AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

PERCEIVED DETERMINANTS OF WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR AMONG THE NON-TEACHING STAFF OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN, NIGERIA

Bamikole Abel Fashogbon Ph.D.[*1], Florence Olubusuyi Funso-Adebayo[*2] and Ihezie Donatus Ukpabi Ph.D.[*3]

[*1,2,3]Department of Adult Education, Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria
[*1] Email: ba.fashogbon@ui.edu.ng, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1068-3235
[*2] Email: florenceolubusuyi@gmail.com
[*3]-Email: ukpabidonatus@gmail.com ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6602-4648

Corresponding author: Bamikole Abel Fashogbon Ph.D.
ba.fashogbon@ui.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

Unethical behavioural practices among employees in any organization could drastically reduce the performance of such organization and operational sustainability becomes a mirage. This study investigate workplace deviant behaviour among the non-teaching staff of the university of Ibadan, Nigeria. Descriptive design was adopted for the study, two hundred 200 samples were selected among the non-teaching junior staff and the study was anchored on two theories (The Sociological and Conflict theories of Deviant Behaviours) The findings of the study revealed that deviant behaviours such as misuse of resources, spreading gossip and rumours about colleagues and management, and theft of office equipment or materials are the most prominent deviant behaviours among the non-teaching staff of the University of Ibadan. The data indicates that factors such as low wages, poor working conditions, and ineffective management practices are the leading contributors, indicating dissatisfaction with both tangible and intangible aspects of employment. Also, reveals that job satisfaction with roles, security, and teamwork are the most significant contributors to reducing deviance, reflecting the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic job factors. The data reveals that strong leadership and a collaborative culture are key factors to minimizing workplace deviance, reflecting the importance of effective management and teamwork. Fairness, transparency, and alignment with organizational values strongly influence staff behaviour and compliance. Based on the findings, recommendations were made; need for better enforcement of policies, ethical training, and supervision and proper sanctioning to non-adhering non-teaching staff to curb these behaviours. Provision of policies that ensure job stability to reduce anxiety and its associated deviant behaviours. Salary review and incentives by introducing competitive salaries and performance-based incentives to improve staff satisfaction and reduce financial grievances. An upgrade of facilities and equipment to create a conducive work environment. Leadership training that will equip leaders with the skills to manage staff effectively and foster positive relationships and also to enhance communication channels within the organization to address grievances proactively. By addressing these key areas, deviant behaviour among the non-teaching staff of the University of Ibadan can significantly be mitigated thereby ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of job performance.

Keywords: *Workplace, Deviant Behaviour, Non-teaching Staff, University of Ibadan*

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Introduction

Workplace deviant behaviour refers to any intentional actions by employees that violate the established norms and regulations of an organization, which may harm the organization or its members. In academic institutions like the University of Ibadan, non-teaching staff are essential to the daily operations, contributing to administrative, technical, and support functions. However, there have been reports of various forms of workplace deviance, such as absenteeism, theft, insubordination, and misuse of resources among non-teaching staff. These behaviours not only disrupt the workflow but also affect the overall productivity and effectiveness of the institution. Understanding the factors that lead to such deviant behaviours is crucial for developing strategies to mitigate them and enhance the work environment.

Workplace deviance had drawn the interest of many researchers and policy makers in most organization in recent years (Abiona, 2014; Katou, 2015; Sharma et al., 2016). Deviance can simply be put as a violation of the norm, values, rules and regulations of an organization. Several behaviour is considered deviant when employees are nonconforming to an organisation's policies, core values, culture and such behaviour impede the vision, welfare and organisational standards (Bennett and Robinson, 2003; Robbins and Judge, 2007; Kottawtta, 2007; Schilzand, 2016; Jiang, 2017).

Despite the critical role of non-teaching staff in maintaining the operational efficiency of the University of Ibadan, there has been an increasing concern about the prevalence of workplace deviant behaviours within this group. These behaviours undermine organizational goals, create a hostile work environment, and can lead to financial losses.

Workplace deviant behaviour has been a persistent issue in Nigerian organizations, including tertiary institutions and private organizations, particularly affecting their social development. It has been a prevalent aspect throughout the history of Nigerian labour relations. In tertiary institutions, some identified causes of such deviant behaviour include a lack of commitment to achieving goals and a careless attitude towards fulfilling responsibilities. While deviant behaviour is generally a concern, it becomes more serious and alarming when it occurs within tertiary institutions. This is because these institutions are viewed as key agents responsible for human capital development, where future leaders, academics, and researchers are nurtured in both character and knowledge. Therefore, it is expected that students and researchers receive proper mentoring, which is considered a fundamental duty of the academic profession, thereby safeguarding the public trust placed in academic staff. Workers in tertiary institutions, both teaching and non-teaching staff, are often expected to prioritize the concerns of students. However, this expectation appears increasingly unrealistic, as there is a noticeable rise in inappropriate behaviours such as theft of educational materials, sexual misconduct, rudeness, gossip, buck-passing, and idleness among staff members in public institutions (Longan, 2016).

Previous studies have often focused on deviant behaviours among teaching staff, leaving a gap in understanding the dynamics among non-teaching staff. Also, research has highlighted several factors that contribute to workplace deviant behaviour. These factors include individual characteristics such as personality traits (Guay, Choi, Oh, Mitchell, Mount & Shin, 2016), organizational factors such as perceived injustice (Baig & Ullah, 2017), and work-related factors such as abusive supervision (Ahmad & Omar, 2013). The

negative perceptions held by employees due to these issues have led to significant declines in the turnover of some organizations. Given these challenges, this research aims to address this gap by identifying the determinants of workplace deviant behaviour among non-teaching staff at the University of Ibadan.

Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of this study is to investigate the determinants of workplace deviant behaviour among the non-teaching staff of the university of Ibadan, Nigeria. While the specific objectives are to;

i. examine the relationship between job satisfaction and workplace deviant behaviour.
i. identify strategies can be implemented to reduce workplace deviant behaviour among non-teaching staff.

Research Questions

ii. How do organizational factors such as job satisfaction and organizational culture influence workplace deviant behaviour?
iii. What strategies can be implemented to reduce workplace deviant behaviour among non-teaching staff?

This study focuses on the non-teaching staff of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. It explores various forms of workplace deviant behaviours and examines the factors that contribute to these behaviours within this specific context. The study does not include teaching staff or staff from other universities. Data will be collected from different departments to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the issue across various roles and job functions.

