

Comparative Study of Deviant Work Behaviour and Staff Performance of Umar Suleiman College of Education Gashua and Federal College Education Potiskum in Yobe State

Usman Musa Kazir, Idriss Sheriff Dalah

School of Vocational Education, Business Education Department Umar Suleiman college of Education, P.M.B 02, Gashua

School of Vocational Education, Business Education Department Umar Suleiman College of Education, P.M.B 02, Gashua

Submitted: 10-02-2021	Revised: 20-02-2021	Accepted: 26-02-2021

ABSTRACT: This paper compare the work deviant behaviour and staff performance in tertiary institution in Yobe state, Nigeria. Managing employee performance is important and valuable to the institutional/organizational success and achieving competitive advantage for achieving efficient and effective workplace. Work deviant behaviour make in many institution/organization not to achieved goals, if behavior is not manage it can have negative effect on job performance and objectives which lead to poor performance in academic institution and organization. The study went to investigate the reasons of work deviant behaviour and staff performance in achievement of organization, which in turn can have critical consequences at variety at workplace. The study used structure questionnaire distributed some selected the academic and non-academic staff in order to find the level of work deviance behaviour, the researcher distribute questionnaire to student to determine the staff performance by the academic and non-academic of the institutions. the factors affect of work deviant behaviour in the institutions are unfavorable condition, lack of technological facilities in teaching and learning, politic and recommendation is the institution should provide favorable working environment to enable staff stay in workplace and technological facilities to enable efficient and effective learning which will leads to academic performance.

Keywords: work ,deviant, and Staff performance

I. INTRODUCTION

Employees are the focal point in the success of every organization. If the employees work together and share a good relationship with employers they can achieve their task much faster

and easier. Managing employee performance is important and valuable to the organizational success and achieving competitive advantage. Employee performance is defined as the outcome or contribution of employees to make them attaint goals (Hertbert, John and Lee 2000) while performance may be used to define what an organization has accomplished with respect to the process, result, relevance and success of an organization. Afshan(2012) define performance as the achievement of specific tasks measured against predetermined or identified standard of accuracy completeness, cost and speed. Employee performance can be manifested in improvement in production, easiness in using the new technology, highly motivated workers. Conversely, job performance has been an issue of concern among staff of various organizations in Nigeria, especially among academic staff of Umar Suleiman College of education Gashua and Federal college of education Potiskum in Yobe state, Nigeria. The reason is that, it shows how much an employee commits to carry out their duties. Job performance has been variously defined by many authors, scholars and researchers, it is seen as the way and manners in which a staff in an organization performs the duties and responsibilities assigned him to carry out in order to realize the organizational goals and objectives (Olaniyan, 1999). On deviant or counterproductive work behavior, various names have been given to all forms of behavior by employees that thwart the organization goals such as deviant work behaviors (Benett& Robinson, 2003).

Several studies on deviance work behavior and work performance have been conducted in different countries and few in Nigeria. For



example, (Rahman, Ferhman, & Karan 2016; Rahman, Shabudin&Nasrudin, 2012 and Baghini, Pourkiani, &Abbasi, 2014) in Bangladesh, Malaysia and Kuwait respectively are relevant studies conducted outside the show of Nigeria. The studies on deviant work behavior and job performance in Nigeria is respectively few despite its important, if behavior is not manage it can have negative effect on job performance. Hence, the gap to be filled by the current study is, there is no similar study on deviant behavior and performance in Umar Suleiman college of education and federal college of education, Potiskum in Yobe state, also the current study would use different proxies(as oppose to previous related studies) such as; work deviance, technological equipments deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression deviant work behavior and test their effect on the performance of staff of the college of education in Nigeria and Yobe state in particular. In line of the above, the study will attempt to answer the following research questions.

