

**THE INFLUENCE OF ONBOARDING TRAINING
PROGRAM, ORGANISATIONAL FORMAL
CONTROL, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT
AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP AS A
MODERATOR ON DEVIANT WORKPLACE
BEHAVIOUR AMONG FEDERAL POLYTECHNICS
ACADEMICIANS IN NIGERIA**

UMAR SARKIN GARDI IBRAHIM

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2024

**THE INFLUENCE OF ONBOARDING TRAINING
PROGRAM, ORGANISATIONAL FORMAL
CONTROL, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT
AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP AS A
MODERATOR ON DEVIANT WORKPLACE
BEHAVIOUR AMONG FEDERAL POLYTECHNICS
ACADEMICIANS IN NIGERIA**

by

UMAR SARKIN GARDI IBRAHIM

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements.
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

April 2024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the most gracious and compassionate. All praise and honour are owed to Allah (SWT), the Creator of the universe, who gave me the strength and courage to complete this daunting undertaking. May Allah (SWT) send peace and blessings to our beloved Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), his family, his companions, and everyone who follows them in righteousness until the Day of Judgement.

Without the help and encouragement of many individuals, I would not have been able to finish this thesis, which represents a significant milestone in my life.

My sincere gratitude goes to Dr. Rosmelisa Yusof and Associate Professor Dr. Hazril Izwar Ibrahim, my two amazing supervisors, for their tolerance, wise counsel, and superb supervision during my Ph.D. journey. Thank you to Dr. Rosmelisa Bint Yusof, my main supervisor, for your guidance, inspiration, and support over the past 36 months. Being under your direction has been a privilege. She has immensely provided me with insightful feedback, advice, and helpful criticism to help me make this work better. I consider myself fortunate to have worked with her in many ways. She has had a significant impact on my knowledge, thinking, and writing. Throughout my lengthy and difficult Ph.D. journey, Dr. Rosmelisa has also encouraged me to publish a lot of work in credible journals and conference proceeding. I want to give her a heartfelt thank-you.

A significant source of inspiration for me has been Professor Dr. Hazril Izwar Ibrahim, my co-supervisor, for whom I am extremely grateful. He managed to find time to work on this thesis despite his hectic schedule. He acted with confidence towards me and expressed his belief in my high level of academic self-efficacy. His expertise, lifelong learning, and dedication to education serve as an inspiration to me. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the members of the Oral Examination Committee for their valuable feedback and recommendations provided during the viva voce session. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to the administrative employees at the School of Management, who have all played very useful roles. I wish to express my gratitude to Mrs. Robitah Spian and Mrs. Rosnah Mohamad Saleh in particular for their invaluable help.

Also, I would like to thank my Rector, Federal Polytechnic in Kaura Namoda, Eng. Dr. Yahaya Muhammad Bande, who nominated me for the TETFUND sponsorship. I would also like to thank TETFUND, my sponsor, without whom this programme would not be feasible.

My beautiful wives, Aisha Ahmand and Iklima Ibrahim, have been extremely supportive, encouraging, loving, patient, and caring during my Ph.D adventure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xviii
ABSTRAK	xix
ABSTRACT.....	xxi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background of the study	1
1.3 Preliminary study	7
1.4 Findings and implications of the preliminary study.....	14
1.5 Statement of the problem	17
1.6 Research Question.....	24
1.7 Research Objectives.....	25
1.8 Motivation for the study.....	27
1.9 Scope of the Study	28
1.10 Significance of the study.....	30
1.10.1 Theoretical Contribution	31
1.10.2 Practical (policy)Contribution.....	35
1.11 Operational Definition of key terms	38
1.12 Summary and Conclusion	42

1.13	Organisation of chapters	43
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....		44
2.1	Introduction.....	44
2.2	Deviant workplace behaviour	45
2.2.1	Definition of Deviant workplace behaviour.....	45
2.2.2	Dimensions of Deviant workplace behaviour	47
2.2.3	Consequences of Deviant workplace behaviour	54
2.2.4	Antecedents of deviant workplace behaviour	58
2.3	Onboarding Training Program	62
2.3.1	Compliance.....	66
2.3.2	Clarification.....	66
2.3.3	Culture.....	66
2.3.4	Connection	67
2.4	Organisational control.....	69
2.4.1	Types of organizational control.....	69
2.4.1(a)	Punishment certainty as deterrent factor.....	77
2.4.1(b)	Punishment Severity as deterrent.....	78
2.4.1(c)	Punishment celerity and as deterrent factor.....	79
2.4.1(d)	Contingent reward as motivational factor.....	80
2.5	Organisational Commitment	82
2.5.1	Affective Commitment.....	84
2.5.2	Normative Commitment.....	85
2.5.3	Continuance Commitment	86
2.6	Leadership	87
2.6.1	Transactional leadership.....	89

2.7	Gaps analysis.....	91
2.8	Underpinning theories.....	97
2.8.1	Social exchange theory.....	98
2.8.2	General Deterrence Theory	102
2.9	Research Framework.....	105
2.10	Hypotheses Development	106
2.10.1	Onboarding training and deviant workplace behaviour	107
2.10.1(a)	Compliance onboarding level and deviant workplace behaviour	108
2.10.1(b)	Clarification onboarding level and deviant workplace behaviour.....	109
2.10.1(c)	Culture onboarding level and deviant workplace behaviour	111
2.10.1(d)	Connection level of onboarding and deviant workplace behaviour.....	112
2.10.2	Organisational control and deviant workplace behaviour.....	114
2.10.2(a)	Punishment certainty and deviant workplace behaviour.	115
2.10.2(b)	Punishment Severity and workplace deviant.....	117
2.10.2(c)	Punishment celerity and deviant workplace behaviour	119
2.10.2(d)	Contingent Reward and deviant workplace behaviour	120
2.10.3	Organisational commitment and deviant workplace behaviour...	123
2.10.3(a)	Affective Commitment and deviant workplace behaviour	123
2.10.3(b)	Normative commitment and deviant workplace behaviour	125
2.10.3(c)	Continuance Commitment and Deviant workplace behaviour	127

