



Determinants of Workplace Deviant Behaviours among Non-academic Staff in Universities in South-South Nigeria

Emmanuel Mitaire Tarurhor^{a*} and Kikelomo Titilayo Opatayo^{a†}

^a *Department of Business Administration, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJEBA/2022/v22i2230716

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/90659>

Original Research Article

Received 17 June 2022
Accepted 22 August 2022
Published 29 August 2022

ABSTRACT

This paper studied the determinants of workplace deviant behaviours (WDB) among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. Three hundred (300) non-academic staff were drawn equally from the six universities in the six states that make up the South-South region of Nigeria. Data were generated from two hundred and nineteen (219) questionnaires received from the respondents without errors and analyzed using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation. The results found that vandalism, manipulation of records, abuse of office, wastage of office resources, leaving early from work, favouritism, gossiping, and aggression towards colleagues were prominently workplace deviant behaviour. In addition, the study established that the individual-related factors that cause these deviant behaviours are job stress, personality traits, emotional intelligence and moral deviation, while interpersonal factors are group norms and group behaviours. In the same vein, the organizational factors include workplace religiosity, workplace support, job security, career management, and HR practices. The study concludes that a statistically significant relationship exists between the two major categories of workplace deviant behaviours, interpersonal and organizational factors responsible for deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. The study recommends that university management should set up a committee to strictly address and combat the identified deviant behaviours that are commonly practiced among her non-academic staff in the institution.

[#] Associate Professor;

[†] Ph. D Student;

*Corresponding author: E-mail: tarurhor@gmail.com, metarurhor@delsu.edu.ng;

Keywords: *Interpersonal deviant behavior; organizational deviant behavior; non-academic staff; staff performance; workplace behaviours.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, more attention has been drawn to the different behaviours displayed among staff at their workplace. Several studies have examined workplace behaviours from both the constructive (positive and functional) and the destructive (negative and dysfunctional) perspectives. Researchers that focus on the constructive view believe that these behaviours will lead to an increase in productivity and also improve the workplace environment. However, the destructive perspective perceives negative consequences caused by these behaviours and thus, prescribes these destructive behaviours at the workplace to mean WDB [1]. Robinson and Bennett [2] labeled WDB as those acts of staff at the workplace that are not in conformity with the norms and rules of the organization and, as such, cause harm to the staff, clients or customers within the organization. The impact of WDB on the organization and its human elements cannot be undermined. For instance, deviance and work progress cannot go together as the former is bound to hinder the latter. As recorded by Brooks [3], workplace deviance deteriorates organizational citizenship behaviours, reduces productivity, and enhances actions like absenteeism, and withdrawals, among others.

Several authors have made attempts to explain WDB according to various types. Robinson and Bennett [4] grouped workplace deviance into two types: organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise. They explained organizational-wise to include two types: production deviance (e.g., wastage of resources, early closure from work, observing too many breaks, putting slow efforts into work, etc.) and property deviance (e.g., theft, sabotaging work equipment, etc.). The interpersonal types of deviant behaviours are also grouped into two types: political deviance (e.g., gossiping, unnecessary competition with a colleague, favouritism, etc.) and personal aggression (e.g., endangering colleagues, sexual harassment, etc.). In their typology, Iqbal, Arif, and Badar [5] demonstrated WDB to fall into two dimensions: the ones that have serious consequences and those that have minor consequences. Quoting Robinson and Bennett, these authors affirmed that deviance might vary along a continuum of severity. However, irrespective of the category an act falls into, it is

detrimental to the organization and its members.

Furthermore, from the institutional point of view, it is pertinent to understand the various determinants of WDB to prevent them and possibly combat them when they occur. These antecedents could vary according to context, situations, and associated variables. As Malik and Lenka [6] emphasized in their research, the major causes of WDB are tied to three main factors: individual, interpersonal and organizational factors. Every other factor resulting in these deviant workplace behaviours revolves around the three major factors.

The issue of WDB has lingered on for so long both at the international scene and in Nigeria. In Nigeria studies had shown that WDB is associated to cases of poor work attitude [7]; cybercrime [8] and funds misappropriation [9] have been reported in various media. Kalejaiye and Adeyemi [10] and Uwannah [11] established that deviant behaviours in the universities system are on the increase among university staff. These deviant acts in the university setting, according to Igbe, Okpa and Aniah [12] include but are not limited to abuse of office, funds misappropriation, money extortion, employment racketeering, distortion of staff records and students' grades for financial gain, disregard for constituted authority, and so on.