- i. To what extent does work deviance affect staff performance of the Umar School College of Education Gashua and Federal College Education Potiskum staff?
- ii. To what extent does the college of education provides teaching and learning conducive environment to enable staff performance in USCOEGA and FCE?
- iii. To what extent does technological equipments affect the staff performance in USCOEGA and FCE?
- iv. To what extent does the causes of staff deviance to performing of their duties in colleges
 - Therefore, this study aims to evaluate possible solutions associated with the deviation of work behaviour on staff performance compare in some tertiary institutions in Nigeria a survey carry out in two institutions in Yobe ie state and Federal institutions. To achieve this goals, the study seeks to purse the following specific objectives:
- i. To examine the extent to which work deviance affect staff performance of the Umar School College of Education Gashua and Federal College Education Potiskum.
- ii. To examine the extent of the availability of teaching and learning environment to the staff in USCOEGA and FCE Potiskum.
- iii. To assess whether technological equipments have significance effect on the staff performance in USCOEGA and FCE Potiskum.

iv. To examine the cause of deviant behaviour that affect staff performance in colleges of education?

Significance and Scope of the study

The study will provide the college management and policy makers with the proper means of managing deviance work behavior as a well as in policy making toward improving and managing the behavior of their staff toward their performance. The study will add up to the few literature available which could serve as resource and reference point to future researchers in the field of research work.

The scope of this study is Umar Suleiman college of Education, Gashua and Federal College of education Potiskum all In Yobe state, Nigeria both the academic and Non-academic staff in some selected areas are targeting respondents of this research work due time and financial constraints.

Conceptual Framework And Literature Review

This section of the study deals with conceptual issues relating to the variables of the study. Terms that are operationally defined under this section are picked from the study, mostly from the dependent and independent variables. They include

Deviance:- is a situation when "an individual or group of individuals violates organization's customs, policies or internal regulations, jeopardizing the well-being of the organization or its citizens (Robinson & Bennett, 1995)".

Deviance work Behaviour:- Deviant behavior represent acts committed by organizational members that have are intended to have the effect of damaging co-workers, managers or the organization itself (Vardi&Weitz, 2004; Appelbaun, Iconic & Matousek, 2007;Shamsudin,Subramanian & Ibrahim, 201 +).

Staff Performance:- is a commonly used performance indicator in the work-place. It most commonly refers to whether a person performs his or her job well. According to Campbell (1990) and his colleagues (Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993), job performance is an individual level variable. In other words, it is something a single person does. A number of studies (e.g., Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992; Pearce & Porter, 1986; Tsui, Pearce, Porter, &Tripoli, 1997; Welbourne, Johnson, &Erez, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991) have suggested several factors to measure job performance. According to the preceding authors, it can be measured by quantity, quality, and accuracy of work; employees'



efficiency and standard of work; employees' striving for higher quality work, achievement of work goals, and so on.

Employee:- An employee is a person who work in the service of another person under an express or implied contract of hire under the employer has right to control the detail of work performance (Black's Law of dictation cited in Davamindhan(2014:10).

Employer:- An employer as defined by Holmes & Rabe (2007) is a legal entity that control and direct a worker under an express or implied contract of employment and pays (or its obligated to pay) him or her salary or wage in compensation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews relevant literatures on deviant work behavior and employee performance. Specifically, it attempts to conceptualize the construct of the study and both empirical and theoretical reviews. The comparative study of work deviation and staff performance in both Umar Suleiman college of education and Federal College of education Potiskum. Deviant Work Behaviour is voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in doing so, threatens the well-being of an organization or its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Employee deviance is voluntary in that employees either lack the motivation to conform to normative expectations of the social context or become motivated to violate those expectations (Kaplan, 1975). Organizational norms consist of basic moral standards as well as other traditional community standards, including those prescribed by formal and informal organizational policies, rules and procedures (Feldman, 1984). Researchers have given these behaviors many different names including workplace deviance, counterproductive behavior, antisocial behavior, and workplace incivility (Robins & Judge, 2009).

