ETHICAL CLIMATE AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR AMONG EMPLOYEES OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES: THE CASE OF THE EMERGING COUNTRY

Grace Oluwafunmilayo Obalade [*], Kayode Kingsley Arogundade [**]

* *Corresponding author,* Ekiti State University, Nigeria
Contact details: Ekiti State University, Iworoko road, Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State
** Ekiti State University, Nigeria

Abstract

The study was borne out of the need to assess the effect of ethical climate on deviant behavior among employees in the educational institutions and the need to ascertain whether workplace deviant behavior has a force to bear with institutional ownership. Questionnaires (375) were distributed among the academic and administrative staff of Ekiti State University (EKSU), Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti (ABUAD), the Federal University of Technology Akure (FUTA) and Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin (EU); selected using multistage sampling technique. Descriptive statistics (table, percentage) and inferential statistics (simple regression) were employed to analyse the data. Simple regression was used to analyse the data. Based on the test of the hypothesis, the study found that deviant behavior among employees of selected public and private universities can be significantly determined by ethical climate factors. Ethical climate contributed significantly to deviant behaviors in the public and private universities showing probability of t-statistic (.012 &.022) lesser than 5%. Hence, it is concluded that the ethical climate or wrong ethical system is the major determinant of deviant behaviors in selected public and private universities.

Keywords: Ethical Climate, Deviant Behavior, Public, Private

1. INTRODUCTION

Employees in the workplace are often faced with a lot of pressures as the need to achieve set targets keeps increasing at every point in time (Wameed, 2015). This accounts for the need to continuously change and internally redesign job responsibilities.

Employees and managers alike are faced with pressures to perform their corporate responsibilities. Due to these pressures, the workplace becomes a place where most individuals devote their working hours and derive some measures of identities (Hulin, 2002). So, therefore, it is not surprising, that the workplace is believed to

be a forum for expressing different forms of behavior that may be of consequence to individuals, the organization and the society at large. Employee behavior could be positive when it produces productive results or negative when the effect is unfavourable. Acts exhibited by individuals in the workplace that are different from the organizational norms, at the same time detrimental to the achievement of organizational goals and objectives are referred to as negative deviant behavior.

The classic organization theory treats deviance from organizational rules as exceptional and undesirable (Walle, 2014), nonetheless, some of these behaviors may fulfill important organizational evolution and survival. Literature has argued that breaking of rules can also be linked with solving problems, success, and innovation (Lipsky, 1980; O'Leary, 2005; Riccucci, 2005). In order to aid our understanding of deviant behavior and also explain it, researchers came up with various factors that could possibly influence deviant behavior among employees (Kura, Shamsudin, & Chauhan, 2013). These factors, depending on the employee's perception will determine if an act would be termed positive or negative. These factors include perceived organizational support, organizational justice perceptions, ethical climate, HRM practices, job characteristics, organizational politics, leadership style and psychological contract breach (Nwuche & Eketu, 2015). Thus, workplace deviant behaviors can be either negative or positive and both have repercussions (Bodankin & Tziner, 2009).

Determinants, causes, and consequences of deviant behavior have received attention from researchers globally. Among others, Wameed (2015) examined the ethical climate, job characteristics and human resources practice as determinants of deviant behavior using Chemical/Fertilizers industry of State of Basra as a case study. To the best of our knowledge, various authors have written on the topic "workplace deviance and its determinants" in Nigeria but none has been able to examine ethical climate as a determinant of deviant behaviors. It can also be observed that many of the studies on the subject have focused on other sectors of the economy in Nigeria. This study chose tertiary institutions, because of the consistently reported deviant behavior exhibited among the staff of tertiary institutions on media. The broad objective of this study was to investigate whether ethical climate significantly determines deviant behavior among employees of the selected public and private universities in South-West Nigeria.

In order to achieve an orderly presentation of this research work, the study was divided into five chapters. Section 1 contains a general introduction and provides justification for the study. Section 2 focuses on the literature review on deviant behaviours, HRM Practices, ethical climate, job characteristics, theories and empirical review on the subject. The third section documents a suitable research method to be adopted. Section 4 presents the analyses, interpretation and discussion of results of the tested hypotheses. Section 5 consists of conclusion, summary, recommendations and suggestion for further studies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Conceptual clarifications

Workplace deviant behavior could either be positive or negative. Bennett and Robinson (2000) divided these behaviors into two depending on the object of focus; it could be interpersonal or organizational. Interpersonal, when it is targeted towards co-employee and organizational when it is targeted towards the organization. Due to the consequences of workplace deviance, organizations put in their best and also put up some mechanisms to minimize the occurrence of these behaviors. Such mechanisms are the clocking in system, the use of register, checking cars when going in and out of the workplace, etc. All these are used to safeguard the organization from the hazards these acts may cause. Workplace deviant behaviors range from absenteeism, computer fraud, embezzlement, theft, vandalism, sabotage, etc. (Harper 1990). Oftentimes, the majority of deviant acts are considered negative, yet, there exist positive deviant acts as well (Rogojan, 2009). Constructive deviant behaviors, therefore, are commendable acts which focus on actions with commendable intentions, not regarding their outcomes. Appelbaum, Iaconi, and Matousek (2007) noted that constructive deviance also known as positive deviant behaviors include behaviors that employers do not permit, but are capable of helping the organization reach its financial and economic objectives. Constructive deviant behaviors include innovations and creativity, not complying with directives that are dysfunctional, and the act of criticizing superiors that are incompetent, all these contribute to giving the organisation competitive edge, as well as to the well-being of the society (Appelbaum et al., 2007; Krau, 2008; Galperin, 2002).

