

INDUSTRIAL HARMONY: ANTIDOTE TO WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR AMONG LECTURERS IN NIGERIA

Abstract

The rampant deviant workplace behavior among members of academic staff union of universities has become a critical issue in both academic discuss and society at large. The abnormal, unacceptable and inimical act jeopardizes the socio-economic, psychological and physical well-being of students in tertiary institutions as they could mar their future and cause distortions in their academic calendars thus warranting an empirical investigation to address the anomaly. This study, therefore, examines industrial harmony as an antidote to workplace deviant behavior among lecturers in Nigeria. The study specifically examines the influence of collective bargaining variables construct on production deviant behavior among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria using descriptive and inferential statistics tools on a sample of 290 respondents from purposively selected universities in Nigeria. Findings of the study revealed that all the variables (wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits) included the model exhibited a very powerful influence on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. This is explained by applying the coefficient of determination (R^2) and the F-test. In general, the combined effect of the explanatory variables-independent variables-in the model accounts for 0.860 or 86% of the variations in the workplace deviant behaviour among lecturers in Nigeria. This implies that 75.0% of the variations in the workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. This means that only 14% of the variations in workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria is attributable to other independent variables not captured in the model. Therefore, it is critically important that the government addresses all matters affecting the wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits of the academic staff union of universities in line with the international best practices in the ongoing collective bargaining with the academic staff. This will aid in drastically reducing the production of deviant behaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

Key words: *Wages, Safety and Health, Management Right, Working Conditions, Fringe Benefits, Collective Bargaining, Industrial Harmony*

1. INTRODUCTION

Industrial Harmony emerges from “Industrial Democracy “. Industrial democracy is perceived as a situation in an organization whereby workers’ participation is adequately sought in making timely and valuable decisions that will determine the conditions of their working lives. It involves joint participation in decision making process between the two important actors, the employers and the employees. Industrial harmony depicts a state of organizational stability where management and employees work in unison and total cooperation in order to achieve their desired goals. It is a friendly and cooperative agreement on working relationships between employers and employees for mutual benefits and co-existence (Otobo, 2005; Osad & Osas, 2013). Industrial harmony portrays a situation whereby employees and management cooperate without rancour or acrimony to pursue organization’s objectives which are the main reason for

their existence. Objectives derive action, and action leads to effective performance in order to accomplish the intended objectives. Industrial harmony encompasses four broad areas of cooperation: Responsibilities, employment policy, collective bargaining, communication and consultation (Odia and Omofonmwan, 2007) as cited by Onyeizugbe, Aghara, Enaim and Abaniwu (2018).

Industrial harmony increases labour productivity and enhances performance in organizations, achieving economic growth, improving the living standards of individuals and ensuring a high standard of quality of life. It creates a peaceful working atmosphere conducive to tolerance, dialogue and other alternative means of resolving industrial or labour-related disputes in Nigeria (such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, conciliation and litigation or court adjudication). This creates a high level of employee loyalty and satisfaction. Industrial harmony serves as a panacea that mitigates conflicts and promotes a culture of harmony that will achieve organizational goals. In the same vein, collective bargaining enhances industrial harmony as both parties are involved in strategy crafting and formulation as well as its implementation. Industrial harmony is not the absence of disagreement, but it is an understanding between management and workers that guarantee the system to accomplish its set goals. Conflict is inevitable in practically all organizations, both the governmental and non-governmental organizations, profit and non-profit making organizations. Conflict is part of our existence. There are myriads of variables that give rise to these conflicts. These factors undermine or weaken industrial harmony and productivity in organizations. These factors include leadership behaviour, lack of effective communication, poor work environment, deviant behavior of employees, poor labour-management policies, dehumanization of work environment, and non-recognition of the trade union as a bargaining party. In reality, universities in Nigeria are bedevilled with myriads of industrial challenges caused by inefficient and ineffective management styles or strained relationships between government and labour unions (Osamwonyi and Ugiagbe, 2013). It is explicitly apparent that the interplay of labour and management influences industrial growth and productivity. This depicts that the growth and productivity of any organization hinges to a large extent on the magnitude of industrial harmony at work in that organization. The pivotal issue is that pure state of industrial harmony scarcely exists in organizations especially universities as grievances between labour unions, government, and management erodes the set objectives of the organizations. A typical example is the IPPIS issue which has relegated the varsity system to the background. As it stands at present, government has not been able to resolve the issue with the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU). The matter is still lingering and must be adequately handled to enjoy the aroma of industrial harmony within the university community. This scenario showcases that government lackadaisical attitude has aggravated industrial disharmony and slowed down the smooth pace of academic profundity portrayed by academic gurus in the varsity system. Despite the enumerated bottlenecks, diverse conflict handling mechanisms have also been articulated to ameliorate the occurrence and reoccurrence of industrial disharmony of universities in Nigeria. In these universities, collective bargaining, work-floor democracy and other grievance management procedures have been introduced to induce industrial harmony. ASUU has made unflinching efforts to iron out her differences with Federal Government of Nigeria but to no avail rather industrial disharmony seems to be assuming unprecedented level. These may have led to employees exhibiting such attitudes as lack of cooperation and withdrawal attitude in the place of work, reduced commitment and increased intent to leave the organization. Other visible symptoms are bad tempered behaviour and appearance, moodiness, worry, unnecessary tension, insubordination, and the like. In the