Arising from the above, several studies had established that WDB is on increase in the university system, despite its negative impact on the progress and growth of the University and the society. The researchers are worried by the geometric increase of WDB and felt that if stringent punishments are not introduced to curb it, it will be copied as a norm by the students in the university system. This study therefore, contributes to the extant literature but differ in scope of study considering non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria and methodology.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

To fulfill the purpose of this study, two research objectives were raised to identify the types of WDB practiced among non-

academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria.

1.2 Hypotheses

Ho₁: There is no statistically significant relationship between the organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise types of workplace deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria.

Ho₂: There is no statistically significant relationship among the individual, interpersonal and organizational factors responsible for workplace deviant behaviours among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Workplace Deviant Behaviours

Workplace deviance is the deliberate purpose to do harm to an individual or an organization [13]. WDB has been categorized into two: the positive workplace deviance and the negative workplace deviance. While the positive workplace deviance is used to term those behaviours that contributes to the well-being of an organization and/or its members [14], the negative deviance connotes a violation of an organization's interests and is detrimental towards the organization and its human resources [15]. Workplace deviant behaviours can be directed at organizations or coworkers. They could exist in form of small acts like gossiping, late coming to work, arguing, etc., or could be serious acts such as theft, harassment, funds misappropriation and so on.

Workplace deviant behaviours can also be viewed from the constructive and unconstructive views [16]. These authors opined that the constructive view puts deviance behaviours as the actions with the intention of violating organizational standards and principles in a constructive manner. The constructive view places deviant behaviours to include shrill blowing, organizational citizenship behaviour, and innovation [17]. On the other hand, the unconstructive behaviours are actions that negate organizational standards and principles and diminish organizational procedures negatively [18]. They include disagreeing, slow efforts towards job tasks, etc.

Typically, different WDB exists in universities. These behaviours are propagated among

university staff. Igbe, Okpa and Aniah [12] reported these deviant behaviours among university workers, including abuse of office, gross insubordination, funds misappropriation, impersonation, employment racketeering, and irregular conduction examination for students, among others. In addition, vandalism, tardiness, aggression and sexual harassment are among other types of deviant behaviours exhibited among staff in the universities in recent times.

The employees' characteristics, emotions, and cognitions are considered to be the individual elements that determine workplace deviance [19]. These authors noted attributional variables such as job burnout, justice seeking, and turnover intentions as individual-related factors that determines deviance. And as prescribed by Braje, Aleskic and Jelavic [15], these factors also involve the individual personality traits, his/her level of perception, extent of emotional intelligence, and experience on the job among others. Some other scholars identified low level of trust, negative attitudes and moral deviation as other individual-related factors that results in workplace deviant behaviours. However, a staff member with these characteristics does not necessarily display deviant behaviour, but may provide a risk for it [15].

The interpersonal determining factor of WDB include behaviours exhibited in a group, psychological contract breach, leadership style practiced by superiors, and group norms [6]. From the organizational perspective, these factors include culture and climate [20]; workplace religiousity, workplace support, human resource practices, job security, and career management [6]. Since the organization characterizes every other identified factors, it therefore becomes pertinent for its antecedents to be addressed strictly in tackling deviant behaviours.

2.2 Non-Academic Staff in Universities

The Higher Education Statistics Agency [HESA] [21] defined non-academic staff as "those category of staff in a tertiary institution that do not have academic employment functions. They complement each other in the institution by supporting the academic staff in executing their functions and ensuring the smooth-running of the institution. The non-academic staff of a university is of two groups: the junior non-academic staff and the senior non-academic staff. These categories of university staff are regulated by a

union referred to as the “Non-Academic Staff Union of Education and Associated Institutions” (NASU), who ensures that the interest and welfare of its members, both internally and nationally are duly protected [22]. As confirmed by Madukoma and Opeke [23], the non-academic staff in a university is made up of staff in the following offices: Student Affairs, Admissions, Registry, Exams and Records, Vice Chancellor’s, Cafeteria, Bursary, Bookshop, and so on.