Furthermore, Research by(Khera, 2010)suggests that organizations need to manage their human resource effectively to get the maximum contrbution of employees organization achievement. Shahzads, (2010) further states that for achieving overall goals of an organization, managing and improving employee performance are decisive because employee performance has a direct relation to organizations productivity and triumph.Guest(2001) regards performance as the behavior and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals.It is clear from these definitions that it is linked with and contribute to organizational goals.Employee

performance is originally what an employee does or does not do. Performance of employees could include: quantity of output, quality of output, timeliness of output, presence at work, cooperativeness (Gungor, 2011).

Deadrick and Gardner's (2007)points, employee performance could be defined as the record of outcomes achieved, for each job function, during a specified period of time. If viewed in this way, performance is represented as a distribution of outcomes achieved, and performance could be measured by using a variety of parameters which describe an employee's pattern of performance over time. On the other hand, Darden and Babin, (2016) said employee's performance is a rating system used in many corporations to decide the abilities and output of an employee. Good employee performance has been linked with increased consumer perception of service quality, while poor employee performance has been linked with increased customer complaints and brand switching.

In spite of the size and nature of an organization, the activity it undertakes and the environment in which it operates, its success depends on its employee decisions and their behavior.Job performance is the behavior that can be evaluated in terms of the extent to which it contributes organizational effectiveness. to Hillriegel.Jackson and Slocum.1999) found that job performance as individuals work achievement after having extended effort.It is clear from this definations that job performance is related to the extent to which an employee is able to accomplish the task assigned to him or her on how the accomplished task contributes to the realization of the organizational goal.In the organizational context, performance is usually defined as the extent to which an organizational member contributes to achieving the goals of the organization. Employees are a primary source of competitive advantage in service-oriented organizations (Luthans and Stajkovic, (2009); (Pfeffer, 2016).

To conclude, employee performance could be simply understood as the related activities expected of a worker and how well those activities were executed. Then, many organization especially the service sector like the educational sector assess the employee performance of each staff member on an annual basis in order to help employees identify suggested areas for improvement. The employee could be only satisfied when they feel themselves competent toperform their jobs, which is achieved through better management of deviance in the workplace.



III. METHODOLOGY

Description of the study Area

The study is descriptive survey; primary gathered data were through structured questionnaire. The population of the study is 150 staff of both USCOEGA and FEC Potiskum from daily activities in the institutions constitute the respondents for the study, as such 68 copies of questionnaire where distributed in USCOEGA and 47 in FCE(P) respectively returned out of 100 in USCOEGA and 70 in FCE(P). The whole group of people, objects, events or things that a researcher has interest in investigating is called population (Sekaran & Bourgie, 2010).

Multistage sampling technique would be used for the purpose of this research. The study at first stage will employ the used of purposive sampling in selecting academic and non-academic staff in Umar Suleiman college of education Gashua and Federal college of education, Potiskum.

In the second stage, simple random sampling techniques will be used to select sample for the subject being studied. However at the third stage, snowball sampling will be also used to select four departments in both schools selected in the colleges or institution for the field of study i.e. comparative study of deviant work behavior and staff performance. The totals of fifty (50) academic and(50) non-academic staff in USCOEGA and (40) and (30) in FCE(P) respectively institution used in the study.

Moreover, at the fourth stage, the researchers will employ snowball simple sampling techniques to selected schools, department and non-academic staff in various sections and a number of ten (10) staff from each school and sections in the area of studied. Thus, a total of two hundred (100) respondent will be considered in the study. Snowball sampling according to Bryman (2008:184) suggested that approach to sampling; the researcher makes initial contact with a small group of people who are relevant to the research topic and then uses these to establish contacts with others. However, the technique will be used in

identifying genuine displaced staff during the exercise since there are other people who claim in the colleges for the research work, thus making it difficult to ordinarily identify the real target individual.