Literature Review

Concept of Workplace Deviant

Employees' behaviours at the workplace could have positive or negative outcomes for an organization. Negative behaviours that employees direct against an organization are called workplace deviant behaviours. Workplace deviance is dysfunctional behaviour that employees carry out connected to their organizations. This definition emphasizes that workplace deviance is voluntary. Workplace deviance influences the organization, workers, and other individuals negatively. It disrupts organizations and has significant costs and consequences. Workplace deviance affects employees who are the target of such behaviour. It also has negative effects on third parties. Workplace deviant behaviours prohibit the organization from gaining its objectives. It is harmful for organizations' performance and has a negative impact on the workplace environment, organization, and society.

Therefore, it is important for organizations to manage and minimize workplace deviance. It is a social phenomenon because it results from social reactions in the workplace. Expert staff interact with colleagues in the workplace. These interactions form mutually supported social networks within the organization. These relationships are important for an organization's stability. The growing work in this area for the past 10 or more years helps managers diagnose the attitudes of employees, predict errors, and provide logistics that find applications in the field of personnel management, marketing, and operational decisions. Workplace deviance has become pervasive in organizations of all sizes, in every economic sector, and in countries around the globe. Occurring at disturbingly high daily rates in the workplace, both physical and psychological attacks fomented by individual wrongdoers can result in significant personal and professional consequences. Throughout the ages, emotions, perceptions, motives, ambiguous roles, and organizational justifications for aggressive behaviour have

been studied, but only recently has the level of interest been raised about the negative effects of these actions on working people and organizations.

Causes of Workplace Deviance

Coercive behaviours or aversive conditions may incite deviance in the workplace. Negative emotions, such as frustration or anger, can also motivate deviance. Frustration may lead workers to express their aversion through subtle acts of deviance. Demographic characteristics, such as age, sex, and race, have also been linked to deviant workplace behaviour. Neuroticism, considered as a core element of personality, may result in deviant behaviour in the employment setting. Prosperity during young adulthood was viewed as an influential factor for later deviance. High self-control during childhood was found to have the greatest efficacy in restraining deviance. Additionally, boredom has a direct influence on workplace deviance. As the degree of boredom increases, the level of deviance increases. It has been suggested that you can increase motivation by keeping your employees engaged and interested. Deviant Behaviour at Work includes: - Misbehaving during work activities - Withdrawing or exhibiting alienated behaviour - Intentionally exerting minimal effort - Ignoring or undermining procedures, rules, or authority - Intentionally harming employees or clients

Individual Factors

This report focuses on individual factors and how they interact with situational variables to result in negative workplace behaviours. It begins by examining who engages in deviant actions at work, moves to specific dimensions of behaviour, and then reviews key studies on different types of deviance that hurt organizations in terms of declining productivity and profits. The individual factors that have been found critical in predicting workplace deviance involve these theories, in particular: entitlement, negative affectivity, conscientiousness, self-esteem. In general, there is no single personality profile that predicts deviance and no single type of deviance. Employees vary considerably in their response to a particular work stressor, with some individuals more likely to reciprocate favourably and others reciprocating in a more negative manner.

Organizational Factors

Organizations play a central role in sociocultural approaches to deviance. The principal argument suggests that organizational features, such as rewards, communication, job characteristics, and the like, are powerful influence agents of employee attitudes (such as deviance commitment) because employees can evaluate them and rely on cues in the behaviour of management (such as influencing tactics). It follows that amid different combinations of organizational and management behaviours, people will differentially evaluate rules. Organizational strategies, thus, build a commitment to act in a certain way, encouraging on the one hand, or discouraging on the other, rule violation. So, an equilibrium is reached between behaviour, rules, and strategy, and this equilibrium is what systems theorists call a natural law. Systems theorists like Urich predict that employees, as goal-seeking agents, will act in the interests of the corporation. However, conflicts over rules are not eliminated, part of the reason why employment raises problems.

Types of Workplace Deviance

Many deviant acts can occur in the workplace. Some of those that have garnered particular research interest include theft, violence, sabotage, disciplinary actions, and inefficiency. Each of these represents an act that is disruptive to the organization and is costly, in some fashion,

to the organization as well as to the employees. Among the costliest acts of workplace deviance are those that involve theft. Employee theft occurs with some frequency. Do employees steal because they are inherently dishonest? That's doubtful. A more plausible perspective is that it's the opportunity, rather than the employee, that steals. Many organizations make it easy for employees to be dishonest. During a three-year period, a major U.S. corporation lost over a million dollars a year due to theft by its managers. Such facilitation of theft is costly, but the company's broader ethical climate is also put in much jeopardy.

Organizational Deviance

Convicted drug dealer is fired from 13 banks over a 15-year period. Once again, the drug dealer realizes that it is illegal to deal drugs at work, but he is very good at it and keeps doing it anyway. So begins a typical (so-called) white-collar crime saga in the United States today. Momentum is rapidly building for an era of pervasive white-collar crime. In this context, drug dealing by bank employees may seem relatively unimportant compared to other forms of deviant behaviour in the workplace; however, heavy costs can be imposed by such behaviour. Workplace deviance (WD), therefore, is garnering increasing attention, despite the fact that our understanding of the behaviours, the people who do them, and its deterrent is still not well developed. Although a set of meta-analyses has evaluated the factors contributing to WD, these analyses are more than 20 years old and have noted several limitations of this research. Additionally, the data used in these analyses might incorporate substantial bias. In the intervening years, researchers have made progress in expanding WD research streams and are finding the factors that predict who will perform this behaviour, across contexts, as well as raising important conceptual and methodological issues. Consistent with the concern of this debate, we take a theory-driven multidimensional approach to discussing and analysing WD in organizations. Organizational deviance, defined in opposition to individual oppositional deviance, encompasses large-scale irregularities such as embezzlement, espionage, and the sale of information vital to national security, sabotage, fraud, employee theft, and counterfeit currencies that are the crimes of the corporate mainstream.