2.3 Empirical Review on Determinants of Workplace Deviant Behaviours

Studies exist on the determinants of WDB in different contexts. For instance, Fagbohunbe, Akinbode and Ayodeji [4] conducted an empirical study on the organizational determinants of WDB in Nigeria. The correlational research design was chosen. Data were elicited from 696 employees in several private and public organizations in Lagos State, Nigeria. The study’s findings reported that male participants were considerably different from their female counterparts on personal aggression, political deviance, production deviance and property deviance. Also, the regression result showed that organization response variables (supervision, company identification, kinds of work, amount of work, physical work conditions and financial rewards) are significant predictors of many aspects of WDB among workers.

Igbe, Okpa & Aniah [12] examined employees’ working conditions and deviant behaviours in the University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study investigated the relationship between the variables of working conditions (payment of allowances, employees’ safety) and deviant behaviour in the University. The Equity theory was adopted as the theoretical base on which the study was hinged. The survey research design was used, where data were collected from randomly selected 361 employees from twelve different faculties, departments, units and centers at the university. Data for the study were generated through primary and secondary sources. The Linear regression and Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed to test the received data. The findings showed a significant relationship between non-payment of allowances, poor workers safety, and deviant behaviour among employees in the University.

Akanni, Omisile and Oduaran [2] examined WDB among public sector employees: The roles of

perceived religiosity and job status. Three hundred and fifty one (351) Nigerian workers of the Local Government Service Commission participated in the study. Multiple regressions was utilised to evaluate data from the Workplace Deviant Behavior Scale and Centrality of Religiosity Scale. Religiosity was shown to be negatively related with deviant conduct in the workplace, however there was no significant difference between junior and senior employees in the exhibition of deviant behaviour in the workplace. In addition, respondents’ workplace deviant conduct was simultaneously impacted by their religion and employment position. The findings suggest that a high level of religiosity among employees may minimise the probability of deviance, improving the work environment.

Obalade and Akeke [1] investigated job characteristics and deviant behaviour among employees of selected public and private universities in Ondo and Ekiti States, Nigeria. Using questionnaires, academic and administrative personnel from four institutions were surveyed to acquire the primary data. Both the descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for analyses. The results of the simple regressions showed that job characteristic factors have a negative effect on deviant behaviour in the selected public and private universities. In the chosen institutions, the results indicate that amount of impact, relevance and feedback, role performed, position held, and autonomy enjoyed have a deterrent effect on deviant behaviour.

In their empirical research titled “Blame it on Individual or Organization Environment: What predicts workplace deviance more?” Braje, Aleskic and Jelavic [15] explored organizational culture and individual personality traits as the antecedents of WDB. A multilevel perspective was applied and the snowball sampling technique was used to select 251 employees from 11 organizations in Croatia to participate in the study. Results of the research and hierarchical linear modeling implied that individual-related factors, namely, age and gender, as well as personality traits, are greater predictors of both individual and organizational deviance as opposed to organizational culture.

However, it is observed from the empirical studies reviewed that a lack of literature addresses specifically the determinants of WDB among non-academic staff in universities in

South-South Nigeria. Specifically, the issue of the types and causes of WDB in tertiary institutions have not been addressed holistically let alone the relationship that exists among these variables. Although, it is commendable that several literature exists on this subject matter in the local and national setting, this study would fill the gap that still exists on the determinant of WDB practiced among non-academic staff in the university context.

3. METHODS

This study utilised the correlational research design. Correlational research design seeks to ascertain relationships between two or more [24-26]. Thus, this study was aimed at examining the relationship between the types and causes of WDB and the job performance of non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. This research design was chosen because the researchers do not intend to control or manipulate the data collected during the study.

Because of the large population size, the researchers conveniently selected only 50 non-academic staff from each university comprising senior and junior categories. Hence, the sample utilized for the study is 300 non-academic staff since there are six universities, Federal University of Petroleum Resources (FUPRE), Effurun, Delta State; University of Benin, Benin City; Federal University, Otuoke, Bayelsa State; University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State; University of Uyo, Akwa-Ibom State; and University of Calabar, Cross River State. Thus, the researchers also adopted the convenience sampling technique to arrive at the study's sample.