light of the above discourse, the investigators are motivated to write on industry harmony as an antidote to workplace deviant behaviour among Lecturers in Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Deviant workplace behavior has become a rampant and transparent phenomenon. Lecturers' deviant behaviours have become a critical issue as a result of government lackadaisical attitude towards their concern and needs. Lecturers' deviant behaviors are abnormal, unacceptable and inimical to the socio-economic, psychological and physical well-being of students in tertiary institutions as they could mar their future and cause distortions in their academic calendars. Lecturers' deviant behavior is unequivocally an escalating problem eating deep into the fabrics of this nation because lecturers are instrumental to nation-building. The deviant behaviors which lecturers exhibit as disclosed by Igbe (2017) include theft, extortion of money, sabotage, absenteeism, rumour mongering, victimization of students, falsification of results, sexual harassment, etc. A research conducted by Coffin (2003) found that 75% of employees are victims of theft, fraud, vandalism, embezzlement, deliberate absenteeism, and other deviant behaviors. These deviant behaviors are triggered by unfriendly or poor working environments that workers are exposed to and non-challant attitude of government towards their responsibilities (Faridahwati, Chandrakantan& Hadziroh, 2011, Igbe, 2017). What then shall we do to cushion the effects of these menaces? Has government really taken any valuable time to investigate the causes of these anomalies, that is, deviant behaviors by lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria? If decisive actions are not taken to prevent organizational deviance (which is a product of production deviance); interpersonal deviance, then industrial harmony, an off-shoot of peaceful co-existence cannot be properly entrenched in the organizational domain. Therefore, industrial harmony is the only antidote that can be deployed to bring lecturers back to reality in order to enhance their creative and innovative abilities towards academic excellence and vigor.

Objectives of the study

The broad objective of the study is to determine the influence of collective bargaining on production deviant behavior among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:

- i. Examine the influence of wages on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria
- ii. Ascertain the influence of safety and health on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria
- iii. Examine the influence of management right on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria
- iv. Determine the influence of Working conditions on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria
- v. Examine the influence of fringe benefits on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria

Research Question

- i. What is the influence of wages on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria?

- ii. What is the effect of safety and health on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria?
- iii. What is the influence of management right on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria?
- iv. What is the influence of working conditions on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria?
- v. What is the influence of fringe benefits on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria?