IV. DATA COLLECTION

A well structure questionnaire is prepared to obtain primary source of data from the respondents. An in-depth questionnaire is conducted displaced staff to collect information on their socio-economic characteristic, which includes age, educational status, and years of experience, gender marital status and other need of the staff and the staff could also measure by the level of students satisfactions with the performance of staff in the institutions. Similarly, the questionnaire will be used to derive information on problems associated with deviant behaviors, staff and work behaviour in the institutions.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis refers to the strategies and procedure for summarizing and exploring relationship among the variable on which data have been collected. The statistical technique to be used in analyzing data in this research work is regression analysis. However, statistical package for social science version 20 (SPSS, version 20) will be used for the analysis. Justification of this method is that, Chi-square is used because the researcher's objection is to find the extent of relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

Presentation and Discussion

The result of the data collected were analyzed in the line with the research questions are presented and their discussions in the tables as follows: The questionnaire is categories into section ie first sections deals with deviant work behaviour and second section with the staff performance in USCOEGA and FCE(P) which students in both institutions were given questionnaire to determine the staff performance. Also, (53) and (42) questionnaire were retrieve from students ie USCOEGA and FCE(P) respectively.

	USCOEGA		FCE(P)	
Hours/Day	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
12	22	32%	5	11%
34	31	46%	9	19%
56	9	13%	22	47%

Table 1: Length of time/hours stay in the office/Day

DOI: 10.35629/5252-0302687697 Impact Factor value 7.429 | ISO 9001: 2008 Certified Journal Page 690



International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM) Volume 3, Issue 2 Feb 2021, pp: 687-697 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252

7 and above	6	9%	11	23%
Total	68	100	47	100

Table 1 shows that the numbers of hours(per day) spend by the staff in their workplace. The table shows that 32% of the staff in USCOEGA spend between 1-2 hours in the office as against 11% of the FCE(P). This clearly show that percentage of USCOEGA staff who spent lesser hour in workplace per day is greater than

FCE(P). Also the table shows that the percentage of staff of USCOEGA who spend 7 hours and above in their workplace is only 9% as against 23% of the staff of FCE(P). This implied that work deviant behaviour is more prevalent in USCOEGA than in FCE(P) will leads to poor staff percentage in workplace and college of education in particular.

	USCOEGA		FCE(P)	
Hours/Day	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Always	14	26%	15	36%
Most of the Time	17	32%	19	45%
Partially	13	25%	6	14%
Not at all	9	17%	2	5%
Total	68	100	47	100

Table 2. Lasturar start in offices

Information from the table 2 above can also used to collate the information on the table 1. Table 2 corresponds to the students view with regard to the staff work deviants behaviour in the institutions in Nigeria, and Yobe state in particular. Table 2 reveals that 26% of the staff in USCOEGA always stay in their office/workplace and attend to students complain and other academic activities which leads to effectiveness of staff performance, this percentage is lower than that of FCE(P) with

36% from the other angle, the percentage of staff of USCOEGA who don't stay in their workplace completely and attend to students and perform other academic activities apart delivery of lecture is 7% which is higher than of FCE(P) with only 5% consequently, table 1 and 2 reveal the perception of both staff of the institutions and that students respectively implied that work deviance behaviour is more prevent in the USCOEGA and FCE(P).

	USCOEGA		FCE(P)	
Hours/Day	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Highly commitment & Dedication	8	15%	8	19%
Commitment & Dedication	19	36%	17	40%
Partially Commitments & Dedication	22	41%	15	36%
Not commitment & Dedication	4	8%	2	5%
Total	53	100	42	100

Table 3: Staff performance/Commitments and Dedication to duties



Staff performance/commitment and dedication to duties, this information has been obtained from the perception of students. Table 3 reveals the performance of staff from their students perception based on the questions admitted to them to know whether the staff are highly committed and dedication to duties shows that 15% of the USCOEGA staff are highly committed and

dedicated to perform their duty compared with 19% of the staff FCE(P) from the other angle, the table 3, also shows that 8% of the USCOEGA staff are not committed and dedicated to their duties compared with 5% of the staff of FCE(P),this implied that staff of FCE(P) are more committed and dedication to duties than the staff of USCOEGA respectively.