Interpersonal Deviance

Interpersonal deviance refers to voluntary behaviours that violate significant organizational norms. These deviant acts cause harm to people. Many constructs describe both the organizational and individual aspects of the interpersonal deviant behaviours, including interpersonal aggression, abusive supervision, social undermining, and bullying. All of these behaviours have the potential to cause damage to individuals. Interpersonal deviance can be divided into two categories: functional deviance and dysfunctional deviance, according to the aim of the action. Functional deviance refers to the intent of the individual, hoping to induce, motivate, and encourage to help the organization solve problems and initiate useful change. On the other hand, dysfunctional deviance is defined as the individual's intent to hurt the organization and damage the organization. Further into subcategories, interpersonal deviance can also be divided into task-oriented behaviour (i.e., in-role behaviour) and organizational behaviour (i.e., extra-role behaviour). However, this understanding is not effective in studying the topic of creative workplace behaviour. This chapter focuses only on interpersonal abusive workplace behaviours that are caused by individuals and deliberately harm others under the deviant behaviour.

Deviant Workplace Behaviour (DWB)

According to Robinson & Bennett (1995), Workplace Deviance can be defined as Voluntary behaviour of organizational members that violates significant norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization. Similarly, Vardi & Wiener (1996) used the term organizational misbehaviour defining it as any deliberate activities made by organizational members, which violate the organizational/social norms. Meanwhile, Robinson & Benette, (2003) used the term organizational motivated aggression and has defined it as a destructive behaviour initiated by inside/outside member of an organization. Sackett & De Vore (2001) discussed about the workplace counter productivity which is defined as intentional behaviours which are pre-nominated by organizations as contrary for their organization.

In the same view, counterproductive behaviour is defined as any harmful act made by an organization member to employees or organization itself, was introduced by Everton, Jolton & Mastrangelo (2005) and Robinson & Benette, (2003) said deviant employee intentional behaviours, which violates organizational norms in such a way which creates adverse effect to wellbeing of organizations. In addition to that Baron, Neuman & Geddes (1999) came out with the term workplace aggression by defining it as defining individual behaviours, which cause damages on workers or the workplace. Finally, Robinson et al (1995) has discussed about organizational delinquency and defined it as a syndrome which is occurred as a result of workers' unreliability.

Labelling Theory

In the early 1960's a different approach to deviance theory was taken. Although it was an offshoot of older theories, labelling theory asked questions about deviance from a new perspective which challenges previous definitions of deviance. Those associated with labelling argued that earlier theories had placed too great reliance on the individual deviant and neglected the variety of ways that people could react to deviance. This message was important enough that the position become known as the ***societal reaction school***. The intellectual heritage of labelling reflected the Chicago school's symbolic interactionsim. The teaching and wiring of both George Herbert Mead and W.I. Thomas at the University of Chicago had influenced several creative people. Their students, some of whom return to teach at Chicago, continued to spread the symbolic interactionist approach. A group of graduate students at Chicago during the late 1940's and early 1950's applied the approach to several areas of deviance. One of these students, Howard Backer, was to become the person most strongly identified with labelling. Labelling theory required a different orientation to deviance than that of previous theories. Noting that other definitions depend on statistical, pathological or anomie views of deviance Backer pointed out that none of them does justice to the reality of deviance. He saw that deviance can often be in the "*eyes of the beholder*" because members of various groups have different conceptions of what is right and proper in certain situations.

Further, there must be a reaction to the act. That is, deviance must be discovered by some group that does not share a belief in the appropriateness of the behaviour and it must subsequently be called deviance to the extent that law reflects the values of that group, the behaviour is labelled crime and the perpetrator a criminal.

The labelling approach to deviance can be broken down into two parts:

a. The problem of explaining how and why certain individuals get labelled and;

b. The effect of the label on the so called "deviant"

The effect of the label on the so called "deviant": labelling advocates were also concerned with the effect of labels on the person who is labelled. This aspect of labelling treat the label as an independent variable, a causal agent that then creates deviant behaviour. There are two ways in which this may takes place:

1. The label may catch the attention of the labelling audience, causing the audience to watch and continue the labelling of the individual. According to labelling theorists, such consequences include:

A. Individual who has been labelling becomes visible in the sense that people are more aware of them. This awareness often causes them to be watched more closely and thus, a second and third discovery of deviant behaviour is even more likely than the first one. Especially important is that those who are in deviance processing occupations (police, criminal justice agencies) closely watch individuals once they have come to the attention of their agency. In a sense, those labelled are the clientele of the criminal justice system and like any other good business; the system keeps close tabs on its customers. It is difficult for those once labelled, such as probationers, parolees, or ex-offenders, to escape the attention of this audience and subsequent behaviour is likely to be identified and relabelled.

B. When the original is more likely to be distributed among those with lower-class characteristics, this attention serves to reinforce the image of those individuals as deviants.

People who are identified as "deviants" then have fewer chances to make good in the conventional world. This means that conventional avenues to success are often cut off, and illegal means may become the only way left open. Thus, labelling advocates argue that the lower class bears the brunt of the labelling process and is kept deviant through relabelling

2. The label may be internalized by the individual and lead to an acceptance of a deviant self- concept.

The second form of labelling effect is best reflected in what Lemert (1951) called ***secondary deviance***. This concept suggests that, in addition to audience reaction, there is the possibility that an individual will react to the label. In this instance, Lemert assumes that the individual does not identify the initial act (primary deviance) as an important part of his or her self-image. People vary in their vulnerability or sensitivity to the reaction of others. If the original self-image is not strong enough, the labelled person may come to accept the image offered by others and change the self-image accordingly. The more often a person is labelled, the more likely it is that this change will takes place.

Feedback is important to the process by which a new self-concept can be internalized.

Lemert described the road to secondary deviance as follows:

(1)Primary deviation; (2) societal penalties; (3) further primary deviation; (4) stronger penalties and rejection; (5) further deviation perhaps with hostilities and resentments beginning to focus up on those doing the penalizing; (6) crisis reached in the tolerance quotient, expressed in formal action by the community by stigmatizing the deviant; (7) strengthening of the deviant conduct as a reaction to stigmatizing and penalties; (8) ultimate acceptance of deviant social status and efforts of adjustment on the basis of the associated role.

In a sense, then, secondary deviance is gained through a trading back and forth until the labelled person finally accepts the label as a real identity. This often results in the person's joining a deviant sub-culture

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

with further deviance being the product of the sub-cultural lifestyle. That is, future forms of deviant behaviour are a product of the new role itself. Deviance in its secondary form is quite literally created by the labelling process.

Methodology

The research design used for this study was a descriptive survey design of ex-post facto type, using the mixed method of both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This research method incorporates elements of both approaches. It was considered appropriate by the researcher because the variables in the study were not manipulated, rather the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables was investigated.