Research Hypotheses

Ho₁: Wages has no significant influence on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

Ho₂: Safety and health have no significant influence on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

Ho₃: Management right has no significant influence on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

Ho₄: Working conditions has no significant influence on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

Ho₅: Fringe benefits have no significant influence on workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

2. CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

2.1.1 Workplace deviant behavior

Workplace deviant behavior has been described differently as anti-social behavior, counter-productive behavior, workplace aggression, organizational incivility and workplace misbehavior (Appelbaum, Iaconi& Matousek, 2007; Fagbohunge, Akinbode& Ayodeji, 2012; Norsilan et al., 2014). Workplace deviance is seen as the deliberate or intentional desire to cause harm to an organisation (Omar, Halim, Zainah& Farhadi, 2011), or when employees do not conform to policies, values and culture of the organisation, which impede its standards, welfare and vision (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). deviant behaviour of employees is a deliberate self-motivated action that breaches significant organisational norms and threatens the existence of the organisations Robinson and Bennett (1995). It is also known as wrongful behaviour, organisational misbehaviour, antisocial behaviour, dysfunctional behaviour and counter-productive behaviour (Faridahwati, Chandrakantan & Hadziroh, 2011). DWB gained attention from organizational behavior researchers with its negative psychological, social and tangible consequences for employees and organizations. Behaviour is considered deviant when employees are non-conforming to an organisation's policies, core values, culture etc., and such behaviour impede the vision, welfare and organisational standards (Jawad, Tabassum, Raja & Abraiz, 2013; Bennett and Robinson, 2003; Robbins & Judge, 2007); in addition deviant behaviours are believed to be detrimental to the goals and interests of other members of the organisation (Lawal and Babalola, 2008; Greenbag, 2002).

2.1.2 Production Deviant: production deviance is quite costly to an organization. Production deviance is directed against the organization but focuses specifically on reducing the efficiency of work output. Production deviance is the behavior that violates formally the prescribed organizational norms with respect to minimal quality and quantity of work to be accomplished as part of one's job (Pulich&Tourigny, 2004). Examples of production deviance include leaving early, wasting resources, sabotage setting unrealistic expectations regarding product performance, or intentionally working slowly (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Bennett,

1995). Employees with workplace deviance behavior are likely to quit, have decreased productivity, suffer stress related problems, lose work time and low morale (O’Leary Kelly, Griffin and Glew, 1996). The deviant behaviours are affected by deviant workplace behaviors anchored on various dimensions such as organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance, leader-member exchange, and corporate culture. Production deviance comprises lethargy, leaving early, and deliberately extending the duration of breaks (Shao-Ping Wang¹, Miao-Sheng Chen and Mou-Jian Li, 2018).

2.1.3 Industrial Harmony: Industrial harmony thus covers four broad areas of cooperation: responsibilities, employment policy, collective bargaining, communication and consultation (Odia and Omofonmwan, 2007). Industrial harmony enhances labour productivity and in turn improves performance in organizations, achieving economic growth, and enhancing living standards and quality of life (Onyeizugbe, Aghara, Olohi&Abaniwu, 2018). Industrial harmony refers to a friendly and cooperative agreement on working relationships between employers and employees for their mutual benefit (Otobo, 2005; Osad and Osas, 2013). Industrial harmony is concerned with the relationship between management and employees with respect to the terms and conditions of employment and the work place (Puttapalli and Vuram, 2012). Hanson (2006) opines that industrial harmony represents absence of strike by industrial unions in organization which is bound to result in effective and efficient organization. Industrial harmony is important in the tertiary education industry like other industries because it promotes employees’ commitment which enables the achievement of organizational goals. It also creates a peaceful working environment conducive to tolerance, dialogue and other alternative (to strike) means of resolving industrial or labour disputes in Nigeria (such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, conciliation and litigation or court adjudication).