	USCOEGA		FCE(P)	
Hours/Day	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Unfavorable work condition	11	16%	6	13%
Lack of technological facilities	34	50%	11	23%
Politics	18	27%	22	47%
Other	5	7%	8	17%
Total	68	100	47	100

 Table 4: Causes of work deviance behaviour among staff

Causes of work deviant behaviour among staff of two college of education have been revealed by the table 4. 50% of the staff of USCOEGA attribute by the causes of work deviance behaviour are lack of technological, politics and the condition of atmosphere while 16% of them are in view that the attribute causes of work deviance behaviour are working condition such as good offices, toilet, furniture and fitting and internet facilities in teaching and learning, 47% of the staff attribute to the causes of work deviant behaviour are leads by political issues such as favourism, sectionalism, tribalism and other issues related to internal administration and unionism in the institutions any only 13% attribute to the causes of unfavorable working condition, 23% of the staff of FCE(P) are on view that causes of work deviance behaviour are lack of technological facilities such as internet, e-library etc in teaching and learning.

	USCOEGA		FCE(P)	
Response	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
YES	47	69%	33	70%
NO	21	31%	14	30%
	68	100	47	100

Table 5: Existence of favorable work condition

Available literature shows that condition of place and the environment affect the staff to deviant from their duties table 5 shows that both college the staff are of view that work 70% for the USCOEGA and FCE(P) respectively responded

that work-condition is unfavorable, this support what table 4 shows that is only 16% and 13% staff respectively mentioned in the table above ie work condition cause work deviant behaviour among staff.



Table 6: Gross-tabulation between length of time stay in office versus absence of technological facilities prevent staff of USCOEGA and FCE(P) from stay in office.

Length of time stay in office per	Absence of		
hours/Day	technological		
	facilities		
	YES	NO	Total
12	19	3	22
34	27	4	31
56	4	5	9
7 and above	1	5	6
Total	51	17	68

Chi-square test of independence was conducted to know whether there is dependency between the two variables. The calculated chisquare values is $X^2 = 19.3$, which is compared with the tabulated chi-square value is $X^2 = 0.352$ at 5% level of significance. This means that there is dependency between the variable since the chisquare calculated is greater than the chi-square tabulated. This can be seen from table 6 that most of staff who spend less hours in office(1-2 hours per day). said that absence of technological facilities prevent them from staying at office and only 3 of them said that absence of technological facilities does not prevent them from staying at office.

 Table 7: Gross tabulation between length of time stay in office versus Absence of technological facilities prevents staff of FCE(P) from staying of office.

Length of time stay in office per	Absence of		
hours/Day	technological		
	facilities		
	YES	NO	Total
12	5	0	5
34	8	1	9
56	19	3	22
7 and above	4	7	11
Total	36	11	47

Chi-square test of independence was conducted to know whether there is dependency between the two variables. The calculated chisquare values is $X^2 = 19.3$, which is compared with the tabulated chi-square value is $X^2 = 13.42$ at 5% level of significance. This means that there is dependency between the variable since the chisquare calculated is greater than the chi-square tabulated. This can be seen from table 6 that most of staff who spend less hours in office(1-2 hours per day). said that absence of technological facilities prevent them from staying at office and only 3 of them said that absence of technological facilities does not prevent them from staying at office.

VI. CONCLUSION

The major aim of the study is to compare the work deviance behaviour between USCOEGA and FCE(P) as it affect staff performance. The research work concluded that staff USCOEGA. Also, based on the student responses are on perception that academic and stay at office, staff FCE(P) stay at office more than the staff of USCOEGA. The perception of students of both colleges is almost the same with regards to their lecturers on commitments and dedication to their duties, even though the little bit more prevalent dedication than what the students of USCOEGA reported. The researcher also concluded unfavourable working condition causes work deviance behaviour but only 16% and 13% of staff of USCOEGA and FCE(P) respectively. The most important factors of work deviance behaviour are lack of technological facilities, political issues, favourable atmosphere and condition of workplace effect employees to stay and perform their duties efficiency and effectively.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the result, the following recommendation were made:



1. The college of education management should provide favourable working condition/atmosphere to enable staff stay in office to perform other duties assigned to them such good and ventilate office and toilet with constant power supply.