2.10.3(d)	Transactional leadership and workplace deviant behavior	128
2.10.4	Transactional leadership as a moderator between onboarding training program and deviant workplace behaviour.....	129
2.10.4(a)	Moderating role of transactional leadership in the relationship between compliance and deviant workplace behaviour.....	130
2.10.4(b)	Moderating role of transactional leadership in the relationship between clarification and deviant workplace behaviour.....	131
2.10.4(c)	Moderating role of transactional leadership in the relationship between culture and deviant workplace behaviour	132
2.10.4(d)	Moderating role of transactional leadership in the relationship between connection and deviant workplace behaviour.....	133
2.10.5	Transactional leadership as a moderator between organisational control and deviant workplace behaviour.....	135
2.10.5(a)	Moderating effect of transactional leadership in the relationship between punishment certainty and deviant workplace behaviour.....	135
2.10.5(b)	Moderating effect of transactional leadership in the relationship between punishment severity and deviant workplace behaviour.....	137
2.10.5(c)	Moderating effect of transactional leadership in the relationship between punishment celerity and deviant workplace behaviour.....	139
2.10.5(d)	Moderating effect of transactional leadership in the relationship between contingent reward and deviant workplace behaviour.....	140
2.10.6	Transactional leadership as a moderator in the relationship between organisational commitment, and deviant workplace behaviour.....	141
2.10.6(a)	Moderating effect of Transactional leadership in the relationship between affective commitment, and deviant workplace behaviour.....	142

2.10.6(b)	Moderating effect of Transactional leadership in the relationship between normative commitment, and deviant workplace behaviour	143
2.10.6(c)	Moderating effect of transactional leadership in the relationship between continuance commitment, and deviant workplace behaviour	145
2.11	Summary of chapter two	150
CHAPTER 3	METHODOLOGY	152
3.1	Research methodology	152
3.2	Research Philosophy	154
3.3	Research Approach	156
3.4	Research Strategy	157
3.5	Research Choice	158
3.6	Time Horizon	158
3.7	Data Collection and Data analysis	159
3.7.1	Data Collection	159
3.7.2	Data analysis	161
3.8	Target Population	165
3.9	Sample size and power analysis	167
3.10	Sampling Technique	171
3.11	Measurement of Variables and Instrumentation	173
3.11.1	Workplace deviant behaviour	174
3.11.2	Onboarding training program	177
3.11.2(a)	Compliance	179
3.11.2(b)	Clarification	180
3.11.2(c)	Culture	181
3.11.2(d)	Connection	182

3.11.3	Organisational control.....	183
3.11.3(a)	Punishment certainty	184
3.11.3(b)	Punishment severity	185
3.11.3(c)	Punishment celerity	186
3.11.3(d)	Contingent reward	187
3.11.4	Organisational Commitment	187
3.11.4(a)	Affective Commitment	189
3.11.4(b)	Normative commitment	190
3.11.4(c)	Continuance Commitment	191
3.12	Transactional leadership style.....	192
3.12.1(a)	Transactional leadership	193
3.13	Demographic Variables.....	194
3.14	Pretesting of the Instrument.....	195
3.15	Data preparation.....	196
3.15.1	Response Bias	197
3.15.2	Common Method Variance	198
3.16	Measurement Model Analysis.....	198
3.17	Reliability.....	199
3.18	Pilot study	200
3.19	Ethical Consideration	204
3.20	Summary of chapter three	204
CHAPTER 4	Result and Analysis	206
4.1	Introduction	206
4.2	Response rate	207
4.3	Data screening.....	207

4.3.1	Evaluation of the Outliers	207
4.3.2	Normality test.....	208
4.4	Assessment of Multicollinearity	209
4.5	Non-response bias	212
4.6	Demographic Profile of the Respondents	214
4.7	Descriptive statistics of the latent variables	218
4.8	PLS-SEM path model result evaluation.....	223
4.8.1	Evaluation of measurement model.....	223
4.8.1(a)	Indicator (item) Reliability	224
4.8.1(b)	Internal consistency reliability.....	225
4.8.1(c)	Convergent validity	225
4.8.1(d)	Discriminant validity	228
4.8.2	Structural model assessment	232
4.8.2(a)	Assessment of the Variant Explained (R^2) in the Endogenous Latent Variable.....	233
4.8.2(b)	Assessment of Effect Size(f^2)	235
4.8.2(c)	Predictive Relevance	237
4.8.2(d)	Assessing the Significance of Path Coefficients	238
4.8.2(e)	Moderating effect test.....	242
4.8.2(f)	Moderating Effect Size Test	249
4.8.2(g)	Summary of Hypotheses Testing.....	251
4.8.3	Summary of Chapter four.....	253
CHAPTER 5	Discussion.....	256
5.1	Introduction.....	256
5.2	The effect of Onboarding training on Deviant workplace behaviour	258

5.2.1	H1: Compliance level of employee onboarding training program will be negatively related to deviant workplace behaviour	259
5.2.2	H2: Clarification level of employee onboarding training program will be negatively related to deviant workplace behaviour	260
5.2.3	H3: Culture level of employee onboarding training program will be negatively related to deviant workplace behaviour	261
5.2.4	H4: Connection level of the employee onboarding training program will be negatively related to deviant workplace behaviour	262
5.3	The effect of Organisational control on Deviant workplace behaviour	264
5.3.1	H5: There will be a negative relationship between punishment certainty and deviant workplace behaviour	265
5.3.2	H6: There will be a negative relationship between punishment severity and deviant workplace behaviour	266
5.3.3	H7: There will be a negative relationship between punishment celerity and deviant workplace behaviour	266
5.3.4	H8: There will be a negative relationship between contingent reward and deviant workplace behaviour	267
5.4	The effect of Organisational Commitment Dimensions on Deviant workplace behaviour	269
5.4.1	H9: There will be a negative relationship between affective commitment and deviant workplace behaviour	270
5.4.2	H10; There will be a negative relationship between normative commitment and deviant workplace behaviour	271
5.4.3	H11: There will be a negative relationship between continuance commitment and deviant workplace behaviour	273
5.5	The effect of transactional leadership on deviant workplace behaviour	275
5.5.1	H12: There will be negative relationship between transactional leadership and deviant workplace behaviour	275
5.6	The moderating role transactional leadership style on the negative relationship between onboarding training, organisational control, organisational commitment, and deviant workplace behaviour	277

5.6.1	Moderating Effect of transactional leadership on the Relationship between onboarding experience and deviant workplace behaviour	277
5.6.1(a)	H13: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between compliance level of onboarding training program and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership	277
5.6.1(b)	H14: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between the clarification level of the onboarding training program and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.	278
5.6.1(c)	H15: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between the culture level of the onboarding training program and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.	279
5.6.1(d)	H16: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between the connection level of the onboarding training program and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	280
5.6.2	Moderating Effect of transactional leadership on the negative relationship between organisational control and deviant workplace behaviour	282
5.6.2(a)	H17: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between punishment certainty and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	282
5.6.2(b)	H18: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between punishment severity and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	283