Ethical climate simply refers to the shared perceptions of what is an ethically-correct behavior and how issues of deviations from those expected behaviors are handled (Victor & Cullen, 1988). It is possible, that an organization have a generally perceived climate that contributes to the attitudes and behaviors of the employees negatively (Spector, Coulter, Stockwell, & Matz, 2007). Past studies have suggested that in an organization the ethical climate significantly influences the ethical behavior of the employees (Fritzsche, 2000; Deshpande, George, & Joseph, 2000). In addition, literature in the antisocial realm explains that the presence of an ethical climate partially predicts the existence of workplace deviance (Peterson, 2002). Also, Vidaver-Cohen (1998), puts it that when an organization's mission statement emphasizes an employee's focus and concern, it may help facilitate a more moral climate. In order for organizations to create a successful ethical climate, there is a need to address the behaviors of senior leaders in the organization, because they serve as role models to junior employees and are often involved in the setting of the organization's culture (Finkelstein, 2005). Senior leaders are also at a position whereby other employees look to them for the change they desire and to also create a climate shift that is positive. This means that the ethical behavior of a leader would determine the extent to which subordinates

feel pressurized to engage or involve in workplace deviance (Litzky, Eddleston & Kidder, 2006). Ethical climate helps to provide answers to questions often asked by members of the organization, such as: What should be done? What issues are within the organization's ethical content? What constitutes appropriate decision criteria? And what alternative is correct in the organization's view? (Rogojan, 2009). "Because workplace deviant acts, such as theft, sabotage, absenteeism, tardiness and sexual harassment is also linked to ethical climate. It is, therefore, needful for organizations to create an ethical climate that is strong so as to prevent acts that are unethical" (Rogojan, 2009).

2.2. Theoretical framework

Researchers have frequently used social exchange theory to explain the occurrence of workplace deviance in the organization. This is inconsistency with the rules of reciprocity, which says that an individual will respond to destructive behaviors with the existence of unfavorable conditions, perceived belief, and practices in the workplace. Social learning theory forms the basis for the study of ethical leadership. The proposition of social learning theory is that individuals' ethical behavior can be influenced by leaders via modeling (Brown et al., 2005). The leader has a responsibility of modeling the ethical behavior that they expect their followers to display. Wimbush and Shepard (1994) found that followers emulate leaders' behavior due to the fact that leaders have the power to hold the followers responsible for their actions.

Social learning theory and modeling are rooted in Mead's (1934) theory of symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionism as a theory describes how shared perceptions are created among people via an effective, social interactive process of interpreting, defining, and evaluating events through symbols (Wimbush & Shepard, 1994). Different forms of symbols can be identified in a working relationship. Symbols are usually articulated via verbal and nonverbal communication between leaders and followers (Wimbush & Shepard, 1994). In addition, the role of leaders and supervisors in emphasizing and disseminating the organization's policies, visions, mission and goals throughout the organization cannot be overemphasized. Organizational leaders and supervisors thus become a major determinant as far as the perceptions of organizational policies are concerned throughout the organization (Wimbush & Shepard, 1994). When policies and expectations are communicated incorrectly, inconsistently, or dissimilarly, the various climate types begin to emerge.

2.3. Review of empirical studies

Quite a number of studies have been carried out on deviant behavior. Using public and private universities, Muhammad, Muhammad, and Shamaila (2002) carried out a comparative investigation of workplace deviant act of teaching staff in Pakistan. Sixty respondents were drawn each from two public and two private institutions using random sampling. Results of inferential statistical techniques and descriptive tools such as means and t-test led to the conclusion that workplace deviant acts of staff in private universities are significantly different from those of public universities staff. In another study, Zirgham and Umair (2009) evaluated organizational citizenship behavior and unproductive behavior in the corporate sector in order to measure the link between the two behaviors. The model adopted frequency counts and Pearson correlation statistics and the results proved counterproductive behavior has a high negative correlation with organizational citizenship behavior in Pakistan. Similarly, Saira, Atif, and Yasir (2015) investigated the mediating role of perceived organizational support on the relationship between perceived supervisor support and workplace deviance within a non-western context. The study employed correlation analysis and found that there is a direct relationship between perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support.