Copies of the structured questionnaire were administered to participants in their offices at the respective universities by the researchers on a personal basis with the assistance of two-trained research assistants who accompanied her to the sampled universities. Their responses were collected immediately. The data received through the questionnaire were evaluated using descriptive statistics (such as frequency, simple percentage and mean) and inferential statistics to proffer answers to the earlier stated research objectives. Thus, in testing the hypotheses, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was

employed in examining the relationship among the study's variables. All hypotheses were tested at an alpha level (α) of .05.

4. RESULTS

Three hundred (300) questionnaires were given out to the respondents, but two hundred and fifty-six (256) were returned. From the returned 256 questionnaires, only two hundred and nineteen (219) questionnaires were without errors and could be used for further analysis. However, out of the thirty seven(37) questionnaires, twenty two (22) have major errors and fifteen(15) copies have a lot of missing information. The researchers removed those questionnaire with about 16% missing information, since they are above the acceptance rate of 10% (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson 2010); [27]. Hence, 73% rate of response was achieved from the exercise which was considered high for analysis.

4.1 Analysis of Questionnaire Data

This section presents analysis of the data on the items raised in the questionnaire in line with the research objectives. The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 shows information relating to the types of workplace deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria. As revealed in the Table, the respondents agreed that: vandalism (137, 63%); manipulation of records (155, 70%); abuse of office (126, 58%); wastage of office resources (199, 91%); and leaving early from work (139, 64%) are the different types of organizational-wise deviant behaviours commonly practiced among non-academic staff in universities while they also agreed that: favouritism (177, 81%); gossiping (198, 90%), and aggression towards colleagues (154, 70%) are the interpersonal-wise deviant behaviours common among this category of staff under study. However, the respondents disagreed that: funds misappropriation (179, 82%); putting slow efforts into office tasks (141, 64%); sexual harassment (152, 69%); endangering co-workers (133, 61%); gross insubordination towards superiors (180, 82%) are types of WDB practiced among non-academic staff in universities under study.

Table 1. Types of Workplace Deviant Behaviours in Universities

S/N	Types of workplace deviant behaviours	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
(I) Organizational-wise							
1	Vandalism	137	63	14	6	68	31
2	Funds misappropriation	35	16	5	2	179	82
3	Manipulation of office records	155	70	21	10	43	20
4	Abuse of office	126	58	10	4	83	38
5	Wastage of office resources	199	91	3	1	17	8
6	Leaving early from work	139	64	-	-	80	36
7	Putting slow efforts into office tasks	60	27	18	8	141	64
(II) Interpersonal-wise							
8	Sexual harassment	58	27	9	4	152	69
9	Favouritism	177	81	-	-	42	19
10	Endangering co-workers	80	36	6	3	133	61
11	Gossiping	198	90	-	-	21	10
12	Aggression towards colleagues	154	70	17	8	48	22
13	Gross insubordination towards superiors	39	18	-	-	180	82

Field Data (2021)

Table 2. Causes of Workplace Deviant Behaviours in Universities

S/N	Causes of workplace deviant behaviours	N	Mean	Remarks
(I) Individual-Related Factors				
1	Job stress	219	3.56	Accepted
2	Turnover intentions	219	2.70	Rejected
3	Personality traits	219	3.91	Accepted
4	Emotional intelligence	219	3.60	Accepted
5	Moral deviation	219	3.04	Accepted
(II) Interpersonal Factors				
6	Group norms	219	4.01	Accepted
7	Superior leadership styles	219	2.24	Rejected
8	Group behaviours	219	3.65	Accepted
9	Dissimilarity	219	2.32	Rejected
10	Psychological contract breach	219	2.83	Rejected
(III) Organizational Factors				
11	Workplace religiosity	219	3.53	Accepted
12	Workplace support	219	4.05	Accepted
13	Job security	219	3.61	Accepted
14	Career management	219	3.81	Accepted
15	HR practices	219	4.06	Accepted