5.6.2(c)	H19: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between punishment celerity and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	284
5.6.2(d)	H20: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between contingent reward and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	285
5.6.3	Moderating effect of transactional leadership on the negative relationship between organisational commitment and deviant workplace behaviour	287
5.6.3(a)	H21: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between affective commitment and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	287
5.6.3(b)	H22: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between normative commitment and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership.....	288
5.6.3(c)	H23: Transactional leadership will moderate the negative relationship between continuance commitment and deviant workplace behaviour. Specifically, this relationship will be stronger (i.e., more negative) in an organisation under transactional leadership	289
5.7	Research Implications	290
5.7.1	Implication to the Theory	291
5.7.2	Implication to Practice	296
5.7.3	Methodological implication	299
5.8	Limitations and Future Research Directions.....	300
5.9	Conclusions	303

REFERENCES.....	306
------------------------	------------

APPENDICES

LIST OF PUBLICATION

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	Preliminary study	7
Table 2.1	Summary of Research ypotheses	148
Table 3.1	Research Onion Methodology summery.....	164
Table 3.2	Total Number of Federal Polytechnics Located in North-West Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria, and their academic staff population.....	167
Table 3.3	Proportionate Quota Sampling of Respondents	173
Table 3.4	Items representing deviant workplace behaviour (No. of items=11).....	176
Table 3.5	Items representing compliance (No of items: 2).....	179
Table 3.6	Items representing clarification (No of items: 2).....	180
Table 3.7	Items representing culture (No of items: 2)	181
Table 3.8	Items representing connection (No of items: 4).....	182
Table 3.9	Items constituting punishment certainty (No. of items = 3)	184
Table 3.10	Items representing punishment severity (No. of items=3).....	185
Table 3.11	Items representing punishment celerity (No. of items=3).....	186
Table 3.12	Items representing Contingent Punishment (No. of items=3).....	187
Table 3.13	Items representing Affective commitment (No. of items=6).....	189
Table 3.14	Items representing Normative commitment (No. of items=6).....	190
Table 3.15	Items representing Continuance Commitment (No. of items=6).....	191
Table 3.16	Items representing Transactional leadership (No. of items=11).....	193

Table 3.17	Indicator Reliability, Internal Reliability and Convergent Validity (Pilot Study)	202
Table 3.18	Discriminant validity: Fornnel – Larker (Pilot Study)	203
Table 4.1	Assessment of outliers.....	208
Table 4.2	Correlation Matrix of all Exogenous Latent Constructs	211
Table 4.3	Variance Inflated Factor.....	212
Table 4.4	Non-Response Bias	213
Table 4.5	Demographic Profile of the Respondents	215
Table 4.6.	Descriptive Analysis of the Latent Constructs.....	218
Table 4.7	Descriptive Analysis of the latent Constructs items	220
Table 4.8	Indicator Reliability, Internal Reliability and Convergent Validity.....	226
Table 4.9	Discriminant validity: Fornell–Larcker criterion.....	230
Table 4.10	Discriminant validity (Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT)Ratio of Correlation	231
Table 4.11	Variance Explained in the Endogenous Latent Variable	234
Table 4.12	Assessment of Effect Size.....	235
Table 4.13	Assessment of Predictive Relevance of the Model	237
Table 4.14	Structural Model Assessment (Direct effect).....	238
Table 4.15	Structural Model Assessment (Moderating effect)	243
Table 4.16	Moderating Effect Size	249
Table 4.17	Summary of Hypotheses Testing	251

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Typology of Workplace Deviant Behaviour	49
Figure 2.2	IWG Onboarding Framework	65
Figure 2.3	The 4 C's Onboarding Framework	65
Figure 2.4	Research Framework	106
Figure 3.1	Methodology and Data collection process	164
Figure 3.2	The Output of a Priori Power Analysis	170
Figure 4.1	Measurement model	224
Figure 4.3	Full structural model	233
Figure 4.4	Interaction Effect of connection level of onboarding training- Workplace deviant behavior relationship.....	245
Figure 4.5	Interaction Effect of Contingent Reward-Workplace deviant behavior relationship	247
Figure 4.6	Interaction Effect of Affective Commitment-Workplace deviant behavior relationship	248

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFC	Affective Commitment
AMOS	Analysis of Moment Structures
ASUP	Academic Staff Union of Polytechnics
AVE	Average Variance Extracted
CMV	Common Method Variance
COC	Continuance Commitment
CON	Connection
COM	Compliance
CLR	Clarification
CUL	Culture
COR	Contingent Reward
F2	Effect Size
OST	Organizational Support Theory
NOC	Normative Commitment
PCEL	Punishment Celerity
PCER	Punishment Certainty
PSEV	Punishment Severity
Ph.D.	Doctor of Philosophy
PLS	Partial Least Squares
Q2	Construct Cross-validated Redundancy
R2	R-squared values
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
SET	Social Exchange Theory
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SWT	Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala
USA	United States of America
USM	Universiti Sains Malaysia
VIF	Variance Inflated Factor
WDB	Deviant Workplace Behaviour

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Survey questionnaire
Appendix B	Request for data on research population
Appendix C	Research Population
Appendix D	Removed construct items

**PENGARUH PROGRAM LATIHAN PENGENALAN TUGAS, KAWALAN
FORMAL ORGANISASI, KOMITMEN ORGANISASI DAN KEPIMPINAN
TRANSAKSI SEBAGAI MODERATOR TERHADAP TINGKAH LAKU
DEVIAN DI TEMPAT KERJA DALAM KALANGAN AHLI AKADEMIK DI
POLITEKNIK PERSEKUTUAN NIGERIA**