2. The management/organization should provide technological facilities such as internet, e-library and other gadget using teaching and learning to enable conducive learning environment for worker both academic and non-academic staff.

3. Motivational package will use in making staff to perform assign jobs and responsibility effectively such as bonus and allowance and soft loan.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adeyemi, J. K. (2004). Resource situation and internal efficiency of technical colleges in Nigeria.(Unpublished doctoral dissertation).University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- [2]. Alo, O. (1999). Human Resource Management in Nigeria, Business and Institutional Support Associates Limited.Logos.
- [3]. Anwar, M.N., Sarwar, M., Awan, R.N., &Arif, M.I. (2011), Gender differences in workplace deviant behavourof University teachers and modification techniques. International Education Studies, 4 (1).Published byCanadian Center for Science Education.
- [4]. Appelbaum S., Iaconi, G., D., &Matousek A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impact, and solutions, Corporate Governance, 7 (5), 586-598.
- [5]. Baghini,B.Z., Pourkiani,M&Abbasi,F.B.(2014) the relationship between organizational trust and organizational deviant behavior of staff in refaah bank branches in kermancity,Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review Vol. 3, No.11;
- [6]. Bamikole. O. Fagbohungbe, Gabriel A. Akinbode, FolushoAyodeji (2012), Organizational Determinants of Workplace Deviant Behaviours: An Empirical Analysis in Nigeria, International Journal of Business and Management Vol. 7, No. 5, Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education
- [7]. Baskett, S. &Mikios, E. (1992).Perspectives of effective principal.Canadian Administrator. 32(1): 1-10.
- [8]. Bennets, L. (1996).Emotional Savvy. Parents, March, 56-61.
- [9]. Bennett, R., & Robinson, S. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace

deviance.Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(3), 349-360.

- [10]. Bennett, R., & Robinson, S. (2003). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J.Greenberg (Ed.), Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science (pp.247-281).doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349
- [11]. Bernd, M. (1992). Shared decision making requires effective instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin. 76(540):64-69.
- Borlin, B &Heatherly, L (2001). Predictors of employee deviance: the relationship between bad attitudes and badbehaviour. Journal of Business & Psychology, 15 (3), 405 418
- [13]. Brorimg, V. (2009). An exploratory study into deviant behaviour in the service encounter: How and why frontline employees engage in deviant behaviour. Journal of Management, 14(4), 451-464.
- [14]. Campbell, J. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology.Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, 1(2), 687-732.
- [15]. Campbell, J.P (1983).Job satisfaction are all the parts there? Personnel Psychology, 36,577-600.
- [16]. Campbell, J.P, M., R.A, O., & S.H, S. (Eds.). (1993). A Theory of Performance: San Francisco: Jossey-Based.
- [17]. Campbell, J., McCloy, R., Oppler, S., & Sager, C. (1993). A theory of performance.Personnel selection in organizations, 35, 70.
- [18]. Caroline, U., N. (2015). Absenteeism, Favouritism, and Tardiness as Predictors of Job Deviance in Academia: The Nigeria Experience, Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Vol. 1, No. 2, 2015, pp. 75-81
- [19]. Chikwature, W. Oyedele V.Ganyani, I. (2016) effects of deviant behavior on academic performance in mutare urban primary schools in mutare district European journal of psychological research ISSN 2057-4794 Vol 3
- [20]. Duze, C. O. (2012). Leadership Styles of Principals and Job Performance of Staff in Secondary Schools in DeltaState of Nigeria.An International Journal of Arts and Humanities, 1(2), 224-245
- [21]. Feldman, D. C. (1984). The development and enforcement of group norms. Academy of Manage-ment Review 9 (1), 47-53.