Additionally, Muhammad and Anjum (2013) examined counterproductive workplace attitudes between white collar workers and blue collar in Pakistan. Independent samples t-test, mean rank analysis, regression, and correlation were employed. The study found that the magnitude of counterproductive acts in blue-collar staff is significantly different from those of white-collar workers. The study reported an insignificant level of interpersonal misunderstanding, high level of job satisfaction and low level of counterproductive or deviant acts in white-collar workers. While a small degree of job satisfaction and a significant level of interpersonal misunderstanding and deviant acts are reported in blue collar workers. The study concluded that the deviant act is a reducing function of job satisfaction. With a focus on secretaries in state universities, Vonai and Mildred (2012) studied the drivers and effect of deviant behavior in the workplace in Zimbabwe. The study used the qualitative method and concluded that organization productivity and the individual employee's morale and motivation are adversely affected by workplace deviant behavior. Rumesa (2016) investigated the relationship between ethical leadership and employees' workplace deviance, followed by the mediating role of psychosocial safety climate and moderating role of union commitment in Pakistan health sector. Hierarchical regression employed in analyzing data generated from young doctors and practitioners indicated that ethical leadership has a high and inverse relationship with organizational deviance. Furthermore, it indicated a positive and highly significant relationship between ethical leadership and psychosocial safety climate, and lastly, there is a significant impact of union commitment on the correlation between ethical leadership andorganizational deviance.

Chai, Chia, Fong, Lew, and Tan (2012) investigated the drivers of saving behavior among the students of public and private universities in Malaysia by applying the theory of planned behavior. Primary data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire. Multiple regression and correlations analyses were used to determine whether financial education, parental socialization, peer pressure and temperance are correlated with the saving behavior of university students. The findings showed that the explanatory variables, namely financial education, parental socialization,

peer pressure and temperance have direct relationship with savings behavior with parental socialization having the greatest impact on savings behavior. Mayer, Kuenzi, and Geenbaum (2010) carried out a study in America and evaluated the nexus between ethical leadership and employee's misconduct and the mediating role of ethical climate. Using descriptive and correlation statistics test, the results from the study revealed that there is a statistically significant relationship among the variables. The study concluded that managers played a critical role in creating an ethical climate which ultimately reduces the magnitude of misconduct among staff. Wameed (2015) conducted a study on the determinants of deviant behavior using three variables, namely ethical climate, job characteristics and human resources practices to test the relationship these variables have with the behavior exhibited by employees. The research was carried out in a chemical fertilizer company, in the state of Basra. Questionnaires were distributed to 107 employees of the industry from all the job categories, namely, managerial, executive and non-executive. The data retrieved were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation. Additionally, multiple regression was used to test the hypotheses of the study. It was found out from the study that ethical climate and human resources management practices had an influence on the behavior of employees while job characteristics have no influence on the behavior of employees. In Ghana, Asorwoe and Comfort (2016) reviewed corruption and unethical behavior in public sector organizations in a specific test of social learning theory. Drawing on social learning theory, this study posited that the propensity to engage in corruption is motivated by rationalization, socialization, and institutionalization of corrupt practices.

Monanu, Okoli, and Adibe (2015) examined the nexus between organizational justice and unproductive work attitude in Nigeria using descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation test. The study found that organizational justice has a positive significant relationship with unproductive work attitude. Ikuomola, Okunola, and Fabunmi (2014) investigated the deviant behaviors in library use in three Universities in Nigeria. The study revealed that inadequate security of properties and epileptic power supply are responsible for different types of deviant acts in the use of library information and communication technologies which eventually put an unnecessary burden on both library staff and users. The study suggested that adequate funding and introduction of sophisticated library model will ensure a variety of spatial and safety arrangements in alleviating the deviant problem associated with library utilization. Ehiyamen, Abah, and Gberevbie (2009) conducted research on lack of discipline and productivity of public sector employees in Nigeria. The study showed that indiscipline is the major factor responsible for low productivity in public enterprises and government parastatals and argues that they are controllable. Olabimitan and Alausa (2014) studied the effect of psychological conditions on workplace deviant acts among staff in the public health sector in Lagos. Multiple regression was used and found that work locus of control significantly

predicted workplace deviant behaviorin such away that employees who were susceptible to an external locus of control tended to exhibit workplace deviant behavior than those who displayed the internal locus of control. Workplace deviant behavior reduced with employees' perception of organizational justice. Male nurses manifested higher deviant behavior than their female counterparts. Ajayi (2014) examined the effect of unemployment on the behavior of the university graduates in Ado-Ekiti metropolis. The result of chi-square used in testing the hypothesis shows that there is a relationship between unemployment and crime rate. Thus, there is a need for the creation of enabling an environment for local firms and industries to thrive; development of the agricultural sector to engage a large number of unemployed graduates; giving of revolving credits for the commencement of small business as well as the introduction of entrepreneurship and vocational training in all levels of the educational curriculum. Lukman and Hamadi (2014) empirically explored the issues and prospects of disciplinary measures in Nigerian senior secondary schools. The study discovered that rioting, truancy, theft, absenteeism and drug abuse are evidence of indiscipline in Nigerian high schools while political, parental, social-economic, educational, school curriculum and peer pressure are the drivers of indiscipline. The study asserted that discipline is not necessarily a punishment but punishment is one of the disciplinary measures in school. Hseih and Wang (2016) mediated the effect of perceived organizational support and positive effect through job satisfaction on the relationship between perceived ethical climate and organizational deviance, and found out there remained an insignificant link between organizational deviance and perceived ethical climate after the mediation effects were accounted for. Ekinci (2107) on the basis of the faculty members' perception investigated the relationship between the organization's ethical climate and political behavior. He found that ethical climate perception is minimal and is a significant predictor of the faculty members' political behavior. The review of the literature revealed that ethical climate is one of the determinants of deviance behavior (Wameed, 2015). However, there is no recognised study on the link between the ethics and deviance behavior in the educational sector on one hand and in Nigeria on the other hand.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research design

