DETERMINANTS OF WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOURS AMONG NON-ACADEMIC STAFF IN UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA

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 the questionnaire received from the respondents, and were analyzedusing the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation. The results found out that vandalism, manipulation of records, abuse of office, wastage of office resources, and leaving early from work, favouritism, gossiping, and aggression towards colleagues were prominently the workplace deviant behaviour. However, the study noted that the causes of these deviant behaviours are job stress, personality traits, emotional intelligence, moral deviation, group norms, group behaviours, workplace religiousity, 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 workplace deviant behaviors, interpersonal and organizational factors as 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 deviant behaviours that are commonly practiced among its non-academic staff, and that since the causes of deviant behaviours among staff have been identified, university management should tackles issues that result in the staff involving in these acts.

Key words: Interpersonal Deviant Behaviour, Organizational Deviant Behaviour, Non-Academic Staff,Staff Performance, Workplace Behaviours.

1.0 Introduction

In recent times, more attention has been drawn to the different behaviours displayed among staff at their workplace. To get a stronger understanding on the variables that determine these behaviours as well as the mediators and moderators, several studies have examined workplace behaviours from both the constructive (positive and functional) and the destructive (negative and dysfunctional) perspectives. The constructive view believes that these behaviours will cause a productive outcome and improve the workplace environment. Furthermore, the destructive perspective perceives negative consequences caused by these behaviours and thus, prescribed these destructive behaviours at the workplace to mean WDB (Obalade&Akeke, 2020).

Robinson and Bennett (as cited inAkanni,Omisile&Oduaran, 2018) 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 organization, including staff, clients or customers. Deviance at the workplace differs in its form, extent, nature, and intention (Obalade&Akeke, 2020). Several classifications of deviant behaviours among staff have been attempted by various scholars (e.g. Bowling &Gruys, 2010) but one of the most interesting and extensively used classification is the one developed by Robinson and Bennett more than 40years ago. Its ease of usage and simplicity makes it widely used and accepted.

The issue of WDB has lingered on for so long both at the international scene and in Nigeria.In Nigeria recently, all concerned stakeholders have paid their undivided attention to the danger posed by these deviant behaviours at the workplace. In general, cases of poor work attitude (Obinna, 2011); cybercrime (Chinedu, 2012) and funds misappropriation (Azu, 2012) have been reported in various media. Specifically, reports of deviant behaviours in universities are not left out as these behaviours are on the increase among university staff (Kalejaiye&Adeyemi, 2013; Uwannah, 2015). These deviant acts in the university setting, according to Igbe, Okpa and Aniah (2017) 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.

The above discussion therefore makes it paramount to understand the determinants of deviant behaviours among staff at the workplace so as to be able envisage their happenings and perhaps avoid it. As noted in literature, most deviant behaviours at the workplace are tied to individual,social, interpersonal, and organizational factors (Henle, 2005; Malik &Lenka, 2018). Knowing that all aspects of WDB are exhibited by persons, most literature have focused more on individual-related determinants of deviance, which include emotional intelligence, personality traits, work experience, and perception. As pointed out by Malik and Lenka (2018), the interpersonal-related factors include psychological contract breach, leadership, dissimilarity, group behaviour, and group norms and processes. Focusing on organizational factors as an antecedent of workplace deviance, it is more appropriate to address them as they shape how these behaviours manifest at the workplace. As such, the organizational factors include culture and climate (Marasi, Bennett &Budden, 2018) as well as workplace religiousness, workplace support, career management, job design and

empowerment (Malik &Lenka, 2018). All these logically that precedes workplace deviance should be addressed most often in order to stand a chance against counterproductive behaviours.

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 later. As recorded by Brooks (2012), workplace deviance deteriorates organizational citizenship behaviours, reduces productivity, and enhances actions like absenteeism, withdrawals among others. Thus, if the deviant acts at the workplace are left unattended to, the consequence on the growth and standard of the organization would be adverse. So also is the case in the Nigerian university settings. It is expected that university staff would ordinarily exhibit high ethical behaviour among themselves. Also, most of the deviant behaviours reported among university staff in Nigerian universities are most likely caused by some variables that are yet to be given adequate attention in literature (Olasupo&Fagbenro, 2018). Evidence has shown that these factors affect the staffs' performances.

Staff performance has become a top priority in the university system because of its value to the institution and other stakeholders. This is also due to the fact that it is part of the measure for determining if an institution is doing well or not. As such, attention has been drawn by several studies on the issues that have ramifications for both the job-related and non-job related aspects of staff performances. One of such issuesthat have been addressed in literature is deviant behaviours exhibited at the workplace. It frequently widely practiced acts that incurs major organizationalcost, causes an unpleasant working environment and have social and psychological consequences (Braje, Aleskic&Jelavic, 2020).