ABSTRAK

Pada masa kini, tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja telah menjadi kebimbangan utama dari segi kewangan dan sosio-ekonomi bagi organisasi swasta dan kerajaan di seluruh dunia. Banyak karya kesusasteraan Nigeria, akhbar harian nasional dan antarabangsa, dan media telah melaporkan kes devian organisasi beserta akibatnya yang mengejutkan. Perkara yang paling membimbangkan ialah kelaziman kes ini berlaku dalam kalangan ahli akademik di institusi pengajian tinggi Nigeria. Karya sastera telah mengaitkan beberapa faktor dengan masalah tersebut. Walau bagaimanapun, sarjana kurang memberi perhatian kepada pengalaman kerja awal pekerja, komitmen terhadap kerja dan kawalan formal. Dengan sokongan teori pertukaran sosial dan teori pencegahan umum, kajian ini mengkaji peranan gaya kepimpinan dalam menyederhanakan kesan latihan suai tugas, kawalan organisasi, dan komitmen organisasi terhadap tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja. Teknik persampelan kuota telah digunakan untuk menentukan populasi kajian. Selepas menggunakan kriteria penentuan saiz sampel, 356 ahli akademik dari Politeknik Persekutuan yang terletak di Zon Geopolitik Barat Laut Nigeria telah mengambil bahagian dalam kajian ini. Disebabkan oleh sekatan pergerakan akibat pandemik Covid-19, dan cabaran keselamatan di kawasan kajian, soal selidik elektronik

telah digunakan untuk mengumpul data keratan rentas. Pemodelan persamaan struktur segi empat sama terkecil (PLS-SEM) digunakan untuk menganalisis data yang diperoleh daripada 228 peserta (64% kadar tindak balas). Walau bagaimanapun, ujian kesahan dan kebolehpercayaan telah dilakukan terhadap instrumen kajian sebelum pengumpulan data. Penemuan menunjukkan bahawa pematuhan, budaya dan peringkat sambungan latihan suai kenal pekerja mempunyai kaitan negatif dengan tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja. Tanpa disangka-sangka, hanya hukuman yang teruk sebagai kawalan formal yang ditunjukkan mempunyai kaitan songsang dengan tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja. Seperti yang diramalkan, semua dimensi komitmen organisasi dilaporkan sebagai peramal penting bagi tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja, tetapi yang mengejutkan, komitmen berterusan menunjukkan hubungan yang positif dengan tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja. Mengenai kesan penyederhanaan, keputusan menunjukkan bahawa hubungan antara peringkat sambungan latihan suai kenal, dan komitmen afektif adalah lebih negatif di politeknik yang dikawal oleh tingkah laku kepimpinan transaksi. Manakala kawalan organisasi pula, kesan interaksi silang telah dikenalpasti berlaku antara hubungan ganjaran luar jangka dan tingkah laku devian di tempat kerja. Implikasi teori dan praktikal hasil dapatan kajian telah dibincangkan.

**THE INFLUENCE OF ONBOARDING TRAINING PROGRAM,
ORGANISATIONAL FORMAL CONTROL, ORGANISATIONAL
COMMITMENT AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP AS A MODERATOR
ON DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR AMONG FEDERAL
POLYTECHNICS ACADEMICIANS IN NIGERIA**

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, deviant workplace behaviour has become a primary financial and socio-economic concern for private and governmental organisations worldwide. Numerous works of Nigerian literature, national and international dailies, and media have reported staggering cases of organisational deviance with its attendant consequences. The most worrying of these cases is its prevalence among academics in the Nigerian high institution of learning. Works of literature have linked several factors with the problem. However, scholars have paid less attention to the employee's early work experience, commitment to work and formal control. With the support of the Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Deterrence Theory (DT), this study examined the role of leadership style in moderating the effects of onboarding training, organisational control, and organisational commitment on deviant workplace behaviour. A quota sampling technique was applied to determine the research population. After using a G* power sample size determination criterion, 356 academics from Federal Polytechnics located in the Northwest Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria participated in the study. Due to movements restriction as a result of the Covid - 19 pandemic, and security challenges in the study areas, an electronic

questionnaire was used to collect cross-sectional data. Partial least square-structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) was used to analyse data elicited from 228 participants (64% response rate). The validity and reliability tests were performed on the study instruments before the data collection. The findings showed that compliance, culture, and connection stages of employee onboarding training are negatively related to deviant workplace behaviour. Unexpectedly, only punishment severity as formal control was shown to be inversely related to deviant workplace behaviour. As predicted, all dimensions of organisational commitment were reported as significant predictors of deviant workplace behaviour, but surprisingly continuance commitment indicated a positive relationship with deviant workplace behaviour. On the moderating effects, the result indicates that the relationships between the connection level of onboarding training, and affective commitment were more negative in polytechnic controlled by transactional leadership behaviour. While on organisational control, a cross-over interaction effect was identified on the relationship between contingent reward and deviant workplace behaviour. Theoretical and practical implications of the research findings were discussed.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter begins with background information on the problem. The result of the preliminary study was provided afterward. It proceeds to a detailed problem statement and subsequently provides Research questions and Research objectives. Scope of the study, Significance of the study, which contains the study's theoretical and practical contributions, were later discussed. Finally, the motivation of the study and definitions of key terms were provided.

1.2 Background of the study

Deviant workplace behaviour, in some works of literature, was studied as counterproductive behaviour (Ugwu et al., 2017), unethical behaviour (Veetkazhi et al., 2020), deviance or employee deviance (Kura et al., 2015; Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara, 2011), dysfunctional behaviour (Kumasey & Hossain, 2020), organisational misbehaviour (Weitz & Vardi, 2012), or employee misbehaviour (Egidi & Adewoyin, 2020). The concept has been defined as employees' intended actions that breach vital corporate standards, procedures, or rules and thereby compromise the well-being of the organisation and/or its members or both (Omar et al., 2011; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The term implies those actions committed by the employees that are contrary to the organisation's general purpose. These include absenteeism, coming to office late and leaving before closing time, stealing of organisational resources, use of organisational resources for personal use, partaking in private business during working hours, harassing a co-worker

or any organisational stakeholder and taking advantage of the customers of the organisations (Lugosi, 2019; Uchenna et al., 2015).

Though scholars have come up with different classifications of employee deviance (Bhatti et al., 2015; Veetkazhi et al., 2020), organisational deviance and interpersonal deviance are the two basic categories of deviant workplace behaviour, according to Robinson and Bennett (1995). Acts directed against the organisation, such as sabotaging equipment, stealing, and wasting resources, are examples of organisational deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Interpersonal deviance, on the other hand, includes activities like verbal harassment, hostility, assault, and spreading rumours that cause harm to co-workers (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Deviant workplace behaviour is not a new concept, it has been studied over time, but the factors contributing to the problem are still evolving from time to time under different situations (Lugosi, 2019). Most of the factors identified as antecedents of workplace deviance have been grouped into some distinct categories, which includes: organisational determinants (Baysal et al., 2020; Di Stefano et al., 2019; Li & Zeng, 2019), individual-related factors (Braje et al., 2020), Personality and interpersonal determinants (Amin, Shamsuddin, & Razimi 2018; Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2019), Job-Related antecedents (Haider et al., 2018; Khan & Aleem, 2014) and many more, see Lugosi (2019).