The study adopted a survey research design method. Primary data were used for this study; the primary source of data collection involved administration of well-structured Likert scale questionnaire. The data were collected through the use of questionnaires that were administered to the selected respondents. The questionnaire was made up of four (4) sections with each of the respective sections containing questions on demographic information, workplace deviance scale, ethical climate scale, job characteristics scale, and HRM practices scale. The Robinson and Bennett scale on workplace deviance

was used to test workplace deviance. In collecting the data for this study, 375 questionnaires were distributed among the academic and administrative staff of Ekiti State University (EKSU), Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti (ABUAD), Federal University of Technology Akure (FUTA) and Elizade University, Ilara-Mokin (EU). The universities were chosen within the Ekiti and Ondo states.

3.2. Population, sample and sampling technique

The population of this study covered all the academic and administrative staff of the selected universities. The populations of staff according to the registry department of the four universities are 2450, 1395, 2000 and 300 respectively. Multi-stage sampling technique was used for this study; this was based on the fact that the sample belongs to different sub-group. The first stage was the purposive selection of Ekiti State and Ondo-State. The second stage was the purposive selection of one from two public universities in each state. Out of the two public universities in Ekiti State, namely: EKSU and FUOYE, and Ondo State, namely FUTA and AAU; EKSU and FUTA were chosen following a purposive sampling technique, the two are the older of the two public universities in each of the states. In Ekiti, ABUAD was chosen, which makes it the only private university while EU to be selected among the three private universities in Ondo state using simple random sampling.

The total sample size for the study is 367 using the Yamane model (1967). Proportionate sampling technique was used to get the total number of the respondent from each of the universities. The formula is given and the sample size was calculated as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)2} \qquad (1)$$

$$n = \frac{6145}{1 + 6145(0.05)^2} = 375 \qquad (2)$$

Where,

n = the sample size; N= total population of the study; e = acceptable margin error term (0.05). Thus the number of respondents were 150 85, 122 and 18 from EKSU, ABUAD, FUTA and EU respectively.

3.3. Model specification and estimation technique

In order to determine whether the dependent variable (deviant behavior) is significantly determined by the independent variables (ethical climate), the study developed a model which is stated as follows:

$$DB = F(EC) \qquad (3)$$

Where DB = deviant behaviors; EC = ethical climate

Descriptive statistic was used to present and analyze demographic data of respondents in the frequency table. The demographic factors were age, marital status, faculty, length of service, qualification. Simple regression was used to analyze and test the hypotheses and relationship between the dependent and independent variables. To test

the hypothesis which states that deviant behavior among employees of selected universities cannot be significantly determined by ethical climate, *p*-value of regression analyses were used to determine the significant effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

$$DB_{PUB} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 EC + \varepsilon \qquad (4)$$

$$DB_{PRIV} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 EC + \varepsilon \qquad (5)$$

Where DB_{PUB} and DB_{PRIV} are deviant behaviors in public and private university respectively; α_o is the constant, β_1 is the beta coefficients; ε represents the error term. Other variables are as earlier defined.

4. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the analysis of the data collected. The data were analyzed in two stages. Stage one involved the analysis of the demographical data and general questions, while stage two involved the testing of the hypotheses. The general questions were answered using descriptive statistics involving frequency counts and percentages. The research hypotheses were tested at 5% level of significance using inferential statistics involving multiple regression analysis. It should be noted that three hundred and seventy-five (375) questionnaires were administered for the purpose of this research out of which three hundred and fifteen (315) were retrieved from the field representing 84% response. Hence, the analysis of the study shall be based on the retrieved 315 questionnaires.

4.1. Results of Descriptive Analysis

The analysis in Table 1 showed that, out of the total respondents in the study, 213 representing 67.6% were male while the remaining 102 respondents representing 32.4% were female. This implies that male participants are greater than female participants from the selected institutions. More so, 81 (25.7%) of the total respondents are between the age of 21-30 years of age, 154 (48.9%) were between the age rank of 31-40 years, 58 (18.4%) were between the age range of 41-50 years and the remaining 22 (7%) were 51 years and above. Furthermore, 133 respondents representing 42.2% were Ekiti State University (EKSU) members of staff; 80 (25.4%) are members of staff of the Federal University of Technology, Akure (FUTA); 85 (27%) and 17 (5.0%) of them were members of staff of AfeBabalola University (ABUAD) and Elizade University respectively. This thus implies that public institutions were represented by 67.6% while private universities represent 32.4%. Table 1 shows the educational qualification of the respondents as 16 (5.1%) were ND graduates, 152 (48.3%) were University/HND graduates, 113 (35.9%) obtained M.Sc. degree qualification and 34 (10.8%) were Ph.D. degree holders. Lastly, it can be seen that 158 (50.2%) have been in service between 1-5 years, 88 (27.9%) have between 6-10 years of experience, 43 (13.7%) are well experienced on the job and have been in service between 11-15 years while 26 (8.3%) were 16 years and above experienced.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis of respondent demographic variable