*Criterion mean = 3.00

Table 2 displays information on the causes of workplace deviant behaviours common among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria. As shown in the Table, the respondents agreed that: job stress ($\bar{x} = 3.56$); personality traits ($\bar{x} = 3.91$); emotional intelligence ($\bar{x} = 3.60$); and moral deviation ($\bar{x} = 3.04$) are individual-related factors; and that group norms ($\bar{x} = 4.01$); group behaviours $\bar{x} = 3.65$) are interpersonal factors; while workplace religiosity ($\bar{x} = 3.53$); workplace support ($\bar{x} = 4.05$); job security ($\bar{x} = 3.61$); career

management ($\bar{x} = 3.81$) and HR practices ($\bar{x} = 4.06$) are organizational factors that are responsible for workplace deviant behaviours commonly practiced among non-academic staff in universities under study. Meanwhile, the respondents disagreed that: turnover intentions ($\bar{x} = 2.70$); superior leadership styles ($\bar{x} = 2.24$); dissimilarity ($\bar{x} = 2.32$); and psychological contract breach ($\bar{x} = 2.83$) are factors that cause workplace deviant behaviours among non-academic staff in universities.

4.2 Testing of the Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested were made possible from the data generated from the two hundred and nineteen (219) respondents.

Hypothesis One: There is no statistically significant relationship between the organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise types of workplace deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria.

In order to test this hypothesis, the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was adopted. The result of the data analysis is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 reveals the correlation between the two types of WDB practiced among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. The

result shows that the correlation coefficient, r , is .922 while the significant level (α) is .000 which is lesser than the alpha level of .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no statistically significant relationship between the organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise types of WDB practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria is rejected. It implies that, an increase in organizational-wise WDB may lead to a corresponding increase in the interpersonal types among the staff.

Hypothesis Two: There is no statistically significant relationship among the individual, interpersonal and organizational factors responsible for workplace deviant behaviours among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria.

To test this hypothesis, the Multiple Correlation using the PPMC was adopted. The result of the data analysis is presented in Table 4.

Table 3. Relationship between the organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise types of workplace deviant behaviours practiced by non-academic staff in universities

Correlations		Organizational-wise	Interpersonal-wise
Organizational-wise	Pearson Correlation	1	.922**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	219	219
Interpersonal-wise	Pearson Correlation	.922**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	219	219

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

Table 4. Relationship among the individual, interpersonal and organizational factors responsible for workplace deviant behaviours among non-academic staff in universities

Correlations		Individual	Interpersonal	Organizational
Individual	Pearson Correlation	1	-.927**	.933**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	219	219	219
Interpersonal	Pearson Correlation	-.927**	1	-.863**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	219	219	219
Organizational	Pearson Correlation	.933**	-.863**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	219	219	219

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

Table 4 shows the correlation among all the three factors that causes workplace WDB among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. The result shows that a strong negative correlation exists between the individual and the interpersonal factors ($r = -.927$; $\alpha < .05$) indicating that an increase in one would lead to a corresponding increase in the other. Thus, the correlation between these two variables is significant. Likewise, the correlation between the individual and organizational factors is also significant ($r = .933$; $\alpha < .05$) as a strong positive correlation is indicated. For the relationship between interpersonal and organizational factors, it was disclosed that a strong negative correlation exists between these variables ($r = -.863$, $\alpha < .05$) and is a significant correlation. Thus, the results have shown that a strong relationship exists among all the three variables (individual, interpersonal and organizational factors) of interaction that causes workplace deviant behaviours among non-academic staff in South-South Nigeria.

5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The discussion of the research findings is done in line with the research objectives and hypotheses formulated at the introductory section of this paper. From the findings of the study as revealed in Table 1, the types of workplace deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria are vandalism, manipulation of records, abuse of office, wastage of office resources, and leaving early from work, favouritism, gossiping, and aggression towards colleagues. This finding supports Igbe, Okpa and Aniah's [12] report that deviant behaviours among university workers include abuse of office, impersonation, vandalism, and aggression. However, the finding disagrees with Igbe, Okpa and Aniah's deviant behaviours like gross insubordination, sexual harassment, and funds misappropriation as deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria.

Also, findings of the study as shown in Table 2 revealed that the causes of workplace deviant behaviours among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria are job stress, personality traits, emotional intelligence, moral deviation, group norms, group behaviours, workplace religiosity, workplace support, job security, career management and HR practices. This confirms the statements of O'Boyle, Forsyth

and O'Boyle [19]; Malik and Lenka [6]; and Braje, Aleskic and Jelavic [15] that job burnout, personality traits, extent of emotional intelligence, moral deviation, behaviours exhibited in a group, and group norms, workplace religiosity, workplace support, human resource practices, job security, career management, etc. determines the extent of deviance at the workplace. Meanwhile, this study's findings does not support Malik and Lenka's [15] observation that psychological contract breach, and leadership style practiced by superiors pose as factors that causes deviant behaviours among staff at the workplace.