Three hundred (300) respondents were selected for this study, using purposive and simple random sampling techniques in selecting samples for this study because for easy availability of data, convenience, interest of the researcher and quick access to information for intensive study on the principles that they can be representative of the entire population used for the study.

The researcher made use of five (5) quantitative instruments. The self-structured questionnaire consists of five sections. The first section consists of the respondents' demographic variables while the other sections consist of question items that emanates from the research questions. The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics (such as frequencies and percentages).

Results and Discussion of Findings

The demographic characteristics considered in this study are sex, marital status, religion, educational background and Unit/department. Thus, the demographic characteristics of the respondents revealed that, 117(53.18%) were male respondents, while 103(46.82%) were female respondents. Also, 78(35.5%) were single, 137(62.2%) were married while 5(2.3%) were divorced. 73(33.2%) were Christian,139(63,2%) were Muslim while 8(3.6%) were Traditional. 9(4.1%) were Trade Test holders, 102(46.4%) were SSCE holders, 101(45.9%) were OND/NCE holders, 6(2.7%) were HND holders, while 2(0.9%) were first degree holders. In addition, 25(11.4%) were from Students' Affairs, 60(27.3%) were from Bursary, 40(18.92%) were from registry, 44(19.9%) were from Undergraduate Admissions, 34(15.5%) were from Postgraduate College, while 17(7.7%) were from Maintenance department.

Research Question One

Table 1: Individual, Organizational, and Environmental Factors that Contribute to Workplace Deviant Behaviour Questionnaire

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	Std.	Decision
1	Personal dissatisfaction with job roles encourages deviant behaviour among non-teaching staff.	29 13.2%	140 63.6%	27 12.3%	24 10.9%	2.79	0.81	Agreed
2	Low wages or poor salary structure contribute to workplace deviance.	55 25.0%	106 48.2%	54 24.6%	5 2.3%	2.96	0.77	Agreed
3	Lack of recognition or reward for good performance fosters negative behaviours among non-teaching staff.	43 19.6%	135 61.4%	19 8.6%	23 10.4%	2.90	0.83	Agreed
4	Poor management or leadership practices contribute to deviant behaviour.	52 23.6%	108 49.1%	50 22.7%	10 4.6%	2.92	0.80	Agreed
5	Job insecurity is a reason some non-teaching staff engage in deviant behaviour.	23 10.5%	97 44.0%	68 30.1%	32 14.5%	2.50	0.87	Agreed
6	Work overload or excessive tasks promote workplace misconduct.	54 24.5%	73 33.2%	79 35.9%	14 6.4%	2.89	2.17	Agreed

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

7	Inadequate communication within the organization leads to deviant behaviours.	53 24.1%	93 42.3%	53 24.1%	21 9.5%	2.81	0.91	Agreed
8	Poor working conditions (e.g., facilities, equipment) contribute to non-teaching staff's negative behaviours.	58 26.4%	106 48.2%	39 17.7%	17 7.7%	2.93	0.87	Agreed
9	Peer influence among non-teaching staff encourages deviant actions.	41 18.6%	79 35.9%	67 30.5%	33 15.0%	2.72	2.33	Agreed
10	Organizational policies are sometimes too strict, leading staff to act out inappropriately.	35 15.9%	84 38.2%	68 30.1%	33 15.0%	2.69	2.32	Agreed
Weighted Mean = 2.81								

Interpretation and discussion of findings

Table 1 shows the frequency distribution on the Individual, Organizational, and Environmental Factors that Contribute to Workplace Deviant Behaviour. Low wages or poor salary structure contribute to workplace deviance (x = 2.96) ranked the highest by the mean score rating on the Individual, Organizational, and Environmental Factors that Contribute to Workplace Deviant Behaviour, and was followed in succession by Poor working conditions (e.g., facilities, equipment) contribute to non-teaching staff's negative behaviours (x = 2.93), Poor management or leadership practices contribute to deviant behavior (x = 2.92), Lack of recognition or reward for good performance fosters negative behaviours among non-teaching staff (x = 2.90), Work overload or excessive tasks promote workplace misconduct (x = 2.89), Inadequate communication within the organization leads to deviant behaviours (x = 2.81), Personal dissatisfaction with job roles encourages deviant behaviour among non-teaching staff (x = 2.79), Peer influence among non-teaching staff encourages deviant actions (x = 2.72), Organizational policies are sometimes too strict, leading staff to act out inappropriately (x = 2.69), and Job insecurity is a reason some non-teaching staff engage in deviant behaviour (x = 2.50) respectively. The table shows the weighted mean of 2.81. The weighted mean of 2.81, above the standard mean of 2.50, suggests that these factors collectively contribute significantly to workplace deviance. The findings revealed that factors such as low wages, poor working conditions, and ineffective management practices are the leading contributors, indicating dissatisfaction with both tangible and intangible aspects of employment. Organizational factors, such as strict policies, lack of recognition, and inadequate communication, suggest systemic issues that causes deviant behaviours. Peer influence and job insecurity also state the role of external pressures and workplace culture in shaping behaviours.

The findings align with **Oladipo et al. (2021), who** explored organizational factors influencing workplace behaviours in Nigerian universities and found that poor salary structure and inadequate recognition were key contributors to deviant acts. Also, **Adeola and Adebayo (2022)** examined workplace deviance in non-academic staff and reported that job dissatisfaction and ineffective management practices significantly increased deviant behaviours. **The researcher therefore recommends salary review and incentives by** introducing competitive salaries and performance-based incentives to improve staff satisfaction and reduce financial grievances. An upgrade of facilities and equipment to create a conducive work environment. Leadership training that will equip leaders with the skills to manage staff effectively and foster positive relationships and also to enhance communication channels within the organization to address grievances proactively.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.14 (2), January-April, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Research Question Two

Table 2: Strategies for Reducing Workplace Deviant Behaviour Among Non-Teaching Staff.