S/N	Demographic variable	Grouping	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Sex	Male	213	67.6
		Female	102	32.4
2.	Age	21-30	81	25.7
		31-40	154	48.9
		41-50	58	18.4
		51 years and above	22	7.0
3.	Institutions	EKSU	133	42.2
		FUTA	80	25.4
		ABUAD	85	27.0
		ELIZADE	17	5.4
4.	Educational qualification	OND	16	5.1
		B.Sc./HND	152	48.3
		M. Sc.	113	35.9
		Ph.D.	34	10.8
5	Years of experience	1-5	158	50.2
		6-10	88	27.9
		11-15	43	13.7
		16 years and above	26	8.3

Source: Field Survey Report (2017.)

Question 1: To what extent is deviant behaviors practiced among the employees of selected public and private universities?

In Table 2, item 1 revealed that out of all the respondents sampled in the study, 162 (51.4%) strongly agreed and 106 (33.7%) agreed that taking organization's property from work is not allowed in this company, 25 respondents representing (7.9%) were undecided, while 14 (4.4%) and 8 (2.5%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed. Item 2 revealed that out of the sampled respondents 93 (29.5%) and 141 (44.8%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that taking an additional or longer break than is acceptable is not being practiced in their workplace, 43 (13.7%) were undecided while 30 (9.5%) and 8 (2.5%) disagreed and strongly disagreed to the assertion. Based on the assertion in item 3 of the same table which states that coming in late to work without permission is not allowed 119(37.8%) strongly agreed, 130 (41.3%) agreed, 35 (11.1%) were undecided, while 26 (8.3%) and 5 (1.6%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Furthermore, of the respondents sampled 78 (24.8%) and 146 (46.3%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that intentionally working slowly than one could have worked is frowned at in my organization 56 (17.8%) were undecided while 26 (8.3%) and (2.9%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. To the assertion, falsifying receipt to get more money for work-related expenses is not being practiced in my organization, 102 (32.4%) respondents strongly agreed, 97 (30.8%) agreed, 67 (21.3%) were undecided, while 35 (11.1%) disagreed and 14 (4.4%) strongly disagreed. Item 6, further revealed that 79 (25.1%) and 130 (41.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that making fun of colleagues is not allowed, while 57 (18.1%) were undecided, 40 (12.7%) and 9 (2.9%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Item 7 revealed that 85 (27.0%) and 140 (44.4%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that inciteful statement against colleagues is not encouraged in their institution, 52 (16.5%) were undecided, while 30 (9.5%) and 8 (2.5%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Respondents were also asked if making offensive ethnic, religious or racial remark at work was frowned at, in their institutions, 62 (19.7%) and 73 (23.2%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively, 58 (18.4%) were undecided, 66 (21.0%) disagreed and 56 (17.8%) strongly disagreed. Finally in Table 2, 45 and 48 respondents estimated to be (14.3%) and (15.2%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that Sexual harassment is seen as a normal phenomenon in my organization, 28 (18.9%) of them were undecided to the earlier statement, 60 (19.0%) of the respondents disagreed and 134 (42.5%) strongly disagreed to this assertion.

Table 2. Extent of deviant behaviour among the employees of selected public and private universities

SN	ITEMS	Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Taking organization's property from work without permission is not allowed	162	51.4	106	33.7	25	7.9	14	4.4	8	2.5
2	Taking an additional or longer break than is acceptable is not being practiced in my workplace	93	29.5	141	44.8	43	13.7	30	9.5	8	2.5
3	Coming in late to work without permission is not allowed	119	37.8	130	41.3	35	11.1	26	8.3	5	1.6
4	Intentionally working slowly than one could have worked is frowned at in my organization	78	24.8	146	46.3	56	17.8	26	8.3	9	2.9
5	Falsifying receipt to get more money for work-related expenses is not being practiced in my organization	102	32.4	97	30.8	67	21.3	35	11.1	14	4.4
6	Making fun of colleagues is not allowed	79	25.1	130	41.3	57	18.1	40	12.7	9	2.9
7	Inciteful statement against colleagues is not encouraged	85	27.0	140	44.4	52	16.5	30	9.5	8	2.5
8	Making offensive ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work is not frowned at	62	19.7	73	23.2	58	18.4	66	21.0	56	17.8
9	Sexual harassment is seen as a normal phenomenon in my organization	45	14.3	48	15.2	28	8.9	60	19.0	134	42.5

Question 2: To what extent do the ethical climate factors determine deviant behaviors among the employees of selected public and private universities?