2.1.4 Collective Bargaining: The term ‘collective bargaining’ is made up of two words; ‘collective’ which means a ‘group action’ through representation and ‘bargaining’ which means ‘negotiating’, and it involves proposal and counter-offers. Thus, collective bargaining means group negotiations between the employer and the employee on issues relating to their work situation. Collective bargaining is central to any industrial relations system since it is a tool through which regulated flexibility is achieved (Godfrey, Theron & Visser, 2007). Collective bargaining has been noted to help promote cooperation and mutual understanding between workers and management by providing a framework for dealing with industrial relations issues without resort to strike and lockouts (Azubuike and Konya, 2020). According to Bronwyn (2010), the process of collective bargaining is bipartite in nature involving negotiations between employers and the employees, usually, without a third party’s intervention. Odhong and Omolo (2014) noted that collective bargaining provides an important channel and framework used to determine employment terms and conditions. Odhong and Omolo (2014) noted that collective bargaining provides an important channel and framework used to determine employment terms and conditions. Adewole et al. (2010) asserted that frequent eruption of industrial conflicts between employers and employees in general could be effectively managed through collective negotiation and consultation with the workers representatives.

2.2 Theoretical Framework: the study adopts social exchange developed by sociologist George Homans in 1958, which explains why employees want to participate in positive behaviors and why employees prefer to avoid negative behaviors when providing support and resources to their employing organization. According to social exchange theory, individuals act with the belief that the receiver will return the received benefit in a similar manner (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Social exchange theory suggest that we essentially take the

benefits and subtract the cost in order to determine how much a relationship is worth. Positive relationships are those in which the benefits outweigh the costs while negative relationships occur when the costs are greater than the benefits. The social exchange process begins when an organizational actor or perpetrator, usually a supervisor or coworker, treats a target individual in a positive or negative fashion (Eisenberger, Lynch, Aselage, & Rohdieck, 2004; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous, 1988; McLean Parks, 1997). For clarity, we refer to these initial behaviors as initiating actions. Positive initiating actions may include activities such as providing organizational support (Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009) or justice (Cropanzano & Rupp, 2008). Negative initiating actions might involve abusive supervision (Tepper, Carr, Breaux, Geider, Hu, & Hua, 2009), incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2005), or bullying (Lewis, 1999, 2004; Rayner & Keashly, 2005). The theory is relevance to the study because the negative behavior exhibited by employees seeks to hinder or hurt the progress/ productivity of the organization and individuals associated with the organization.

2.3 Review of related Literature

Many studies advocated that deviant behavior brought immense negative impact on the productivity which caused the deterioration of the overall performance (Peng, Tseng, & Lee, 2011; Spector, Fox, & Domagalski, 2006; Zheng, Wu, Chen, & Lin, 2017). Fox, Spector, and Miles (2001) highlighted that in order to effectively address the deviant behavior, the organization might look forward to creating a nurturing climate for employees' positive psychology. Berry, Ones and Sackett, (2007); Cohen-Charagh, and Mueller, (2007); Dilchert, Ones, Davis and Rostow, (2007) observed that deviant behaviour is fast becoming a prevalent problem in human organisation as report revealed that, between 33 and 75 percent of the world employees have engaged in workplace deviant such as theft, fraud, vandalism, contempt, substance abuse, sexual harassment, absenteeism, insubordination, dereliction of duty, abscondment among others. Other forms of deviant behaviour perpetuated by university employees across Nigeria includes extortion of money, irregularity in conducting examination for students, abuse of office, sexual harassment, distortion of staff records and students' grades for financial gain, gross insubordination or disregard for constituted authority, employment racketeering, admission fraud and impersonation. These attitudes according to Tett and Meyer (1993), Bennett and Robinson (2003), Wang and Kiewitz (2014); Saad, Yahya and Yean, (2016) violate workplace norms and thus are regarded as an antisocial type of behaviour. Generally, Igbe (2017) revealed that universities staff engages in such deviant behaviour as theft, fraud, sabotage, vandalism, absenteeism, spreading rumours, aggression and sexual harassment. Deviant acts led to organizational ineffectiveness in the form of poor students' services, quality control issues, low students' intake and retention, and bad institutional reputation.