S/N	STATEMENTS	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	Std.	Decision
1	Providing regular training on ethical behaviour would reduce workplace deviance.	56 25.5%	96 43.6%	46 20.9%	22 10.0%	2.85	0.92	Agreed
2	Implementing a clear and fair disciplinary system will reduce deviant behaviours.	73 33.2%	96 43.6%	36 16.4%	15 6.8%	3.03	0.88	Agreed
3	Offering recognition and rewards for good performance will motivate staff to behave positively.	52 23.6%	111 50.5%	39 17.7%	18 8.2%	2.90	0.86	Agreed
4	Improving communication between management and staff will reduce workplace misconduct.	53 24.1%	100 45.5%	49 22.3%	18 8.2%	2.86	0.88	Agreed
5	Regular supervision of non-teaching staff will minimize negative behaviours.	59 26.8%	110 50.0%	36 16.4%	15 6.8%	2.97	0.84	Agreed
6	Enhancing job satisfaction through better pay and benefits will reduce workplace deviance.	65 29.5%	108 49.1%	31 14.1%	16 7.3%	3.01	0.86	Agreed
7	Offering more professional development opportunities will decrease negative behaviours.	57 25.9%	111 50.5%	38 17.3%	14 6.3%	2.96	0.83	Agreed
8	Strengthening teamwork and collaboration among staff will help to reduce workplace deviance.	69 31.4%	109 49.6%	28 12.7%	14 6.3%	3.06	0.83	Agreed
9	Developing a strong organizational culture that values integrity will reduce workplace misconduct.	61 27.7%	124 56.4%	29 13.2%	6 2.7%	3.10	0.72	Agreed
10	Ensuring fairness and transparency in the allocation of tasks and responsibilities will minimize deviant behaviours.	96 43.6%	86 39.1%	34 15.5%	4 1.8%	3.29	0.81	Agreed
Weighted Mean = 3.00								

Interpretation and discussion of findings

Table 5 shows the frequency distribution on the Recommendations for Reducing Workplace Deviant Behaviour Among Non-Teaching Staff**.** Ensuring fairness and transparency in the allocation of tasks and responsibilities will minimize deviant behaviours. (x = 3.29) ranked the highest by the mean score rating on the Recommendations for Reducing Workplace Deviant Behaviour Among Non-Teaching Staff, and was followed in succession by Developing a strong organizational culture that values integrity will reduce workplace misconduct (x = 3.10), Strengthening teamwork and collaboration among staff will help to reduce workplace deviance (x = 3.06), Implementing a clear and fair disciplinary system will reduce deviant behaviours (x = 3.03), Enhancing job satisfaction through better pay and benefits will reduce workplace deviance (x = 3.01), Regular supervision of non-teaching staff will minimize negative behaviours (x = 2.97), Offering more professional development opportunities will decrease negative behaviours (x = 2.96), Offering recognition and rewards for good performance will motivate staff to behave positively (x = 2.90), Improving communication between management and staff will reduce workplace misconduct (x = 2.86), and Providing regular training on ethical behaviour would reduce workplace deviance (x = 2.85) respectively. The weighted mean of 3.00, above the standard mean of 2.50, indicates a strong agreement that these measures can reduce deviant behaviours.

The researcher observes that the top-ranking recommendation emphasizes fairness and transparency in task allocation, underlining the need for equitable management practices, recommendations such as promoting a culture of integrity,

teamwork, and a clear disciplinary system suggest a focus on improving organizational structures and values, enhancing pay, benefits, and professional development opportunities reflects the importance of addressing staff well-being to mitigate deviance and **communication and training, even w**hile ranked lower, improving communication and providing ethical training are essential to fostering positive behaviours. The findings align with the study by **Akinola et al. (2022),** which explored strategies for reducing workplace deviance in Nigerian universities. Their research identified fairness in task allocation and a strong organizational culture as the most effective measures. In the same vein, **Olatunde and Ojo (2023)** reported that enhanced job satisfaction, professional development opportunities, and recognition programs significantly reduced deviance among non-academic staff.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study examined the determinants of workplace deviant behaviour among the non-teaching staff of the University of Ibadan. Deviant behaviours such as misuse of resources, spreading gossip and rumours about colleagues and management, and theft of office equipment or materials are the most prominent deviant behaviours among the non-teaching staff of the University of Ibadan.

The data indicates that factors such as low wages, poor working conditions, and ineffective management practices are the leading contributors, indicating dissatisfaction with both tangible and intangible aspects of employment. Organizational factors, such as strict policies, lack of recognition, and inadequate communication, suggest systemic issues that causes deviant behaviours. Peer influence and job insecurity also state the role of external pressures and workplace culture in shaping behaviours. The data reveals that job satisfaction with roles, security, and teamwork are the most significant contributors to reducing deviance, reflecting the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic job factors. Dissatisfaction, whether stemming from pay, workload, or development opportunities, correlates with higher instances of deviant behaviours such as disobedience and disrespect.

The data reveals that strong leadership and a collaborative culture are key factors to minimizing workplace deviance, reflecting the importance of effective management and teamwork. Fairness, transparency, and alignment with organizational values strongly influence staff behaviour and compliance. Weaknesses in accountability, communication, and the absence of a clear code of conduct show areas where organizational culture could be improved. The data indicate that the top-ranking recommendation emphasizes fairness and transparency in task allocation, underlining the need for equitable management practices, recommendations such as promoting a culture of integrity, teamwork, and a clear disciplinary system suggest a focus on improving organizational structures and values, enhancing pay, benefits, and professional development opportunities reflects the importance of addressing staff well-being to mitigate deviance and **c**ommunication and training, even **w**hile ranked lower, improving communication and providing ethical training are essential to fostering positive behaviours.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made;

1. The need for better enforcement of policies, ethical training, and supervision and proper sanctioning to non-adhering non-teaching staff to curb these behaviours. Provision of policies that ensure job

stability to reduce anxiety and its associated deviant behaviours.

2. Salary review and incentives by introducing competitive salaries and performance-based incentives to improve staff satisfaction and reduce financial grievances. An upgrade of facilities and equipment to create a conducive work environment. Leadership training that will equip leaders with the skills to manage staff effectively and foster positive relationships and also to enhance communication channels within the organization to address grievances proactively.

3. `Fostering a positive team culture to reduce interpersonal conflicts and deviant acts like gossip and offering training and career growth opportunities to enhance job satisfaction. Fostering a positive organizational culture, marked by fairness, transparency, and accountability, is crucial in mitigating or combating workplace deviant behaviours.