In Table 3, item 1 revealed that out of all the respondents sampled in the study 100 (31.7%) strongly agreed and 132 (41.9%) agreed that in this company, people protect their own interests above all else, 26 respondents representing (8.3%) were undecided, while 45 (14.3%) and 12 (3.8%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that in their company people protect their own interests above all else. 61 (19.4%) and 137 (43.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that people are expected to do anything to further the company's interests, regardless of the consequences, 50 (15.9%) of the respondents remained undecided to the assertion on item 2 while the remaining 53 (16.8%) and 14 (4.4%) disagreed and strongly agreed respectively. Based on the assertion in item 3 of the same table which states that there is no room for one's personal morals or ethics in this company 47 (14.9%) strongly

agreed, 89 (28.3%) agreed, 63 (20%) were undecided, while 93 (29.5%) and 23 (7.3%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Furthermore, 161 (51.1%) strongly agreed that it is very important to follow the company's rules and procedures here, 98 (31.1%) of the respondents agreed that it is very important to follow the company's rules and procedures here, 31 (9.8%) of the respondents were undecided regarding the assertion, 21 (6.7%) disagreed that it is very important to follow the company's rules and procedures here and the remaining 4 (1.3%) respondents strongly disagreed that it is very important to follow the company's rules and procedures here. Finally in Table 3, 85 and 142 respondents estimated to be (27%) and (45.1%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that people in this company strictly obey the company policies, 38 (12.1%) of them were undecided to the earlier statement, 40 (12.7%) of the respondents disagreed and 10 (3.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that people in this company strictly obey the company policies.

Table 3. Extent to which ethical climate determine deviant behaviors among employee

S N	ITEMS	Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	In this company, people protect their own interests above all else	100	31.7	132	41.9	26	8.3	45	14.3	12	3.8
2	People are expected to do anything to further the company's interests, regardless of the consequences	61	19.4	137	43.5	50	15.9	53	16.8	14	4.4
3	There is no room for one's personal morals or ethics in the company	47	14.9	89	28.3	63	20	93	29.5	23	7.3
4	It is very important to follow the company's rules and procedures here	161	51.1	98	31.1	31	9.8	21	6.7	4	1.3
5	People in this company strictly obey the company policies	85	27.0	142	45.1	38	12.1	40	12.7	10	3.2

Source: Field Survey Report (2017)

4.2. Test for difference of two mean between public and private universities

In order to determine whether the effect of the independent variables (ethical climate) on the dependent variable (deviant behavior) differ between employees of public and private universities, the study presents a test of difference of two means between the two categories and the results are presented in Table 4. The table showed that t-value 31.488 is greater than critical t-value 1.960 at 5%

level of significance. So the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected. It means that there is a significant difference in the effect of ethical climate on deviant behavior among employees in public and private universities. It can be seen that the mean score of the public university is greater than that of private universities, so it is concluded that ethical climate contributes to deviance behavior among employees of public universities than their private counterpart.

Table 4. T-test of equality of mean between selected public and private universities on the effect of ethical climate on deviant behavior among employees (P<0.05)

Institution	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df = (n1+n2) -2	t-cal	t-table
Public institution	213	2.44	1.129	313	31.488	1.960
Private institution	102	2.43	1.086			

Source: Author's Computation, (2017).

4.3. Hypotheses testing

The study presents a test of the hypothesis that deviant behavior is not significantly determined by ethical climate, in public universities on one hand and in private universities on the other hand. The results of the estimation for the two categories of the university are presented respectively in Table 5 and 6.

The public university regression result is presented in Table 5. It showed that deviant behavior value is 1.614 when ethical climate factor is held constant. Ethical climate factor value is 0.188 which signified a positive effect on deviant behavior among the employee of public universities. This implies that a percent increase in ethical climate factor brings about 0.19% increases in the deviant behavior of employees in the selected public universities. The significance of ethical climate factor is indicated by

the *p*-value (.012) which is less than 5 percent. The result indicated that the model has a correlation value of 0.251, which manifests a fair linear relationship between the dependent and independent variable. The table further showed that the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.063 which depicted that 6.3% of the changes in deviant behavior were accounted for by the ethical climate factor. The F-statistics value of 2.787, significant at .018 showed that the model is of a good fit.

The private university regression result is presented in Table 6. It showed that deviant behavior value is 1.718 when ethical climate factors are held constant. Ethical climate factor value is 0.243 which signified a positive and significant effect on deviant behavior among the employee of private universities. This implies that a percent increase in ethical climate factor of the private institution will bring about 2.43% increases in the deviant behavior among private institution in Nigeria. The significance of ethical climate factor is indicated by the *p*-value (.022) which is less than 5 percent. Table 6 indicated that the model had a correlation value of 0.226, which implies a positive linear relationship between the dependent and independent variable. The table further showed that the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.051 which depicted that 5% of the changes in deviant behavior were accounted for by the ethical climate factor. The F value of 5.381 significant at .002 shows that the model is of good fit since the p-value obtained was <0.05.