- [22]. Fox, S & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustrationaggression. Journal of organizational behaviour. 20, 915 – 913.
- [23]. Giacolone, R & Greenberg, J. (1997).Antisocial behaviour inorganizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- [24]. Golparvar, M., Nayeri, Sh., Mahdad, A., 2009, The relationship between organizational values ,job stress, emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance behavior in Steel Company workers,] DaneshvaPazhoohesh (applied psychology), No. 42, pp. 46-68.
- [25]. Hackman, R. J., & Oldham, G. R. (1980).Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [26]. Hair, J. F. et al. (1998).Multivariate data analysis (5th rev. ed.). Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- [27]. Hair, J.F. & Samuel, P. (2007) Research method for business west sussex England john wiley& sons Ltd.
- [28]. Hair J.f black w.c Anderson R.E &tathanR.L(2010) multivariate data analysis (5th edition) N.J pearson education international inc.
- [29]. Heilman, M., Block, C., & Lucas, J. (1992). Presumed incompetent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77(4), 536-544.
- [30]. Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S., & Slocum Jr, J. (1999). Management. New York: South Western College Publishing
- [31]. Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., &Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index forhigh schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. The High School Journal, 86, 38-49.
- [32]. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513-524.
- [33]. Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation ofresources theory. Applied Psychology, 50(3), 337-421.
- [34]. Javed, R. Amjad, M. Yousaf , U. Ul-Ummi, F. &Bukhari R. (2014) International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies ISSN 2028-9324 Vol. 9 No. 3 Nov. 2014, pp. 1073-1078
- [35]. Judge, T. A. & Scott, B. A. (1995). Hostility, job attitudes & workplace deviance: test of a multi-level model. Availableatwp_

judge_mooddeviance_ JAPFIN. Retrieved Nov. 26, 2013,

- [36]. Krischer, M. M., Penney, L. M., & Hunter, E. M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviors be productive? CWB as emotionfocusedcoping.Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15(2), 154-166.
- [37]. Kaplan, H.B. (1975). Self-attitudes and deviant behaviour. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear
- [38]. rejcie R.V & Morgan D.W (1970) Determing Sample Size for Research Activities educationa And psychological measurement.30 (3) 607-610.
- [39]. KabiruMaitama Kura, FaridahwatiMohd. Shamsudin and Ajay Chauhan Othman YeopAbdullah(2013) International Business Management? (2): 121-126, 2013 ISSN: 1993-5250
- [40]. Lonergan, J. M., & Maher, K. J. (2000). The relationship between jobcharacteristics and workplace procrastination as moderated by locus of control. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15(5), 213-224.
- [41]. M. Mount, R. Ilies, and E. Johnson, "Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction," Personnel Psychology, vol. 59, pp. 591-622, 2006
- [42]. Maufi, J. (2011). Causes & consequences of deviant workplace behaviour. International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 2 (2), 123 – 126.
- [43]. Mijani, M. &Rahbar A.(2016)A study on the effect of organizational cynicism on deviant behaviors of the employees in the Organization for Economic Affairs and Finance of Kerman Province, journal of current research in scienceISSN 2322-5009
- [44]. Nair,N.Bhatnagar, D. (2011), Understanding Workplace Deviant Behaviour in Nonprofit Organi-zations toward an Integrative Conceptual Framework, Nonprofit management & leadership, vol. 21, no. 3, published online in Wiley Online Library
- [45]. Okunola, F.A. (1990). Motivation: The worker force in a depressed economy: A chief executives perspective. Nigerian Journal of Personnel Studies.4:1.
- [46]. Olaniyan, A.O. (1999). Principal Preparation, Selection and Leadership Roles: Teachers and Teaching in Nigeria.Festa Press Ltd, Benin.