Deviant workplace behaviour is a burning issue affecting the whole world (Aku, 2017; Anyim, 2018; Hovav & D'Arcy, 2012; Kumasey & Hossain, 2020; Lugosi, 2019). Studies show that both public and private organisations worldwide are suffering from cases of organisational deviance with all its attendant consequences (Aku, 2017; Malisetty

& Vasanthi, 2016; Veetkazhi et al., 2020). Similarly, its negative impact is global. Baharom et al., (2017) summarize many studies on global financial cost and economic damages caused by workplace deviant and counterproductive behaviour, which gives a clear picture of the consequences of the menace. For instance, a recent study revealed that fraud could cost businesses worldwide 3.7 trillion dollars (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, 2016). Additionally, it has been calculated that aggressive workers associated depressed and anxiety-related disorders cost the US economy 1.15 trillion dollars annually (Michalak & Ashkanasy, 2020).

Furthermore, in developing countries, workplace deviance is increasing day by day (Stephen et al., 2018). Studies conducted in Croatia, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Malawi and Nigeria (Braje et al., 2020; Ekwoaba et al., 2017; Iqbal et al., 2012; Khan, 2017; Munyenymbe et al., 2020; Omar et al., 2011; Zein-El-Din & Baddar, 2019), show how teachers shun their places of work in India and Pakistan, the prevalence of cyberloafing in Malaysia, absenteeism and cyberloafing among health care workers in Malawi and Egypt, sexual harassment among academic staff in the Nigerian universities and colleges.

As a global issue, deviant workplace behaviours, are taking an alarming dimension in Nigeria. The misbehaviour among academics at the higher school level is of particular concern. Recent empirical investigations and media reports have shown that organisational deviance is a serious threat to service delivery in both public and private high schools (Egidi et al., 2017; Ezeh & Osineme, 2017; Israel et al., 2020; Onoyase, 2019). Sexual harassment of female students by their lecturers, in particular, which is

notoriously known as “sex for grade” has been extensively reported (Adebowale, 2021; Adekanye, 2019; Fadipe & Bakenne, 2020; Kabir, 2020; Olufemi, 2020).

The prevalence of employee deviant behaviours among academics in Nigeria has been primarily related to many factors such as poor working conditions and working tools (Egidi et al., 2017; Egidi & Adewoyin, 2020). job pressure (Adeoti et al., 2021) and job characteristics (Grace & Akeke, 2020), job discrimination (Azeez, 2018), weak formal control (Kura et al., 2017), ethical climate (Obalade & Arogundade, 2019), personality and personal factors (Fagbenro & Olasupo, 2020; Olasupo & Fagbenro, 2021). A literature search indicates that some situational and organisational factors that can have potential effects on employee deviance among academics in Nigeria have been empirically overlooked. Consequently, this study examined the effects of the onboarding training program on the deviant workplace behaviour among academic staff of the Nigerian polytechnics. The onboarding training program is designed for new employees to assist them to be familiarized with the organisational requirements like rules and regulations, their terms of employment, condition of service, policies, norms, ethics, values, and also to introduce them to their co-workers and the larger organisational environment (Clouse, 2020; Raub et al., 2021). Furthermore, this study investigates the impact of organisational control mechanisms on the deterrence process, specifically the three primary variables of perceived certainty, severity, and celerity of punishment. Different organisational controls have been proposed to address the problem of deviant workplace behaviour. Scholars frequently promote a negative enforcement strategy i.e., punishment based on the DT (Gibbs, 1968). The DT proposes that unwanted behaviours can be deterred as the likelihood of being punished for wrongdoing- punishment certainty, the degree and

severity of the punishment for wrongful behaviour- punishment severity and the speed with which the punishment is applied-punishment celerity increase (Buckenmaier et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2012; Hollinger & Clark, 1983).

Some scholars, however, advocate the positive enforcement strategy-reward based on organisational literature ideas. Some argue that reward combined with a sanction is one of the important factors that can influence individual employees' rational cost-benefit assessment of engaging in unproductive behaviour (Bulgurcu et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2012; Ifinedo & Idemudia, 2017), Hence, the current study examines the effects of both negative and positive stimulus in mitigating wrongful behaviours.

Furthermore, the current research investigates the effect of organisational commitment on deviant workplace behaviour. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), Employees' emotional tie to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation is referred to as organisational commitment. Organisational commitment is usually studied as a three-dimensional term that includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Khalip, 2016; Meyer & Allen, 1991). According to Khalip (2016), affectively committed employees works with tremendous dedication and continuance commitment ensures that employees sustain their organisational membership, while normatively committed individuals frequently feel obligated to stay in the organisation. Organisational commitment is believed to be the best predictor of employee turnover, followed by job satisfaction (Saridakis et al., 2020; Ugwu, 2017; Yücel, 2012). Therefore, its impact on deviant workplace behaviour can be anticipated.

Finally, this study proposes transactional leadership as a moderator in the interaction between onboarding training, organisational control, organisational commitment, and deviant workplace behaviour for a clearer explanation and deeper knowledge of the topic under study (Lee & Wei, 2017; Tetteh-Opai & Omoregie, 2015). Transactional leadership is a monitoring and controlling leadership style that emphasizes certain elements, such as a clarification of the goals and tasks that are expected of employees, an emphasis on meeting standards and adhering to rules, a focus on avoiding mistakes and errors, and finally, monitoring employees to detect deviations and anomalies (Bass & Bass, 2008; Kark et al., 2015). This leadership style is well-known for having a significant impact on many parts of the workplace, including job performance and behavioural outcomes (Abasilim et al., 2019; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Yao et al., 2014).

1.3 Preliminary study

To get more clarity on the nature and antecedents of deviant workplace behaviour in the proposed context as expounded in the background of the study above, and to further justify the need for the study, the researcher decided to carry out a preliminary study in which two senior lecturers, two labour union leaders, a Head of the Department and a Registrar from some selected polytechnics participated. The result of the study is shown in **table 1.1**.