Table 5. Regression coefficients (public)

	Unstandardized coefficients		*Standardized coefficients*		
Variables	*B*	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*T*	*Sig.*
(Constant)	1.614	.265	.251	6.087	.000
Ethical climate	.188	.074		2.539	.012

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Deviant behavior; R = .251; R^2 = .063; F-stat 2.787 (0.018)

Table 6. Regression coefficients (private)

	Unstandardized coefficients		*Standardized coefficients*		
Variables	*B*	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	*T*	*Sig.*
(Constant)	1.718	.240	.226	7.167	.000
Ethical climate	.243	.105		2.320	.022

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Deviant behavior; R2 = .051; F-stat 5.381 (0.02)
Source: Author's Computation, 2019.

4.4. Discussion and implication of findings

The result of the test of hypothesis reveals that an ethical climate factor is a significant determinant of deviant behavior in the public and private universities. The test shows that the ethical climate contributed significantly to deviant behaviors amongst university staff. This implies that ethical climate or what employees of public and private universities believe to be ethically correct or wrong contribute majorly to acts that are different from the organizational norms, which can be detrimental to the achievement of organizational goals and objectives. This finding is consistent with Wameed (2015) who found that ethical climate had a serious influence on organizational deviance and Andreoli and Lefkowitz (2008) who found that ethical climate is a major determinant of deviant behavior in government establishment. Since the ethical climate factors increase deviant behavior in the two categories of universities, it is safe to state that employees' reactions to ethical climate are similar, forms of ownership notwithstanding. However, the relatively higher impact of ethical climate on deviant behavior in public institution could be traced to the systematic differences in their organizational environment which would make ethics to differ in public and private sectors (Richard, 2006).

5. CONCLUSIONS

The study investigated the effect of ethical climate as a determinants of deviant behavior among employees of selected public and private universities in South Western Nigerian, with a view to establish whether acts that are different from the organizational norms, which can be detrimental to the achievement of organizational goals and objectives are significantly explained by Ethical climate factors (what employees believe to be ethically correct or wrong). The study was borne out of the need for such a study in the educational institutions and the need to ascertain whether workplace deviant behavior has a force to bear with institutional ownership. These gaps were revealed from a comprehensive review of the literature.

Based on the results of the ANOVA test, it was found that ethical climate affects the deviant behavior of employees of public and private institutions differently and the effect is higher in the public than private institutions. Based on the test of the hypothesis, the study concluded that deviant behavior among employees of selected public and private universities can be significantly determined by ethical climate factors. Ethical climate contributed significantly to deviant behaviors in the public and private universities showing probability of *t*-statistic (.012 & .022) smaller than 5%. Hence, it is concluded that the ethical climate or the wrong ethical system is the major determinant of deviant behaviors in selected public and private universities. Consequent upon the finding and conclusion of the study, we suggest that management of public and private university should ensure adequate training of staff and compliance with professional ethics to ameliorate the occurrence of deviant behavior.

This study is limited to four universities and the South West region of Nigeria. A future researcher may consider other parts of the countries. They may similarly group data by perhaps surveying by College or department (i.e., the dean and staff in each college within the university, or department chair and faculty within academic departments). Another possible way to build upon the current study is to survey the respondents over time. Other measures of deviant behaviour such as absenteeism, the number of reported cases of theft, fraud could also be considered.