Deviant workplace behavior has accounted for a tremendous amount of revenue loss and even more permanent damage to a workplace environment. Other costs include insurance losses, tarnished reputations and public relations expenses, lost repeat business, worker compensation, and increased turnover (Slora and Terries, 1991). Workplace deviance causes enormous social and economic losses to organisations and their members (Vardi and Weitz, 2004). Studies have shown that individual employees personality, for example, socialization and impulsivity construct are causes of workplace deviant behaviours(Yunus Joy and Terries, 2012) also organizational factors such as organizational frustration, job stressors, weak sanctions for rule violates,lack of control over the work environment and organizational changes such as downsizing are causes of workplace deviance. Deviant behaviour usually takes place when an

employee perceives unfair treatment and inequality within the organisation. Employees evaluate organisational fairness based on outcomes, procedures, personal interactions and what they think is better done elsewhere and the management is not willing to embrace (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998). Once employees perceive their work environment as unfair, they may develop negative attitudes and emotions such as job dissatisfaction, anger, frustration, and mistrust, leading to deviant acts against the organisation and other members of staff (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Greenberg & Alge, 1998). Poor Remuneration is another cause of workplace deviant behavior employees expected to get paid for the efforts and energies they have put into their jobs (Osibanjo, Adeniji, Falola and Heirsmac, 2014). Once the remuneration and reward system is very poor, it is likely to give room for some employees to indulge in deviant behaviours such as stealing, using official things for personal use, sabotaging and other counterproductive behaviours(Omotayo et al 2015). Penny & Spector, (2005) advocated that job stress trigger deviant behaviour in response to increase in job stressors while Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir& Khairudin, (2011) noted that employees who experience negative emotions such as frustration due to workrelated stress are more prone to engage in some counterproductive behaviors.Iqbal (2012) asserted teachers, more often, report discontentment and even those few dedicated to the profession feel unappreciated, overworked, and humiliated as professionals and educators. Lawrence and Robinson (2007) suggested that if teacher perceives that he is not receiving proper attention or not respected in the institution, he would not respond positively in fulfilling his responsibilities. Empirically Igbe, and Akomaye (2017) found that there is a significant relationship between non-payment of allowances, poor workers' safety, and deviant behaviour among employees in the University of Calabar, Cross River state, Nigeria. Asiyai (2019) revealed that the extent of prevalent of deviant behaviour in large schools was more than in small schools which severely impacted on students' learning. (Bennett & Robinson, (2000) asserted that Production deviance violate the standards of quality and quantity goods or services which may be quite costly to an organization.

Tertiary institutions in Nigeria have experienced disharmony in recent times, instability and other forms of industrial conflict. This situation has resulted in low productivity in many tertiary institutions. Industrial crisis includes any form of work dissatisfaction that can manifest in several ways such as absenteeism, strike, high labour turnover, among others. It affects the immediate parties involved, which normally trickles down to the entire society especially when it occurs at a national level. Policy inconsistencies, poor remuneration and low level of workers' motivations with respect to remuneration (both promptness and total package) has been the causes and a bone of contention between the workers and employers. Despite the industrial crisis and work place deviant behaviour prevalent in Nigeria tertiary institution, industrial harmony has played a great role in creating a peaceful working environment conducive to tolerance, dialogue and a high level of employee satisfaction. Industrial harmony according to Ladan (2012) is imperative for a productive educational system because it enhances labour productivity as one of the critical means of improving performance in the tertiary institutions, achieving economic growth, enhancing living standards and quality of life. Unfortunately, academic performance in tertiary institutions has been constrained by frequent labour unrests in Nigerian educational institutions. It also creates a peaceful working environment that is attractive to tolerance, dialogue and other alternative means of resolving industrial/labour disputes.

3. METHODOLOGY

The research design, population of the study, sample size and sampling technique, method of data collection and method of data analysis were presented in this section.

Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive research design. This helps to elicit data quantitative data for the purpose of describing and interpreting existing phenomena by using structured questionnaire.

Population of the Study

The population of the study cuts across the academic staff of opinion of universities in Nigeria. However, a convenience sampling technique was used to purposively select fifty academic staff each from the oldest universities (University of Nigeria Nsukka; University of Benin; University of Ife, Ibadan; Ahamadu Bello University, Zaria; Usman Danfodio University, University of Jos) in each of the geopolitical zones in Nigeria, thus bringing the sample size of the study to 300.