The result of the first hypothesis as disclosed in Table 3 showed a statistically significant relationship between the organizational-wise and interpersonal-wise types of WDB practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria. It implies that, an increase in organizational-wise WDB may lead to a corresponding increase in the interpersonal types of workplace deviant behaviours among the staff. This finding is in line with the observation of Iqbal, Arif and Badar (2012). They opined that irrespective of the category of WDB, they are all detrimental to the organization and some sort of severity. This indicates that all the types of WDB are interrelated since they all cause some sort of damage to the organization and its members.

Finally, the second hypothesis's result revealed a statistically significant relationship among the individual, interpersonal and organizational factors responsible for WDB among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. This finding is in line with that of Malik and Lenka (2018). They emphasized in their research that the major causes of workplace deviant behaviours are tied to three main factors: individual, interpersonal and organizational factors. They further noted that every other factor that results in deviant behaviours at the workplace revolves around the three major factors, signifying that all the determining factors responsible for these deviant behaviours are associated with leading non-academic staff into engaging in these acts.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper studied the determinants of WDB among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. To paint a clearer picture of the subject matter, the study identified the types of WDB commonly practiced in universities and

disclosed the possible determining factors responsible for these behaviours [28,29]. Attempt was also made to find out the relationship among the variables highlighted in the study using bivariate and multiple correlational analyses with the help of the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation [30-32]. From the results of analyses and the findings extracted, it can be concluded that the types of WDB practiced among non-academic staff of universities in South-South Nigeria are vandalism, manipulation of records, abuse of office, wastage of office resources, and leaving early from work, favouritism, gossiping, and aggression towards colleagues [33,34]. Also, conclusion can be drawn that causes of these deviant behaviours are job stress, personality traits, emotional intelligence, moral deviation, group norms, group behaviours, workplace religiosity, workplace support, job security, career management and HR practices.

The study further concludes that a statistically significant relationship exists between the two major categories of WDB identified in the study and that a statistically significant relationship exists among the individual, interpersonal and organizational factors responsible for these deviant behaviours practiced among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. Although, all the correlations were significant, the degree to which the variables were related varied as some were positive while others had negative correlations.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made in line with the findings of the study:

- (1) University management should set up a committee to strictly address and combat the deviant behaviors commonly practiced among her non-academic staff.
- (2) Since the causes of deviant behaviours among staff have been identified, university management should tackle issues resulting in the staff involved in these acts.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Obalade GO, Akeke NI. job characteristics and deviant behaviour among employees of selected public and private universities

- in Ondo and Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Acta Universitatis Danubius*. 2020;16(1):7-21.
2. Akanni AA, Omisile I, Oduaran CA. Workplace deviant behaviour among public sector employees: The roles of perceived religiosity and job status. *European Review of Applied Sociology*. 2018;11(17):44-51. DOI: 10.1515/eras-2018-0010
3. Brooks G. Misbehavior, its dimensions, and relationship to commitment in organizations. Quoted in Di Stefano, Giovanni, Fabrizio Scrima, and Emma Parry. 2019. The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviours in the workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 2012;30: 2482–503.
4. Fagbohunge BO, Akinbode GA, Ayodeji F. Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Management*. 2012;7(5):207-216. DOI:10.5539/ijbm
5. Iqbal MZ, Arif MI, Badar S. A comparative study of deviant workplace behaviour of teaching staff of public and private universities of Punjab-Pakistan. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*. 2012;2(12):2128-2137.
6. Malik P, Lenka U. Integrating antecedents of workplace deviance: Utilizing AHP approach. *Journal of Indian Business Research*. 2018;10:101-122.
7. Obinna T. Attitude to work among employee in selected beverages companies. *The Sun News*; 2011. Available: www.sunnews.com
8. Chinedu JU. Counseling strategies against corrupt practices and cybercrime in universities. *The Counsellor*. 2012;23: 15-24.
9. Azu C. Financial misconduct in higher education in Nigeria; 2012. Available:<http://www.nigerdeltacogress.com>
10. Kalejaiye PO, Adeyemi BF. Job tenure, job status and employees' attitude to work: A study of selected non-academic staff of Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria. *Journal of Business Management and Administration*. 2013;1(2):22–27.
11. Uwannah NC. Absenteeism, favoritism, and tardiness as predictors of job deviance in academia: The Nigeria experience.

- Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities. 2015;1(2):75-81.
12. Igbe JE, Okpa JT, Aniah EA. Working conditions and deviant behaviour of employees in the University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. 2017;22(7):74-83.
 13. Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir, Kairudin. Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior. *World Applied Sciences Journal*. 2011;12:45-51.
 14. Bodankin M, Tziner A. Constructive deviance, destructive deviance and personality: How do they interrelate? *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*. 2009; 11:549-564.
 15. Braje IN, Aleskic A, Jelavic SR. Blame it on individual or organization environment: What predicts workplace deviance more? *Soc. Sci.*, 2020;9(99):1-12. DOI: 10.3390/socsci9060099
 16. Appelbaum SH, Iaconi GD, Matousek A. Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviours: Causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance*. 2007; 7(5):586-598.
 17. Muafi G. Causes and consequence deviant workplace behavior. *International Journal of Innovation Management and Technology*. 2011;2(2):123-12.
 18. Ahmad Z, Ahmad J, Farhan M, Tahir A. Workplace deviance behaviour: Role of psychological empowerment and transformational leadership. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (ISOR-JBM)*. 2019;21(12):1-11. DOI: 10.9790/487X-2112030111.
 19. O'Boyle EH, Forsyth DR, O'Boyle AS. Bad apples or bad barrels: An examination of a group—and organizational-level effects in the study of counterproductive work behavior. *Group and Organization Management*. 2011;36:39-69.
 20. Marasi S, Bennett RJ, Budden H. The structure of an organization: Does it influence workplace deviance and its' dimensions? And to what extent? *Journal of Managerial*. 2018;30:8-27.
 21. Higher Education Statistics Agency [HESA]. Staff definitions 2008/09; 2009. Available: http://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_datatables&task=show_file&defs=1&Itemid=121&catdex=2&dfile=staffdefsf0809.htm
 22. Adeniji MA, Adekunjo OA. The role and impact of Non-Academics Staff Union (NASU) in two Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-Journal)*. 2010:332. Available: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/332>
 23. Madukoma E, Opeke RO. Information use and job performance of senior non-academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (eJournal)*. 2013:973. Available: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/973>
 24. Tan L. Correlational study. In W. F. Thompson (Ed.), *Music in the social and Behavioural sciences: An encyclopedia*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. 2014:269-271.
 25. Tarurhor EM, Osazevaru BE. The balanced scorecard as a performance management tool for small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria, *AU eJournal of interdisciplinary Research (ISSN:2408-1906)*. 2019;4(1):49-57.
 26. Tarurhor EM, Emudainohwo BE. Lean manufacturing and firm performance in the palm oil industries in Delta state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*. 2020;8(4): 319-331.
 27. Tarurhor EM, Amawhe EP. Yield management and non-financial performance of hotels in Delta state, Nigeria. *SSRG International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*. 2022;9(4):17-23.
 28. Brief AP, Weiss HM. Organisational behaviour: affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2002;53:279-307. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156>
 29. Cheng MY, Ho JSY, Lau PM. Knowledge sharing in academic institutions: A study of Multimedia University, Malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*. 2009;7(3):313–324.
 30. Henle CA. Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 2005;17(2):247-263.
 31. Olasupo MO, Fagbenro DA. Perceived competence, discrimination and deviant behaviour among university employees: A mediating study. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social*. 2018; 21(3):24-36.

32. Weiss HM. Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. Human Resource Management Review. 2002;12:173-194.
33. Bowling NA, Gruys ML. New perspectives in the study of counterproductive behavior in organizations. Human Resource Management. 2010;20:54-61.
34. Brice W, Rupp DE. The psychology of workplace deviant & criminal behavior. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology. 2015;105(2):533-548.

© 2022 Tarurhor and Opatayo; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/90659>