4. Implement transparent processes for assigning tasks and responsibilities to prevent perceptions of favouritism or inequity. Build an organizational culture that values integrity, honesty, and ethical conduct. Provide ongoing professional training and career advancement options to motivate staff. Develop recognition programs that acknowledge and reward positive behaviour and achievements.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, A., & Ismail, W. K. W. (2017). Organisational Predictors of Workplace Deviance in Public University in Malaysia. Paper Presented at the International Conference on Innovation

Abbasi, A., Ismail, W. K. W., Baradari, F., Zureigat, Q., & Abdullah, F. Z. (2022). Can Organisational Justice and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Reduce Workplace Deviance?

Abdullah, A., & Marican, S. (2016). The Effects of Big-Five Personality Traits on Deviant Behavior. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 219, 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.

Abiona, B. G., Adesanya, D. A., Oose, M.O., Yila, J. Adeogun, S.O. and Fapojuwo, O.E. (2021): Effects of Human Resource Management Practices on Agricultural Employee's Job Performance in National Horticultural Research Institute, Oyo State, Ibadan, Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Agricultural and Development Economics. 10(1):31-50. www.uniabuja.edu. ng/ijade

Abiona, B.G., Alabi, S.O., Olorode, S. and Adeoti, T.E. (2020): Effects of Organizational Culture on Employee's Job Performance in selected agricultural research institute, Oyo State, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural and Rural Development. 18:15-27. http://gjard.net

Abiona, B.G., Odetayo, T.D., Adeogun S.O., and Fakoya O.E. (2022). Effects of Workplace Politics Practice On Employees' Job Performance In Selected Federal Universities of Agriculture in Nigeria. Dutse *International Journal of Social and Economic Research* (DIJSER) 8(1): 80-88

Adeogun, S.O., Abiona, B.G., Alabi, S.O. and Yila, J. (2019). Perceived Effect Of Coaching And Mentoring On Employee Job Performance Among Academic Staff In University of Ibadan, Oyo State, *Nigeria. Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences and Creative Arts* 18(1): 98-110. http://journal.unaab.edu.ng

Adi, N. (2022). Research in Business & Social Science Determinants of Employee Performance : The Mediating Role Of Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Research In Business And Social Science*, 11(2), 144–156. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs. v11i2.1595

Aleksi'c, A. A., Nacˇinovi', I., Braje, N., Rasˇi'c, S. R., & Jelavi'c, J. (2019).

Creating sustainable work environments by developing cultures that diminish deviance. Sustainability, 11(24), 7031. https://doi.org/10.3390/SU11247031

Amah, O. E. (2018). Employee Engagement in Nigeria: The Role Of Leaders And Boundary Variables. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 44, E1–E8. Amah, O. E., & Sese, E. (2018). Relational Energy & Employee Engagement: Role Of Employee Voice & Organisational Support. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 53(3), 475–487.

Ameswari, A., Wibisono, C., & Widia, E. (2021). The Effect of Work Environment, Motivation, and Work Culture on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction as Intervening Variables in PT Bank Tabungan Negara (PERSERO). *Journal Research of Social Science, Economics, and Management*, 01(2), 79–90. https://doi.org/10.36418/jrssem.v1i2.11

Appelbaum S.H, and Shapiro B.T (2006). Diagnosis and Remedies for Deviant workplace Behaviours. *Journal of American Academy of Business,* Cambridge, ABi/INFORM Global 14.

Appelbaum, S.G, Iaconi, G.D & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and Negative Deviant Workplace Behaviors: Causes, Impact, and Solutions, Corporate Governance, Vol. 7(5), 586-598.

Arifin, A. H., and Matriadi, F. (2022). The Role of Job Satisfaction in Relationship to Organization Culture and Organization Commitment On Employee Performance. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 3(6), 117–129.

Arthur, J. B. (2011). Do HR System Characteristics Affect the Frequency of Interpersonal Deviance In Organizations? The Role of Team Autonomy and Internal Labor Market Practices. Industrial Relations. 50 (1): 30-56.

Aryati, A. S., Sudiro, A., Hadiwidjaja, D., & Noermijati, N. (2018). The influence of ethical leadership to deviant workplace behavior mediated by ethical climate and organizational commitment. International Journal of Law and Management, 60(2), 233–249. https://doi.org/10.1108/ IJLMA-03-2017-0053

Austin, C. L., Saylor, R. and Finley, P. J. (2017). Moral distress in physicians and nurses: Impact on professional quality of life and turnover. Psychological trauma. Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 9(4): 399. Badil, S. H., Ali, S. A. and A., S. M. (2017). Severity of stress in nurses everyday life in Karachi, Pakistan. J Liaquat Uni Med Health Sci, 16(01): 62-70.

Basheer, M., Siam, M., Awn, A. and Hussan, S. (2018). Exploring the role of tqm and supply chain practices for firm supply performance in the presence of information technology capabilities and supply chain technology adoption, A case of textile firms in Pakistan. Uncertain Supply Chain Management, 7(2): 275- 88.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(3), 349–360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Blanchard, C., Baker, A., Perreault, D., Mask, L., & Tremblay, M. (2020). The importance of keeping employees satisfied: Three prevailing factors for health organization leaders.

Boafo, I. M. (2018). The effects of workplace respect and violence on nurses, job satisfaction in Ghana, A crosssectional survey. Human Resources for Health, 16(6): 1-10

Boye, M. W., & Jones, J. W. (1997). Organizational culture and employee counterproductivity. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), Antisocial behaviour in organizations (pp. 172–184). Sage Publications.

Breidahl, E., & Marty, A. (2018). Organizational resources, organizational engagement climate, and employee engagement. The Career Development International, 23(1), 67–85.

https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-04- 2017-0064.

Browning, V. (2009). An exploratory study into deviant behaviour in the service encounter: How and why front-line employees engage in deviant behaviour. *Journal of Management,* 14(4), 451-464.

Business Ethics, 95(Suppl. 1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10551-011-0794-0 Milner, A. J.,

Cahya, S. F., Astuti, W. and Triatmanto, B. (2021). The Impact of Organizational Culture and Emotional Intelligence on Employee Performance: An Empirical Study from Indonesia. The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 8(11), 285–296. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no 11.0285

Cheche, S. G., Muathe, S. M. A., & Maina, S. M. (2019). Employee engagement, demographic characteristics and performance of state research and training corporations in Kenya. IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18(1), 55–70.

Chirasha, V. & Mahapa, M. (2012). An Analysis of the Causes and Impact of Deviant Behaviour in the Workplace. The Case of Secretaries in State Universities Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS) 3(5): 415-421.