Despite the aforementioned disclosure, personal observation by the researcher with regards to WDB in the university setting has shown that major concerns are placed only on the consequences these acts pose on the institutions' growth and progress while less or no attention is given to the antecedents that results in these behaviours. Even those studies that address these behaviours focus on the academic staff and raises issues of discrimination among them. In reality, very scanty studies have been conducted on the determinants of WDB among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. Hence, the rationale for this study is retained.

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

Ho_1: 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.

Ho_2: 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.

2.0 Review of Related Literature

2.1 Workplace Deviant Behaviours

Workplace deviance is the deliberate purpose to do harm to an individual or an organization (Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir &Kairudin, 2011). This 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 (Bodankin&Tziner, 2009), the negative deviance connotes a violation of an organization's interests and is detrimental towards the organization and its human resources (Braje, Aleskic&Jelavic, 2020). 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, etc.

Workplace deviant behaviours can also been viewed from the constructive and unconstructive views (Appelbaum, Iaconi&Matousek, 2007). 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 (Muafi, 2011). On the other hand, the unconstructive behaviours are actions that negate organizational standards and principles as well as diminish organizational procedures in a negative manner (Galperin, as cited in Ahmad, Ahmad, Farhan & Tahir, 2019). They include disagreeing, slow efforts towards job tasks, etc.

Attempts have been made by several authors to explain WDB according to various types. In his typology of WDB in organizations using multidimensional scaling approaches, Robinson and Bennett (as cited in Fagbohungbe, Akinbode&Ayodeji, 2012) 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 much breaks, putting slow efforts into works, 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 colleague, favouritism, etc.) and personal aggression (e.g. endangering colleagues, sexual harassment, etc.). In their typology, Iqbal, Arif and Badar (2012) 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 may vary along a continuum of severity. However, irrespective of the category an act falls, it is detrimental to the organization and its members.

Typically, different WDB exists in universities. These behaviours are propagated among university staff. Igbe, Okpa and Aniah(2017) reported these deviant behaviours among university workers to include abuse of office, gross insubordination, funds misappropriation, impersonation, employment racketeering, irregularity in conduction examination for students, among others. Other types of deviant behaviours exhibited among these staff are vandalism, tardiness, aggression, sexual harassment. These acts have become widespread in universities in recent times.

From the institutional point of view, it is pertinent to understand the various determinants of WDB in order to be able to prevent them and possibly combat them when they occur. These antecedents could vary according to context, situations, and variables of association involved. As Malik and Lenka (2018) had emphasized in their research, the major causes of WDB are tied to three main factors: individual, interpersonal and organizational factors. Every other factor that results in these deviant behaviours at the workplace revolves around the three major factors.

Characteristics, emotions, and cognitions of the employees are considered to be the individual elements that determine workplace deviance (O'Boyle, Forsyth,&O'Boyle, 2011).

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 (2020), 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. (Braje, Aleskic&Jelavic, 2020).

The interpersonal determining factor of WDB include behaviours exhibited in a group, psychological contract breach, leadership style practiced by superiors, and group norms (Malik &Lenka, 2018).From the organizational perspective, these factors include culture and climate (Marasi, Bennett &Budden, 2018); workplace religiousity, workplace support, human resource practices, job security, and career management (Malik &Lenka, 2018). Since every other identified factors are characterized by the organization, 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] (2009) 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 are 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 (Adeniji&Adekunjo, 2010). As confirmed by Madukoma and Opeke (2013), the non-academic staff in a university are made up of staff in the following offices: Student Affairs, Admissions, Registry, Exams and Records, Vice Chancellor's, Cafeteria, Bursary, Bookshop, and so on.

2.3Empirical Review on Determinants of Workplace Deviant Behaviours

Studies exist on the determinants of WDBin different contexts. For instance, Fagbohungbe, Akinbode and Ayodeji (2012) conducted an empirical study on the

organizational determinants of WDB in Nigeria. The correlational research design was choosen. 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 (2017) examined working conditions and deviant behaviours of employees 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 and the findings showed that there is a significant relationship between non-payment of allowances, poor workers safety, and deviant behaviour among employees in the University.

Akanni, Omisile and Oduaran (2018) 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 regression 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, hence improving the work environment.

Obaladeand Akeke (2020) investigated job characteristics and deviant behaviour among employees ofselected 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 the purpose of analyses. The results ofthe 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 (2020) 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 there is a lack of literature that 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 WDBin 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 WDBpracticed among non-academic staff in the university context.