Table 1.1 Preliminary study

Question I	What do you understand by deviant workplace behaviour
Registrar	"Deviant workplace behaviour, to my understanding, is behaving contrary to expectation, or not in line with the provision of the law"
Head of Department	"Behaving outside convention, rules and or behaving abnormally."
Labour Union Leader (Academic)	"Deviant workplace behaviour in my own understanding is a negative behaviour mostly found in tertiary institutions, precisely polytechnic."
Labour Union Leader (Non-Academic)	"Deviant workplace behaviour we call it misconduct. It is any behaviour that violates the extant rules of the organisation."
Academic staff I	"It is any behaviour that violates the organisational rules and regulations."
Non-academic staff II	"To me, it is defined as any behaviour that goes contrary to the laid down rules and regulations of the polytechnic or in short Civil Service Rules."

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Question 2	From your experience, which type of deviant behaviour do you observe among your institution's academic and non - academic staff, and which ones are more frequently seen?
Registrar	“Most frequently reported misconducts here are Absenteeism without permission; insubordination; Late coming and leaving office before official closing time without permission. Favouritism and giving undue advantage are also very common behaviours in this polytechnic. Stealing of school property is also reported among some low-income earners”.
Head of Department	“We observed deviant employee behaviours like absenteeism, coming late and leaving office before the closing time without permission and extortion of students. But most frequent behaviour is coming late and leaving office before time. There are very rare cases of exam malpractice, cyberloafing and sexual harassment of female students by some academic staff”.
Labor Union Leader (Academic)	“The most common deviances among the employee in my institution are extorting money from students, especially when giving them admission. There are also cases of sexual assault of female students
Labour Union Leader non- academic)	“Absenteeism, falsification of information, illegally leaking organisational information, extortion and insubordination are the most observed deviant behaviours among both staffs of polytechnic. But falsification of information is more rampant among the non-academic staff. Both academic and non-academic do extort money from students to either give them an undue academic advantage or process their results. There were cases of sexual harassment and theft but very rare”.
Lecturer I	“Unauthorized late coming and leaving office before closing hours; Academic misconduct where academic staff collect money to help their student in their research project, and insubordination are frequently observed behaviours among academic staff. Absenteeism, late coming, and extortion are common behaviours among the non-academic staff. There are reports of admin staff collecting money from the student before they prepare their results. There are also cases of sexual harassment but they are very rare, perhaps due to the fact that students do not report such cases, maybe because of fear of stigmatization. Some academic staff exchange grades for sex, though mostly the student themselves contribute to sexual molestation through their indecent dresses. Cases of academic misconduct are also reported”.
Lecturer II	“Deviant behaviours among both academic and non-academic staff are quite many. But the most frequently seen are negligent of duty, absenteeism, late coming and leaving office before official closing time, exam malpractice or supporting the student in exam malpractice, extorting money from students for a handout or illegal sale of books against the polytechnic rules banning such practice, the use of office equipment for personal use and cyberloafing. There are also incidences of physical assault of staff against their colleagues, gossiping, and backbiting are rampant. I also witnessed very rare cases of sexual harassment of students and stealing of school properties.”

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Question 3	In your own opinion, what effects does the deviant workplace behaviour have on your polytechnic and the educational system in general?
Registrar	“It has a serious negative effect.”
Head of Department	“The notable effect of deviant behaviour to the school is that there will be low productivity among the staff due to late coming and absenteeism, and to some extent, school will be producing half-baked graduates who do not have anything to contribute to the society. Secondly, students will also be psychologically traumatized, which can affect their academic performance and even their future life
Labor Union Leader (Academic)	“The effects are negative. I think one of the negative consequences of deviant behaviours is Low productivity of staff, and poor performance of students. It can also lead to many school dropouts due to perpetual fear of molestation and extortion, and these students may become a nuisance to the society”.
Labor Union leader (non- academic)	“The effect of employee deviant behaviours, first is the production of poor graduate with fake and unreliable qualification, which means the society will not have a trustworthy, efficient, reliable soldiers, doctors, nurses, judges, engineers, etc., and that is exactly what we are facing as a society today. Secondly, it causes low productivity and poor job performance among the staff, which consequently costs the school financially. Thirdly it can lead to student dropouts, and that is what we are experiencing now adays, many students no longer come to the polytechnic to study”.
Lecturer I	“Deviant workplace behaviour has very devastating effect not only to the school but to the society in general. One, it affects the productivity and performance of both staff and the students which consequently lead to the failure of the school. Two, it destroys the educational system, which is the bedrock of societal development, by producing poor teachers, administrators, leaders, and policy makers. Three, it undermines the authority and power of the school management, which may lead to lawlessness. Four, graduate produced by deviant employees will imbibe the same behaviours, and anywhere he/she finds himself in future, he will influence other people who will lead to the pollution of the society.”
Lecturer II	“Employee deviant behaviours in the first place destroy the very foundation of the polytechnic, which is ‘character and learning. The graduate of the school with deviant employees may not have good character and will not learn much to contribute to society. Secondly, the whole nation relies on polytechnics for most of its technicians and engineers. If this attitude is not addressed, it will be disastrous to the nation's quest for technological development”.

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Question 4	In your own opinion, what do you think are the factors responsible for the observed deviant workplace behaviour among both academic and non-academic staff?
Registrar	“Family background and socio-economic factors”
Head of Department	“Family factor or the parental upbringing is one of the responsible factors that contribute to deviant behaviour at the workplace. Secondly, faulty recruitment and selection processes can be attributed to it. Thirdly, many deviant behaviours are related to peer influence. And lastly, I think induction and orientation of newly recruited staff are very important”.
Labor Union Leader (Academic)	“Lack of strict enforcement of rules and regulations governing the conduct of the staff is in my own opinion solely responsible for many workplaces deviant behaviours”
Labor Union Leader (Non-academic)	“I think three reasons are responsible for deviant behaviour in my polytechnic. One, there was hardly any orientation or induction training given to the newly recruited staff in the past. Secondly, staff were not properly screened and selected before they were employed. Their attitude should have been evaluated. Thirdly, greediness is responsible for extortion behaviour because many people want to make money quickly”.
Lecturer I	“Staff in this school engage in deviant workplace behaviour because they did not receive any orientation. There was not any induction training of the newly recruited employees in this school. Secondly, appropriate punishments are not applied to erring staff. There are rules and corresponding punishment, but they are not applied. Another contributing factor to deviant workplace behaviour is redundancy, especially among non-academic staff. Too many staff were employed most of them do not have work to keep them busy.”
Lecturer II	“One of the common factors responsible for that behaviour is lack of orientation. Most of the staff employed did not receive any form of induction training. Many of them do not even know their responsibilities, and what is expected of them; they do not know their schedules. Secondly, erring staff are not punished accordingly. Thirdly, the leaders themselves sometimes engage in the same deviant behaviour”