Di Stefano, G., Scrima, F., & Parry, E. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. International Journal of Human Resource Management,

Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(4), 547–559. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.547

Everton, W. J., Jolton, J. A. & Mastrangelo, P. M. (2007). "Be nice and fair or else: understanding reasons for employees' deviant behaviors", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 117-131.

Faiz, N. (2013). Impact of manager's reward power and coercive power on employee's job satisfaction: A comparative study of public and private sector. International Journal of Management and Business Resources, 3(4), 383-392.

Falola, H.O, Ibidunni A. S., & Olokundun, M. A. (2014). Incentives Packages and Employees' Attitudes to Work: A Study Of Selected Government Parastatals In Ogun State, South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science. Vol.3 (1), 63-74.*

Galperin, B. L. (2012). Exploring the nomological network of workplace deviance: Developing and validating a measure of constructive deviance. *Journal of Applied social psychology,* 42(8), 2988-3025. Http// doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00971.

Galperin, B.L. (2002). *Determinants of deviance in the workplace: an empirical examination in Canada and Mexico.* Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Concordia University.

Geue, P. E. (2018). Positive practices in the workplace: Impact on team climate, work engagement, and task performance. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 54 (3), 272–301.

Goldman, A., van Fleet, D. D., & Griffin, R. W. (2006). Dysfunctional organization culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysfunctional work behaviors. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(8), 698–708. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610713244

Gor, A. (2007). An attributional analysis of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) in response to occupational stress. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of South Florida.

Griffin, R.W. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2004). *The Darkside of Organizational Behaviour*., New York. Wiley.

Grobelna, A. (2019). Effects of individual and job characteristics on hotel contact employees' work engagement and their

performance outcomes: A case study from Poland. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31(1), 349–369.

Gülsüm, B., Adem, P., Mehmet, K.,İIker, G. & Mehdi, D. (2016). Investigation of the relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment, *Universal journal of Educational Research,* 4(6), 1418-1425.

Hameed, W. U., Basheer, M. F., Iqbal, J., Anwar, A. and Ahmad, H. K. (2018). Determinants of firm"s open innovation performance and the role of r & d department, An empirical evidence from malaysian sme"s. Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research, 8(1): 29.https://scienceij.com 11

Hassan, M. & Sermerciöz, F. (2010). Trust in personal and interpersonal forms, its antecedents and consequences: A conceptual analysis within organizational context. *International journal of management and information systems,* 4(6), 67-84.

Husni, F., Kurniadi, D., Kawangung, V. Y., & Rahmawati, P. (2021). The Influence of Career Development, Competence, Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Against the Performance of Health Service Employees in Bintan Regency. Conference Series, 3(2), 67–74. https://doi.org/10.34306/conferenceseries.v 3i2.464

Jawad. M., Tabassum. T. M., Raja, S. & Abraiz, A. (2013). Study on Work Place Behaviour: Role of Person-Organization Fit, Person-Job Fit& Empowerment, Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences, 2013, Vol. 1, No. 4, 47-54.*

Joe-Akunne, C.O., Oguegbe, T.M., & Okonkwo, K.I. (2015). Impact of Emotional Intelligence and job Boredom proness on counter productive work behavior *American Institute of Science,* 1(2), 101-106.

Johnson, D. & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective based trust in service relationships. *Journal of business Research,*58(6), 500-507. Journal of Health Organization and Management, 34(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-04-2019-0084/FULL/ XML

Kabiru, K., Faradahwati, S. &Chauhan, A. (2013). Influence of organizational format control on workplace deviance: A pilot study, *Middle –East Journal of Scientific Research,* 13(4), 538-544, Dio:5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.13.4.312.

Kagaari, J. R. K. (2011). Performance management practices and managed performance: The moderating influence of organisational culture and climate in public universities in

Kalemci, R. A., Kalemci-Tuzun, I., & Ozkan-Canbolat, E. (2019). Employee deviant behavior: Role of culture and organizational relevant support. European Journal of Management

Knapp, P. (1994). *One World – Many Worlds: Contemporary Sociological Theory* (2nd Ed.). Harpercollins College Div, pp. 228–246.

Kurniawan, A., Indrayani, I., Khaddafi, M., & Ngaliman, N. (2022). Determination of Competence, Individual Caracteristics, Education and Training on Satisfaction Working Through the Performance of Employees in Hr Development Agency Karimun District. International Journal of Educational Review, Law And Social Sciences (IJERLAS), 2(1), 59–66. https://doi.org/10.54443/ijerlas.v2i1.144

Lazaric, N. (2003). *Trust building inside the Epsitemic community:* An investigation with an empirical case study, E. Elgar publishing, USA.

Liden, R.C., Wayan, S.J., Zhoa, H., & Henderson, D. (2005). *Development of multidimensional measure of servant leadership*, Management Association, Charleston, SC.

Litzky, B. E. (2000). The good, the bad and the misguided. How managers inadvertently encouraged deviant behaviours; Academy of management perspectives, 13 (5): 91-100.

Mathew, O.T., Chigozie, U. B. &Kosiso A. (2014). Workplace Deviance: A Predictive study of occupational stress and emotional Intelligence among secondary school teachers.

International Journal of Academic Research in Business and social sciences. 4(12), 178-186. Doi.10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i12/1337.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2010). Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: The mediating role of ethical climate. Journal of

McAllister, D. (1995). Affect and Cognitive-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in organizations.*The Academy of Management Journal,* 38(1), 24-59.

McCauley, D. & Kuhnert, K. (1992). A theoretical review and empirical investigation of employee trust in management. Journal of *Public Administration,*16(2), 265-285.

McKnight, D. Cummings, L. & Chervany, N. (2008). Initial Trust Formation in New Organizational Relationships. *Academy of Management Review,*23(3), 473-490.

Minatogawa, V., Franco, M. and Pinto, J. (2018), "Business model innovation influencing factors: an integrative literature review", Brazilian Journal of Operations and Production Management, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 610-617. DOI: https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.14488/BJOPM.2018.v15.n4.a14

Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: the centrality of trust", in Kramer, R.M and Tyler, T.R (ed.): Trust in organizations: *frontiers of Theory and research*", 261-287. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Mitchel, M. and Ambrose, M. L. (2007) Abusive supervision and work place deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (4):1159-1168.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 59(3), 591–622. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/J.1744-6570.2006.00048.X

Muafi, J. (2011). Causes and consequences of deviant workplace behavior *International Management and Technology Journal.* 2(2), ppp.123-126.