3.0 Methods

This study utilised the correlational research design. Correlational research design is one which seeks to ascertain relationships between two or more(Tan, 2014; Tarurhor & Osaze, 2019; Tarurhor & Emudainohwo, 2020). Thus, this study was aimedat examining the relationship between the types and causes of WDBand the job performance of non-academic

staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. This research design was chosen because the researcher does not intend to control or manipulate the data collected during the study.

Because of the large size of the population, the researcher conveniently selected only 50 non-academic staff from each university comprising both 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 researcher also adopted the convenience sampling technique in arriving at the sample for the study.

Copies of the structured questionnairewere administered to participants in their offices at the respective universities by the researcher 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 usingboth the descriptive statistics (such as frequency, simple percentage and mean) and inferential statistics in order 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 existing among the variables of the study. All hypotheses were tested at an alpha level (α) of .05.

4.0 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 established that any questionnaire that has about 16% missing data, should be included for analysis since it is above the acceptance rate of 10% (Hair, Black, Babin &Anderson,2010; Tarurhor &Amawhe, 2022). 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 got on the items that were raised in the questionnaire in line with the research objectives. The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Types of Workplace Deviant Behaviours in Universities

S/N	Types of Workplace Deviant Behaviours	Agree		Undecided		Disagree	
	(I) Organizational-wise	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
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 1shows 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 2: Causes of Workplace Deviant Behavioursin 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 religiousity	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 2displays information relating to 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 religiousity ($\bar{x}$ = 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: 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 3reveals 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. This 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.

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

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 4shows 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 factors and the interpersonal factors (r = -.927; α<.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 factors and the organizational factors is also significant (r=.933; α<.05) as a strong positive correlation is indicated.For the relationship between interpersonal factors and organizational factors, it was disclosed that a strong negative correlation exists between these variables (r=-.863, α<.05) and it is a significant correlation.Conclusively, 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.

5.0 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(2017) report that deviant behaviours among university workers include abuse of office, impersonation, vandalism, and aggression. However, the finding disagrees with Igbe, Okpa and Aniah'sadded behaviors 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 2revealed 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 religiousity, workplace support, job security, career management and HR practices. This confirms the statements of O'Boyle, Forsyth and O'Boyle (2011); Malik and Lenka (2018); and Braje, Aleskic and Jelavic (2020) that job burnout, personality traits, extent of emotional intelligence, moral deviation, behaviours exhibited in a group, and group norms, workplace religiousity, 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 (2018) 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 that there is 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. This 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 withthe observation of Iqbal, Arif and Badar (2012) who opined that irrespective of the category ofWDB, 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 result of the second hypothesis revealed that there is 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) who 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.

6.0 Conclusion

This paper studied the determinants of WDB among non-academic staff in universities in South-South Nigeria. To paint a clearer picture on the subject matter, the study identified the types of WDB commonly practiced in universities and also disclosed the possible determining factors responsible for these behaviours. Attempt was also made to find out the relationship that exists among the variables highlighted in the study using both bivariate and multiple correlational analyses with the help of the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation. 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.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 religiousity, workplace support, job security, career management and HR practices.

The study further concludes that a statistically significant relationship exists between the twomajor 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 some others had negative correlations.

7.0 Recommendations

The researcher makes the following recommendations in line with the findings of the study:

(1) University management should set up a committee to strictly address and combat the deviant behaviours that are commonly practiced among its non-academic staff.

(2) Since the causes of deviant behaviours among staff have been identified, university management should tackles issues that result in the staff involving in these acts.

References

Adeniji, M. A., &Adekunjo, O. A. (2010). The role and impact of Non-Academics Staff Union (NASU) in two Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal), 332.* Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/332

Ahmad, Z., Ahmad, J., Farhan, M., & Tahir, A. (2019). Workplace deviance behaviour: Role of psychological empowerment and transformational leadership. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (ISOR-JBM), 21*(12), 1-11.DOI: 10.9790/487X-2112030111.

Akanni, A. A., Omisile, I., &Oduaran, C. A. (2018). Workplace deviant behaviour among public sector employees: The roles of perceived religiosity and job status. *European Review of Applied Sociology, 11*(17), 44-51. DOI: 10.1515/eras-2018-0010

Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., &Matousek, A., (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: Causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance, 7*(5), 586-598.

Azu, C. (2012). *Financial misconduct in higher education in Nigeria.* Retrieved from http:// www.nigerdeltacogress.com

Bodankin, M., &Tziner, A. (2009). Constructive deviance, destructive deviance and personality: How do they interrelate? *Amfiteatru Economic Journal, 11*, 549-564.

Bowling, N. A., &Gruys, M. L. (2010). New perspectives in the study of counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Human Resource Management, 20,* 54-61.