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Question 5	Specifically, to what extent do you think job satisfaction can influence employee's deviance in the polytechnic sector
Registrar	"Job satisfaction has a relationship with employee deviance, but in our institution, it is not an issue, but contentment is absent."
Head of Department	"I think job satisfaction is an important factor that influence workplace deviance, Adequate remuneration, and good working condition are important determinants of deviant behaviour in any organisation. In our context, there is no problem with that. The salary is okay".
Labor Union Leader (academic)	"Job satisfaction can influence deviance, but in the polytechnic sector, the salary is highly attractive. Therefore, it is not an issue here."
Labor Union Leader (non-academic)	"Job or pay satisfaction is not an issue in the polytechnic sector. Our salary is relatively good compared to another sector. Our problem is greediness."
Lecturer I	"In the polytechnic sector, salary and other motivational measures are relatively satisfactory. To me, job satisfaction is not a problem at all."
Lecturer II	"To be honest, there is no issue about the job satisfaction or salary. polytechnic staff are highly paid compared to others, and the condition of service is favourable, but there is too much greed and lack of contentment."

Table 1.1(Continued)

Question 7	What relationship does Organisational control have with the incidences of workplace deviance in polytechnics?
Registrar	“Organisational control is also a very important factor that determines workplace deviance. If an erring staff is punished accordingly, it will serve as a deterrent to others. Lack of proper punishment encourage people to behave negatively.”
Head of Department	“I think leadership by example is more important than any formal control mechanism. There is no problem with our organisational control, but the problem lies with the leadership willingness to enforce those control mechanisms.”
Labor Union Leader (Academic)	“Organisational control is a very important document that regulates the conduct of the employee, strictly enforcing those rule and regulations will go a long way in reducing deviant behaviour”
Labor Union Leader (Non- Academic)	“I believe there is matching sanctions against any wrongdoing in the civil service rules and staff manual of the polytechnic; if they are appropriately used, deviant workplace behaviour would be contained.”
Lecturer I	“I strongly believe that inefficient use of control mechanism is responsible for the prevalence of deviant workplace behaviour in our polytechnic. And in most cases, the problem is with the leadership's unwillingness to apply them appropriately”.
Lecturer II	“Deviant workplace behaviour can to some extent be attributed to lack of application of the relevant sanction against misbehaviour. There are good rules and regulations that are meant to guide the conduct of the polytechnic staff, which if applied and enforced appropriately, all these deviant behaviours will be controlled or minimized.

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Question 8	In your own opinion, does a leadership style relate to deviant workplace behaviour?
Registrar	“I think leadership by example is one of the most effective ways of mitigating deviant behaviour in any organisation. A responsible leader does not overlook bad behaviour”
Head of Department	” To be an exemplary leader and constant supervision is critical in addressing deviant behaviour. I believe that leadership style is undoubtedly an important factor that influences deviant workplace behaviour”
Labor Union Leader (Academic)	“Yes, because controlling any negative behaviour is the sole responsibility of school authority led by the Rector, and he can do that in many ways, but the best way is to enforce compliance with established rules.”
Labor Union Leader (Non-Academic)	“In my own opinion, deviant behaviours thrive when rules are not respected by leaders and are not strictly enforced by them. Therefore, there is a strong relationship between leadership style and employee deviance”
Lecturer I	I think the way staff behaves toward their job depends largely on the leadership style. A responsible leader will not tolerate wrongdoing and always lead by example. So, subjects always tend to copy from their leaders. A leader influences deviant behaviour in the way he handles issues of indiscriminate application law”.
Lecturer II	“Sincerely, civil service rules are made to regulate behaviours, and are made for both the leaders and the led. Therefore, serious and responsible style of leadership is a very critical element that determine how employees behave”.

Source: Researcher

1.4 Findings and implications of the preliminary study

This preliminary study, which was carried out within the polytechnic system, has provided additional useful insight into the nature and gravity of the problem under investigation. Moreover, the preliminary study has further revealed more factors responsible for the problem. All the respondents in the context under study have provided a consistent and unambiguous input. The findings from the preliminary study have revealed the following information:

That withdrawal behaviour, extortion, and exam/academic misconduct are the most rampant deviant behaviour among both academic and non-academic staff of some polytechnic in some selected polytechnic of Northern Nigeria. The findings have also shown that there are rare cases of sexual harassment of female students among some academic staff of polytechnic as reported by some media outlets. Stealing of school properties, unauthorized use of official gadgets for personal use have also been identified. Moreover, there are rare, reported cases of negligence of duty, falsification of information, revealing organisation information, interpersonal aggression, cyberloafing, among others. The findings also revealed that deviant workplace behaviours have a severe negative consequence on the school and the nation. Some of the notable consequences of employee deviance on the school include low productivity of employees; poor performance of students; students' dropouts as reported in Olufemi (2020); loss of credibility of the school and its products. Likewise, the consequences of the phenomena on the nation, according to the findings of this study, are more alarming. Firstly, the responses show that deviant employee behaviour in the polytechnics can produce half-baked graduates

to the labour market. It can spoil the character of the student and demoralize them. It discourages hard work and encourages laziness and corruption.

Four of the respondents in the study stressed that lack of orientation or induction training of employee in their respective schools is mainly responsible for their negative behaviour. The second important factor identified is that organisational control system is not functioning effectively. Lack of enforcement of the control mechanism is attributed to many employee deviances. Parental upbringing, peer influence, and greediness are also shown to contribute to the prevalence of deviant workplace behaviour.