Nasir, M., & Bashir, A. (2012). Examining workplace deviance in public sector organizations of Pakistan. International Journal of Social Economics, 39(4), 240–253. https://doi.org/

Nwankpa, J. K. &Roumani, Y. (2014). "Influence of Organizational Mindfulness on Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system usage.*Communications of the Association for information systems: Vo*l.34, No. 85, pp.1470-1492.

Olaogun, J.A. and Adebayo, A.A, (2015). Gender Imbalance in the Academia in Nigeria: European Scientific Journal, November 2015/Special/edition. ISSN 1857-7881.

Omar, F., Halim, F. W., Zainah, A. Z., Farhadi, H., Nasir, R., & Khairudin, R. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior. *World Applied Sciences Journal,* 12(Special Issue of Social and Psychological Sciences for Human Development), 45-51.

Omar, M. S., Rafie, N., & Ahmad Selo, S. (2020). Job satisfaction influence job performance among polytechnic employees. International Journal of Modern Trends in Social Sciences, 3(14), 39–46. https://doi.org/10.35631/IJMTSS.314003

Onuoha, J .I, & Ezeribe, S. N. (2011). Managerial Attitudes and Workplace Deviance: A Psycho-Sociological Perspective. ABSU Journal of Arts, Management, Education, Law and Social Sciences Vol.1 (1) 149-161.

Peterson, D. K. (2002). "Deviant Workplace Behaviours and the Organizations Ethical Climate". *Journal of Business and Psychology* 17(1): 47-61.

Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. Journal of Business and Psychology, 17(1), 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1023/A: 1016296116093

Purwoharsojo, P., Caisar Darma, D., & Mirwansyah, D. (2020). Exploration of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Performance. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 6, 116–130. https://doi.org/10.47577/ tssj.v6i1.242

Putri, S. M., Swasono, E., & Baehaki, I. (2020). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepuasan Kerja Sebagai Variabel Intervening. Journal of Economi Business, 01(02). http://ejournal. ijshs.org/index.php/commo/a rticle/view/122

Qiu, T. & Peschek, B. S. (2013). The Effect of Interpersonal Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors on the Performance of New Product Development Teams. *American Journal of Management* vol. 12(1).

Quadri, L. A. (2022). Supervisor and Co-Workers Relationship and Employee Engagement of Law Firms in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. International Journal of Academic Accounting, Finance & Management Research, 6(2), 1–10.

Rachman, M. M., Sugijanto, & Samsiyah, S. (2020). The Effect of Transformational Leadership on the Performance of Employees with Motivation and Job Satisfaction as an Intervention (A study in the Office of the Irrigation Department working in Sidoarjo District, Indonesia). European Journal of Business and Management, 12, 12-23. https://iiste.org/ Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/view/5 2872

Rafiee, M., Hoveida, R. & Rajaeipoor, S. (2015). The relationship of the deviant workplace behaviour with organizational Justice and staff development in the Universities of Tehran, *International Journal of Human Resource studies,* 5(1), 126-140.

Rezaei, M., Salehi, S., Shafiei, M. & Sabet, S. (2012). Servant Leadership and Organizational trust: The mediating effect of the leader trust and Organizational Communication. *Emerging Market Journal,* 2(3), 70-78.DOI. 10.5195/emaj.2012.21

Robinson, S. & Bennett, R. (1997). Workplace deviance" Its definition, its Manifestations and its causes. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*. 6(1), 3-27.

Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1995). "A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multi- dimensional scaling study". *Academy of Management Journal,* .38(2), 555-572. Retrieved athttp://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256693.

Rogojan P. T., (2009). Deviant Workplace Behavior in Organizations: Antecedents, Influences, and Remedies. Angestrebter akademischer Grad, Wien

Rusu, R. &Babos, A. (2015). Organizational trust between institutional and Interpersonal trust.*Buletic specific.* 6(2), 40-43.

Samadi, B., Wei, C., Seyfee, S. &Yusoff, W. (2015). Conceptual model of organizational trust and knowledge sharing behaviour among multi-generational employees. *Asian Social Science,* 11(9), 32-42. DOI: 10.5539/ass.v11n9p32.

Scott, K. D. Bishop, J. W &. Chen. X. (2003). An Examination of The Relationship of Employee Involvement With Job Satisfaction, Employee Cooperation, and Intention to Quit in U.S. Invested Entreprise In China, The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, Vol. 11(1), 3-19.

Semercioöz, F., Aldemir, Z. & Hassan, M. (2011). An Empirical Study on the Role of Interpersonal and Institutional Trust in organizational innovativeness. *International Business Research,*4(2), 125-136.

Spreitzer G.M & Sonenshein S. (2004). Toward the construct definition of positive deviance, American Behavioural Scientist, Vol. 47(6),828-47.

Stouten, J., Baillien, E., Broeck, A. V., Camps, J., Witte, H. D., & Euwema, M. (2011). Discouraging bullying: The role of ethical leadership and its effect on the

work environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(1), 17-27.

Sunday, A.J. (2013). Workplace Deviant Behaviour: A case of Intels Nigeria Limited. *Research on Humanities and social science,* 3(22), 49-56.

Uganda. Measuring Business Excellence, 15(4), 36–49. https://doi.org/10.1108/13683041111184099

Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2003). Misbehaviour in Organizations: Theory, research, and management. Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/ 97 81410609052

Wang, Q., Lin, M. H., Narayan, A., Burns, G. N., & Bowling, N. A. (2022). A cross-cultural examination of the relationships between job attitudes and workplace deviance. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 39(1), 249–272. https://doi.org/10.1007/s 10490-020-09721-1

Widyaningrum, M. E., & Rachman, M. M. (2019). The Influence of the Work Environment, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employee Performance and Motivation as Intervening (Studies in the Matahari Department Store Tbk. Tunjungan Plaza in Surabaya, Indonesia). European Journal of Business and Management, 11, 60-68.

Windsperger, J. (2009) Deviant Workplace Behaviour in Organizations: Antecedents, Influences, and Remedies. Internationale Betriebswirtschaft.

Zheng, W., WU, Y. C. J., Chen, X. and Lin, S. J. (2017). Why Do Employees Have Counterproductive Work Behavior? The Role of Founder's Machiavellianism and The Corporate Culture in China. *Management Decision,* 55(3): 563–578.