Braje, I. N., Aleskic, A., &Jelavic, S. R. (2020). Blame it on individual or organization environment: What predicts workplace deviance more? *Soc. Sci., 9*(99), 1-12. Doi: 10.3390/socsci9060099

Brice, W., & Rupp, D. E. (2015). The psychology of workplace deviant & criminal behavior. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 105*(2), 533-548.

Brief, A.P., & Weiss, H.M. (2002). Organisationalbehaviour: affect in the workplace. *Annual Review ofPsychology, 53*, 279-307. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156

Brooks, G. (2012). Misbehavior, its dimensions, and relationship to commitment in organizations. Quoted in Di Stefano, Giovanni, FabrizioScrima, and Emma Parry. 2019. The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 30*, 2482–503.

Cheng, M. Y., Ho, J. S. Y., & Lau, P. M. (2009). Knowledge sharing in academic institutions: A study of Multimedia University, Malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 7*(3), 313–324.

Chinedu, J. U. (2012). Counseling strategies against corrupt practices and cybercrime in universities. *The Counsellor, 23*, 15-24.

Fagbohungbe, B. O., Akinbode, G. A., &Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Management, 7*(5), 207-216. DOI.105539/ijbm

Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of ManagerialIssues, 17*(2), 247-263.

Higher Education Statistics Agency [HESA] (2009). *Staff definitions 2008/09.* Retrieved from http://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_datatables&task=show_file&defs=1&Itemid=121&catdex=2&dfile=staffdefs0809.htm

Igbe, J. E., Okpa, J. T., &Aniah, E. A. (2017). 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), 22*(7), 74-83.

Iqbal, M. Z., Arif, M. I., &Badar, S. (2012). A comparative study of deviant workplace behaviour of teaching staff of public and private universities of Punjab-Pakistan. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 2*(12), 2128-2137.

Kalejaiye, P. O., &Adeyemi, B. F. (2013). Job tenure, job status and employees' attitude to work: A study of selected non-academic staff of OlabisiOnabanjo University, Nigeria. *Journal of Business Management and Administration, 1*(2), 22–27.

Madukoma, E., &Opeke, R. O. (2013). Information use and job performance ofsenior non-academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (ejournal),* 973. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/973

Malik, P., &Lenka, U. (2018). Integrating antecedents of workplace deviance: Utilizing AHP approach. *Journal of Indian Business Research, 10,* 101-122.

Marasi, S., Bennett, R. J., &Budden, H. (2018). The structure of an organization: Does it influence workplace deviance and its' dimensions? And to what extent? *Journal of Managerial Issues, 30*, 8-27.

Muafi, G. (2011). Causes and consequence deviant workplace behavior.*International Journal of Innovation Management and Technology, 2*(2), 123-12.

O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D. R., & O'Boyle, A. S. (2011). Bad apples or bed barrels: An examination of a group–and organizational-level effects in the study of counterproductive work behavior. *Group and Organization Management, 36,* 39-69.

Obalade, G. O., &Akeke, N. I. (2020). job characteristics and deviant behaviour among employees of selected public and private universities in Ondo and Ekiti State, Nigeria. *ActaUniversitatisDanubius, 16*(1), 7-21.

Obinna, T. (2011). Attitude to work among employee in selected beverages companies. *The Sun News*. Retrieved from: www.sunrewsonline.com

Olasupo, M. O., &Fagbenro, D. A. (2018). Perceived competence, discrimination and deviant behaviour among university employees: A mediating study. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 21*(3), 24-36.

Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir &Kairudin (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 12*, 45-51.

Tan, L. (2014). Correlational study. In W. F. Thompson (Ed.), *Music in the social and behavioural sciences: An encyclopedia* (pp. 269-271). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Tarurhor, E.M & Osazevbaru, B.E (2019). The balanced scorecard as a performance management tool for small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria, AU eJournal of interdisciplinary Research (ISSN:2408-1906) 4(1), 49-57.

Tarurhor E. M & Emudainohwo, B. E (2020). Lean manufacturing and firm performance in the palm oil industries in Delta state, Nigeria. International Journal of Economics and Business Administration 8(4), 319-331.

Tarurhor, E.M and Amawhe, E. P. (2022). Yield management and non-financial performance of hotels in Delta state, Nigeria. SSRG International Journal of Economics and Management Studies,9(4),17-23.

Uwannah, N. C. (2015). Absenteeism, favoritism, and tardiness as predictors of job deviance in academia: The Nigeria experience. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1*(2), 75-81.

Weiss, H.M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences.*Human Resource Management Review, 12*, 173-194.