- [47]. Omar, Halim, Zainah, Farhadi, Nasir&Kainidin.(2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behavior.World Applied Sciences Journal, 12, 45-51.
- [48]. O'Regan, N., Ghobadian, A., & Sims, M. (2005).The link between leadership, strategy, and performance in manufacturing SMEs. Journal of Small Business Strategy, 15(2), 45-57
- [49]. Owolabi, A. B. &Babalola, S. S. (2005). Effect of perceived inequality and perceived job insecurity on fraudulent intent of bank employees in Nigeria.Europe's Journal of Psychology,7(1), 99 – 111.
- [50]. Pearce, J., & Porter, L. (1986).Employee responses to formal performance appraisal feedback.Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(2), 211-218.
- [51]. Peterson. (2010). Deviant workplace behaviour and the organization's ethical climate.Journal of Business andPsychology, I 7(1).47-56.
- [52]. Rahman,S.,Ferdausy,S,. &Karan,R.(2012), Relationship among emotional intelligence, deviant workplace behavior and job performance: an empirical study,School of Economics and Management technical university of lisbon.
- [53]. Rahman , A., Rahim,A., Shabudin,A&Nasurdin,A.,M(2012) Effects of Job Characteristics on Counterproductive Work Behavior Among Production Employees: Malaysian Experience
- [54]. Rebecca J. Bennett,Sandra L & Robinson(2000),Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance,Journal of Applied Psychology2000, Vol. 85, No. 3, 349-360
- [55]. Robbinson, S. P. & Judge, T. A.
 (2007).Organizationalbehaviour.12th
 edition. New Jersey: Upper Saddle
 River.Pearson Educational Inc
- [56]. Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations (pp. 3–27). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [57]. Robbins, S. & Judge, T. (2009). Organizational Behavior (13th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India
- [58]. Rotundo, M., &Sackett, P. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship and counterproduc-tive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-

capturing approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 66-80

- [59]. Saeed , R. Mizna.,Lodhi,R.N., Gill,A,A. Amin, A., Simra&Iqbal A.(2014) Impact of Human Resource Practices on Deviant Workplace Behavior A Study on Banking Sector Employees J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res., 4(2)81-86, ISSN 2090-4304
- [60]. Sekaran U. &Bougie R (2010) research methods for business.A still building approach (5th edition) John Willey UK.
- [61]. Shamsudin, Subramania& Ibrahim (2011).
 HR Practices andDeviant Behavior at Work: An Exploratory Study. International Conference on Business and EconomicsResearch IPEDR.Singapore: IACSIT Press. Vol.16
- [62]. Spector, P Fox, S Penney, L Bruursema, K Goh, A & Kessler, S (2006), "The Dimensionality of counterproductivity:Are all counterproductive behavior created equal?" Journal of Vocational Behavior, Vol. 68, pp. 446-460.
- [63]. Sunday, A.J. (2013). Work Place Deviant Behaviour: A Case Study of Intels Nigeria Limited Research on Humanities and Social Sciences ISSN 2222-1719 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2863 (Online) Vol.3, No.22, www.iiste.org
- [64]. Tsui, A., Pearce, J., Porter, L., & Tripoli, A. (1997). Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: does investment in employees pay off? Academy of Management Journal, 40(5), 1089-1121.
- [65]. Unal, A. (2012). Deviant teacher behaviors and their influence on school rules and interpersonal relationships at school.EgitimArastirmalari - Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 49, 1-20.
- [66]. Vardi, Y &Weitz, E. (2004).Misbehaviour in organizations: theory, research & management. Retrieved atwww.findarticle.com.
- [67]. Waseem,M.(2016) Deviant Workplace Behaviors in Organizations in PakistanThe Lahore Journal of Business 4 : 2: pp. 93–104
- [68]. Welbourne, T., Johnson, D., &Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. Academy of Management Journal, 41(5), 540-555
- [69]. Williams, L., & Anderson, S. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. Journal of Management, 17(3), 601-617



- [70]. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1994). An alternative approach to method effects by using latent-variablemodels: Applications in organizational behavior research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 323-331.
- [71]. Whetten, D., Cameron, K., & Woods, M. (2000).Developing management skills for Europe. London: Addison-Wesley
- [72]. Zikmund, W.G., Babin B.J., Carr J.C.& Griffin, M.(2010) Business research methods, 8th edition CanSouth western cengage learning.

International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management ISSN: 2395-5252

IJAEM

Volume: 03

Issue: 02

DOI: 10.35629/5252

www.ijaem.net

Email id: ijaem.paper@gmail.com