Method of Data Collection

The questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. The questionnaire was designed and administered to 300 academic staff of the five selected universities in the six geopolitical zones of the state. The four point summative scale response categories of SA= Strongly Agreed, A= Agreed, D= Disagreed and SD-strongly Disagree was used in coding the questionnaire. By so doing the respondents will be able to tick the option of their choice. Any item with mean value of 2.5 and above **was** regarded as agreed while items which have a mean value below 2.5 was regarded as disagree. Out of 300 copies of questionnaire distributed only 290 was dully completed and returned.

Method of data Analysis

The data obtained were analyzed using regression analysis and they were presented in the subsequent section. The analysis of the responses of the academic staff union of universities of the selected universities which serves as the sample size of the study were analyzed using frequency table, percentages and the regression technique.

4. PRESENTATION OF EMPIRICAL RESULTS

This section deals with the presentation and analysis of data collected from the field of study. The aim is to present the data in an interpretable form so that the variables of the study can be well understood.

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents According to Gender

Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)	Cumulative (%)
Male	158	54.5	54.5
Female	132	45.5	100
Total	290	100	

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 1 shows that 54.5% of the respondents are males while 45.5% of the respondents are females.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents According to Age

Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)	Cumulative (%)
18-32	14	4.8	4.8
31-40	46	15.9	20.7
41-50	84	29.0	49.7

51-60	88	30.3	80.0
61-70	58	20.0	100.0
Total	290	100.0	

Source: Field Survey 2021

As shown in table 2, 4.8% of the respondents are between the ages of 18-32. 15.9% of the respondents, are between the ages of 31-40. 29.0% of the respondents, are between the ages of 41-50. 30.3% of the respondents, between the ages of 51-60, while 20.07% of the respondents, are between the ages of 61-70.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents According to Marital Status

Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)	Cumulative (%)
Married	237	81.7	81.7
Single	42	14.5	96.2
Widow/Widower	11	3.8	100.0
Total	290	100.0	

Source: Field Survey 2021

From table 3, 81.7% of the respondents are married. 14.5% of the respondents are single, while 3.8% of the respondents are widow/widower.

Regression Analysis Result

Table 4: Regression Result on influence of collective bargaining on production deviant behavior among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria

Model	B	Std. error	T	Sig.
Constant(C)	-0.175	0.020	-8.579	0.000
Wages	-0.599	1.933	-3.098	0.003
Safety and health	-0.316	0.020	-15.749	0.000
Management right	-0.550	0.014	-3.991	0.007
Working conditions	-0.526	0.075	-7.046	0.006
Fringe benefits	-0.689	0.062	-11.143	0.000
R	0.929			
R²	0.863			
Adj. R²	0.860			
F-statistic	101.601			0.000

Source: Field Survey 2021

Dependent Variable: Workplace behaviour

From the regression result, all the coefficients (wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits) have inverse relationship with workplace misbehaviour among the academic staff of union of universities. The implication is that as wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits increases through collective bargaining, it decreases the workplace misbehaviour among the academic staff of union of universities. The regression table also revealed that the probability values of the t-test statistics of all the five coefficients of the model significantly influence the deviant behavior among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria, thus concluding that wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits have significant effect on workplace behaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the final analysis, the findings of the study are robust because of the fitness of the variables that were included in the model of the study. All the variables (wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits) exhibited very high influence on workplace behaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. This is explained by applying the coefficient of determination (R^2) and the F-test. In general, the joint effect of the explanatory variables-independent variables-in the model accounts for 0.860 or 86% of the variations in the workplace behaviour among lecturers tertiary institutions in Nigeria. This implies that 75.0% of the variations in the workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. This means that only 14% of the variations in workplace misbehaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria is attributable to other independent variables not captured in the model. Therefore, it is critically important that the government addresses all matters affecting the wages, safety and health, management right, working conditions and fringe benefits of the academic staff union of universities in line with the international best practices in the ongoing collective bargaining with the academic staff. This will aid in drastically reducing the production of deviant behaviour among lecturers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