REFERENCES

1. Ajayi, J. O. (2014). Graduates unemployment and criminality in Ado-Ekiti. *International Journal of Management and Business Resources, 5(1),* 61-77.
2. Andreoli, N., & Lefkowitz, J. (2008). Individual and organisational antecedents of misconduct in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 85(3),* 309-332. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9772-6
3. Appelbaum, S. G., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: Causes, impact, and solutions. *Corporate Governance, 7(5),* 586-598. https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700710827176
4. Asorwoe, E., & Comfort, C. M. (2016). Corruption and unethical behavior in public sector organizations: A specific test of social learning theory. *International Journal of Management and Economics Invention, 2(1),* 504-516. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijmei/v2i1.04
5. 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
6. Bodankin, M., & Tziner, A. (2009). Constructive deviance, destructive deviance and personality: How do they interrelate? *Economic Interferences, XI(26),* 549-563.
7. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and teaching. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97,* 117-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002
8. Chai, M. T., Chia, Y. K., Fong, S. N., Lew, W. C., & Tan, T. (2012). *Determinants of saving behaviour among the university students in Malaysia* (Working Paper No: RMP15 T1G3).
9. Deshpande, S. P., George, E., & Joseph, J. (2000). Ethical climate and managerial success in Russian organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 23(2),* 211-217. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005943017693
10. Ehiyamen, O. M., & Gberevbie, D. E. (2015). Staff indiscipline and productivity in the public sector in Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, 3(4),* 461-471.
11. Ekinci, C. E. (2017). The relationship between organizational ethical climate and political behavior perceptions of the faculty members. *Journal of Education, 32(1),* 1-17. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2016023171
12. Finkelstein, S. (2005). When bad things happen to good companies: Strategy failure and awed executives. *Journal of Business Strategy, 26,* 19-28. https://doi.org/10.1108/02756660510586300
13. Fritzsche, D. J. (2000). Ethical climates and the ethical dimension of decision-making. *Journal of Business Ethics, 24(2),* 125-140. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006262914562
14. Galperin, B. L. (2002). *Determinants of deviance in the workplace: An empirical examination in Canada and Mexico* (Doctoral Thesis Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada). Retrieved from https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/2433/
15. Hulin, C. L. (2002). Lessons from industrial and organizational psychology. In J. Brett and F. Drasgow (Eds.). The psychology of work: *Theoretically based empirical research* (pp. 3-22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
16. Hseih, H. H., & Wang, Y. D. (2016). Linking perceived ethical climate to organizational deviance: The cognitive, affective, and attitudinal mechanisms. *Journal of Business Research, 69(9),* 3600-3608. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.001
17. Ikuomola, A. D., Okunola, R. A., & Fabunmi, S. O. (2014).qualitative engagement of Nigerian students and librarians in the analysis of deviance in library utilization. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal), 1111,* 1-23.
18. Krau, E. (2008). Work, creativity, inventions and society. *Man and Work, 16,* 46-54.
19. Kura, K. M., Shamsudin, F. M., & Chauhan, A. (2013). Moderating effect of self–regulatory efficacy on the relationship between organizational formal controls and workplace deviance: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Academic research in Business and social sciences. 3(1),* 15-26.
20. Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation. https://doi.org/10.2307/1288305
21. Litzky, B. E., Eddleston, K. A., & Kidder, D. L. (2006). The good, the bad, and the misguided: How managers inadvertently encourage deviant behaviors. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 20(1),* 91-103. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2006.19873411
22. Lukman, A. A. & Hamadi, A. A. (2014). Disciplinary measures in Nigerian senior secondary schools: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Research & Method in Education, 4(3),* 11-17. https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-04311117
23. Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., & Geenbaum, R. L. (2010). Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: The mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95(1),* 7-16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0794-0
24. Mccardle, G. J. (2007). *Organisational justice and workplace deviance: The role of organizational structure, powerlessness, and information salience* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando). Retrieved from https://stars.library.ucf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?r eferer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=4259&context=etd
25. Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
26. Monanu, O. G., Okoli, I. E., & Adibe, C. G. (2015). Examining the link between organizational justice and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business & Management Studies, 1(2),* 1-10.
27. Muhammad, Z. I., Muhammad, I. A., & Shamaila, B. (2002). A comparative study of deviant workplace behaviour of teaching staff of public and private universities of Punjab Pakistan. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 2(12),* 2128-2137.
28. Muhammad, A. A., & Anjum, P. (2013). Counterproductive behavior at work: A comparison of blue collar and white collar workers. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 7(3),* 417- 434.
29. Olabimitan, B., & Alausa, W. A. (2014). Psychological factors predicting workplace deviance behaviour among nurses in the public health sector in Lagos. *Nigerian Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, 2(6),* 137-152.
30. O'Leary, R. (2005). *The ethics of dissent: Managing guerrilla government.* Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
31. 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
32. Riccucci, N. M. (2005). *How management matters: Street-level bureaucrats and welfare reform.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

33. Richards, C. H. (2006). Private and public sector ethics. *Journal of Business and Economics, 4(5),* 35-41. https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.v4i5.2663
34. Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (2001). 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
35. Rogojan, P. T. (2009). *Deviant workplace behavior in organizations: Antecedents, influences, and remedies.* Retrieved from http://othes.univie.ac.at/6623/1/2009-08-28_9848220.pdf
36. Rumesa, P. (2016). Impact of ethical leadership on followers' organizational deviance, mediating role of psychosocial safety climate, moderating role of union commitment: a study in the context of Pakistan. *Jinnah Business Review, 4(2),* 9-22.
37. Spector, P. E., Coulter, H. G., Stockwell, G., & Matz, M. W. (2007). Perceived violence climate: A New construct and its relationship to workplace physical violence and verbal aggression, and their potential consequences. *Work & Stress, 21(2),* 117-130. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370701410007
38. Victor, B. & Cullen, J. B. (1988). The organizational bases of ethical work climates. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 33(1),* 101-125. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392857
39. Vidaver-Cohen, D. (1998). Moral climate in business firms: A conceptual framework for analysis and change. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17,* 1211-1226. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005763713265
40. Vonai, C., & Mildred, M. (2012). An analysis of the causes and impact of deviant behaviour in the workplace. The case of secretaries in state universities in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS), 3(5),* 415-421.
41. Walle, V. S. (2014). Building resilience in public organizations: The role of waste and bricolage. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 19(2),* 1-18.
42. Wameed, A. K (2015). *The effect of ethical climate, and the relationship between human resource management practices and workplace deviant behaviour.* Retrieved from https://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=103552
43. Wimbush, J. C., & Shepard, J. M. (1994). Toward an Understanding of ethical climate: Its relationship to ethical behavior and supervisory influence. *Journal of Business Ethics, 13(8),* 637-647. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF008 71811
44. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.).* New York: Harper and Row.
45. Zirgham, U. B., & Umair, A. (2009). Relationship between organizational citizenship behavior & counterproductive work behavior in the geographical context of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management, 4(1),* 85-92. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n1p85