role expectation conflict decreases, sabotage behaviour among the staff increases and vice versa. Similarly, co-worker support significantly and negatively predicted sabotage among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=-.160$ ,  $t=-8.325$ ,  $p<.01$ ). the negative prediction indicates that as co-worker support increases, sabotage behaviour decreases and vice versa. The results in the Table 4.2 show that, time stress was not found to be a significant predictor of CWB of sabotage among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.468$ ,  $t=5.129$ ,  $p>.05$ ).

The result in table 4.2 also showed that, there

was a significant influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, expectation conflict, co-worker stress and work life balance on theft, dimension of CWB among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue state [ $R=.968$ ,  $R^2=.938$ ,  $F(5,378)=1027.910$ ,  $p<.01$ ]. This implies that staff who experience stress on their job will likely engage in counterproductive behaviour like stealing. Job stress factors positively accounted for 96.8% in the total variance observed in the CWB dimension of theft among the non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State.

Regarding the dimensions of job stress on theft, the result indicated that, time stress significantly and positively predicted theft among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.092$ ,  $t=2.922$ ,  $p<.05$ ). the results also show that, role expectation conflict positively predicted theft among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=-.193$ ,  $t=5.961$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The results presented in Table 4.2 further indicate that co-worker support had a significant and positive impact on theft among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State ( $\beta=.661$ ,  $t=22.964$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Similarly, work life balance ( $\beta=.199$ ,  $t=7.957$ ,  $p<.01$ ) positively predicted CWB of theft among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State. However, the results in Table 4.2 show that anxiety stress ( $\beta=-.098$ ,  $t=-2.411$ ,  $p<.05$ ) negatively predicted CWB of theft among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. This

results imply that increase in anxiety stress among the staff will lead decrease in behaviour of theft among staff of Universities in Benue State.

Finally, the results in Table 4.2 reveal that, there was a significant influence of job stress (time stress, anxiety stress, expectation conflict, co-worker stress and work life balance on withdrawal among non-teaching staff of universities in Benue State [ $R=.980$ ,  $R^2=.960$ ,  $F(5,347)=1648.239$ ,  $p<.01$ ]. Job stress significantly contributed 96% in the total variance observed in withdrawal dimension of CWB suggesting that increase in job stress will likely leads to staff withdrawal from their jobs.

### **Discussion**

Hypothesis of the study which stated that there will be a significant influence of job stress on counterproductive work behaviour among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State was tested using Multiple Linear Regression. Findings showed that, job stress significantly influenced counterproductive work behaviour among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. Finding further showed that, independently, job stress factors of time stress, anxiety stress, role expectation conflict, co-worker stress and work life balance significantly predicted counterproductive work behaviours among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. This implies that high job stress among the non-teaching staff will leads to high level

of their counterproductive work behaviours.

This finding lends credence to the work of Yusufari and Bambale (2022). The result of their study showed that job stress significantly affects counterproductive work behaviour. Their results also indicated insignificant relationship between time stress and counterproductive work behaviour. This shows that job stress is like a virus that attacks and kills institution in totality. It does more harm than good to non-teaching staff of universities.

The finding of this study also agrees with the work of Ugwu (2022). Results from his study showed that, Occupational stress was a significant positive predictor of counterproductive work behaviour. This implies that the more the staff perceived stress as a result of performing their job the more they exhibit counterproductive work behaviours.

The finding is also in line with the works of Hira and Javeed (2012) whose study showed a significant influence of job stress on counterproductive work behaviour. This means that job stress among employees led them somewhat towards counterproductive work behaviours. Similarly, this finding is consistent with the works of Meier and Spector (2013) whose result indicated workplace stressors significantly predicted counterproductive work behaviour.

Furthermore, this finding corroborated the works of Pitariuș and Budean, (2020) who studied the predictive value of different occupational pressures on job satisfaction and counterproductive work behaviour using an occupational sample in the financial service field. Their findings showed that job stress is a significant factor determining counterproductive work behaviour among the employees. The finding of this study also agrees with the work of Oyishi and Onukwo (2014) who studied the cause of counterproductive work behaviours in the work environment. They reported that stress is a significant predictor of counterproductive work behaviour among secondary school teachers.

### Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that:

Job stress as a whole increase the tendency of counterproductive work behaviour of the non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State. It was further showed that job stress factors independently predicted counterproductive work behaviour among non-teaching staff of Universities in Benue State.

### Recommendation

The following recommendations were made based on the findings of this study:

On policy basis, it is recommended that management of the Universities should evolve policies that would aim at training and

retraining staff on appropriate coping strategies, which will help in reducing job-related stress and incidences of counterproductive work behaviour among them.

### References

- Ataria, J.O, Yusuf, A. A & Shuaibu, H. (2022) Effect of job stress on employee's counterproductive work behaviour: A case study of Deluxi, Nigeria limited. *Ijmsspcs online journal* 5, (2) 342-354
- Ehigie, B.O., & Hameed, S.A. (2020). Emotional Intelligence and Organisational Constraints as Predictors of Counter Productive Work Behaviour Among Teachers in Abeokuta metropolis Ogun State. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*; 10 (6) (1), 90-101.
- Lawal, A.M., Babalola, S.S. & Orlu, U.F. (2019). Examining Age, Pay Satisfaction and intent to leave in counterproductive work behaviours among University Support staff. *Bangladesh e- Journal of Sociology*. 16, (2), 23-34.
- Meisler, G., Dory, A., & Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2020) perceived organizational politics and counterproductive work behaviour: The mediating role of hostility. *Personal Review*, 49(8), 1505 – 1517).
- Saleem, F., Malik, M.I., & Qurieshi S.S. (2021) Work stress hampering employee's performance during COVID-19: Is safety culture needed? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12 655839.
- Spector, P.E. Fox, S. Penney L.M. Bruursema K., Goh, A. & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductive: Are all counterproductive behaviours created? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68(3),

446-460.

- Srivastava, A.K & Singh, A.P. (1981). *Manual of the Occupational Stress Index*. Varanasi: Department of Psychology, Banaras University.
- Ugwu, F.O. (2022) Counterproductive work behaviours in Nigerian civil services: do self-control, perceived organisational support, and occupational stress matter? *African Journal for psychological study of social issues*. Vol. 25 No. 1 2022.
- Yusufari, M.Y., & Bambale, A.J. (2022). The effect of job stress on counterproductive work behaviour among non-academic staff of universities in Yobe State Nigeria. *Industrial and organisational science journal*, 1 (1), 25-40.