References

- Adewole, O.A. & Adebola, O. G. (2010). Collective bargaining as a strategy for industrial conflict management in Nigeria. *Journal for Research in National Development*, 8.1, 326-339
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 452–471.
- Azubuikwe A. E and Konya K.T (2020). Collective Bargaining Agreements and Industrial Harmony in Rivers State-Owned Tertiary Institutions. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing* 6 (6) 67-78
- Bronwyn, K. (2010). *Employer Policies and Organizational Commitment*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

- Eisenberger, R., Lynch, P., Aselage, J., & Rohdieck, S. (2004). Who takes the most revenge? Individual differences in negative reciprocity norm endorsement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30: 787–799.
- Faridahwati, M. S., Chandrakantan, S. & Hadziroh, I. (2011). Wrongful behaviors among
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28: 78–95.
- Godfrey, S., Theron, J. and Visser, M. (2007). The State of Collective Bargaining in South Africa: An Empirical and Conceptual Study of Collective Bargaining. Labour Policy and Enterprise Policy Research Group, Working Paper 07/130, University of Cape Town.
- Hanson J (2006) “Economics. Macdonald and Evans Limited,” *London International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research*, 1(1), 146 – 151.
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1876434>.
- Igbe, J. Egid, Okpa, J. Thompson & Aniah, E. Akomaye (2017)
- Lewis, D. (1999). Workplace bullying-interim findings of a study in further and higher education in Wales. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20: 106–119.
- manufacturing employees in Malaysia: An exploratory study. Retrieved online from:
- McLean Parks, J. (1997). The fourth arm of justice: The art and science of revenge. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations*, vol. 6: 113–144. US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press
- O’Leary Kelly, Griffin and Glew (1996). Organisation- motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of management journal* 21: 225-253
- Odhong, E. A., & Omolo, J. (2014). An analysis of the factors affecting employee relations in the flower industry in Kenya. A Case of Waridi Ltd, Athi River. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5, (11/1), 147- 160.
- Odia, L.O. and Omofonmwan S.I. (2007). Educational system in Nigeria: problems and prospects. *Journal of social Sciences*. 14(1): 81-86.
- Omotayo O.A, Olubusayo F.H, Olalekan A.J, Adenike A.A (2015) An Assessment of Workplace Deviant Behaviours and Its Implication on Organisational Performance in a Growing Economy. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*. 15(1)
- Onyeizugbe U.C , Aghara V , Olohi E.S, Abaniwu P. C (2018) Industrial Harmony and Employee Performance in Food and Beverage Firms in Anambra State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)* 6 (6), 22-35
- Osad, I.O. and Osas, E.U. (2013). Harmonious industrial relations as a panacea for ailing enterprises in Nigeria. *Journal of Asian Scientific Research*, 3(3):229-246
- Otobo, D. (2005). *Industrial Relations: Theory and Controversies*. Lagos: Malhhouse Press Ltd.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). Workplace incivility. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets*: 177–200. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Pulich&Tourigny (2004). Workplace deviance: Strategies for modifying employee behavior. *The Health care manager* 23(4)290-301
- Puttapalli, A.K. and Vuram, I.R. (2012). Discipline: The tool for industrial harmony. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research*, 1(1), 146 – 151.S
- Rayner, C., & Keashly, L. (2005). Bullying at work: A perspective from Britain and North America. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior*:

- Investigations of actors and targets: 271–296. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Riggle, R. J., Edmonson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A metaanalysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62: 1027–1030
- SloraK, Joy D and Terries W(1991). Personnel selection to control employee violence. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 5: 417-421
- Tepper, B. J., Car, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109: 156–167
- Vardi and Weitz(2004) *misbehavior in organisations: theory, research and management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Yunus O. Khalid K, Nordin S.A(2012) A personality trait and workplace deviant behaviours. *Elixir Human Resource Management* 47: 8678-8683

UNDER PEER REVIEW