Specifically, five out of four respondents believe that there is a significant relationship between deviant workplace behaviour in the polytechnics and the labour unions. The findings suggest that. One, in an amicable labour relation, the union can facilitate improved and good working conditions for its members, which can ensure job satisfaction among members and consequently reduce some deviant behaviours. Two, many people misbehave in the workplace because they believe that the labour union they belong to, will be ready to protect them against any disciplinary action. All the respondents have consistently and unanimously believed that job or pay satisfaction is an essential determinant of employee's behaviour, but remuneration which is one of the aspects of job satisfaction, is not a problem in the polytechnics system due to relatively high pay enjoyed by polytechnic staff. Similarly, all the participants in the study pointed out that irresponsible leadership and impunity, Lack of strict enforcement of organisational control mechanisms very significantly contribute to deviant workplace behaviour among both academic and non-academic staff. The implication of the above preliminary study is that deviant workplace behaviour is so prevalent in the polytechnic sector

in Nigeria. The result of this study strongly supports the findings of Ijitona et al. (2018), Onoyase (2019), and many media reports such as Bamas (2019), Dike (2017) and Olanike (2020). Moreover, the findings of this study imply that deviant workplace behaviour has a devastating effect not only on the affected schools but on the nation's developmental drive and the society in which poor, unqualified and unreliable workforce is working. The findings have further provided an insight into the importance of induction or orientation training of newly recruited employees. Induction is an essential element of staff training which seek to familiarize the newly recruited employee with his organisation, its safety rules, conditions of his employment, rules, and regulations, schedules of duty, his colleagues, and the section or department he is posted to (Antonacopoulou & Güttel, 2010). As important as this factor is, in determining and shaping employees' behaviours (Imran & Tanveer, 2015; Nkeobuna & Ugoani, 2018), preliminary study results show that academic staff are not given any orientation.

Furthermore, the result shows that many employees engage in misbehaviour in the polytechnics because they can simply go away with it, implying that punitive measures are not taken against the culprits, although organisational control measures such as punishment and contingent reward are crucial factors that discourage unproductive behaviours (Ifinedo & Idemudia, 2017).

Moreover, this study has demonstrated the influence of labour unions on their members wrongful behaviour. In the same vein, it has also been revealed that leadership style can influence employees' deviant behaviour. Action or inaction of a leader significantly determine the behavioural outcome of his subjects (Zheng et al., 2020). Finally, the responses of the participants implied that even though remuneration is not an

issue in the polytechnics, because employees of the sector are relatively satisfied with their salary. However, little is known about the impact of other factors that contribute to job satisfaction and, as a result, generate emotional attachment, sense of obligation, and identification with the organisation, which can lower the risk of employees engaging in misbehaviour (Demir, 2011; Lian et al., 2012; Saridakis et al., 2020).

1.5 Statement of the problem

Deviant workplace behaviour is a prevalent global issue that is gradually becoming a vital concern of both practitioners and organisational researchers in Nigeria (Kura et al., 2017). Although no reliable statistics exist on the percentage of workers who engage in workplace deviance in Nigeria or its magnitude and cost on the employers and the economy, it is clear from the empirical studies and frequent newspaper reports of public sector employees and government officials engaging in corruption and fraud, that the public sector in Nigeria is not immune to workplace deviance (Balogun et al., 2016; Benjamin & Samson, 2011; Egenuka, 2021; Loyal & Barnes, 2020; Moyinoluwa, 2020; Ofodu, 2021; Olufemi & Richard, 2015; Omodero, 2019; Shehu et al., 2020). Deviant workplace behaviours such as habitual lateness to work, absenteeism, employee theft, bribery, corruption, misuse of government property, and sabotage, according to recent research reports, pervade most public sector organisations and pose a serious threat to the delivery of quality service in most Nigerian communities (Adekanmbi & Ukpere, 2020; Adeoti et al., 2021; Balogun et al., 2016; Balogun & Komolafe, 2016; Ekwoaba et al., 2017; Shehu et al., 2020).

Education is one of the sectors widely reported on with issues of counterproductive behaviours in recent times (Erinosho et al., 2021; Moyinoluwa, 2020; Nneka & Nwagbata,

2020; Oyeoku et al., 2022). Empirical investigations revealed cases of extortion of money from students, exam misconduct, result manipulation, fraud, plagiarism, certificate forgery, absenteeism, and job absconding as some of the examples of the phenomenon (Adeoti et al., 2021; Amin, Shamsuddin, & Razimi 2018; Onyebueke, 2020; Saganuwan & Charles, 2018). Furthermore, most recently, cases of female students being sexually harassed by lecturers in both universities and polytechnics have been documented and publicly published in academic inquiries and news reports (Agency, 2021; Erinoshio et al., 2021; Fadipe & Bakenne, 2020; Ijitona et al., 2018; Olasupo & Fagbenro, 2021; Onoyase, 2019; Oyeoku et al., 2022). For instance, Olufemi (2020), and Nneka and Nwagbata (2020) published a detailed empirical report of how sexual molestation affects female students at universities, prompting many of them to withdraw out. In a similar vein, BBC's "eye on Africa" undercover documentary exposed how instructors in several universities in Nigeria and Ghana sexually harass female students and occasionally trade academic grades for sex (Bell & Soyinka, 2019). The episode showed how many female students were driven out of their colleges and left feeling demoralized.

Similarly, the problem is also a difficult challenge in the polytechnic sector (Ijitona et al., 2018; Onoyase, 2019; Saganuwan & Charles, 2018). In light of this, Nigerian national dailies have reported on disciplinary actions taken against both academic and non-academic personnel in several high institutions (Adekanye, 2019; Bamas, 2019; Dike, 2017; Egbas, 2019; Kabir, 2020; Nwosu, 2019; Yusuf, 2020) and the Federal Government move to address the issue (Webmaster, 2015). For example, at Ahmadu Bello University in Zaria, 15 teaching and non-teaching personnel were fired for sexual harassment and other infractions (Bamas, 2019). Similarly, 15 employees of Nigeria's National University,

Nsuka, were suspended for various workplace misbehaviours (Nwosu, 2019). In the same vein, according to Dike (2017), Delta State University administration dismissed Fourteen teachers and Seventeen support workers in 2017 due to extortion, sex abuse, exam malpractice, absenteeism, gross misconducts, and other illegal activities. In a similar vein, a prominent lecturer at the University of Abuja, Nigeria's capital city, was fired for sexual molestation (Egbas, 2019). Moreover, the Vanguard Newspaper reported that Adamawa State Polytechnic has fired four of its employees for cheating on exams (Yusuf, 2020). Furthermore, several research undertakings have been carried out to understand the nature of the problem and suggest means of curtailing it. However, latest studies show that the problem seems to be raging uncontrollably (Adeoti et al., 2021; Erinoshio et al., 2021; Oyeoku et al., 2022) leaving much to be desired academically and managerially.

Researchers in Nigeria have connected deviant workplace behaviours to four groups of factors: situational/organizational (Amin, Shamsudin, & Shahril, 2018; Kura et al., 2017); personal/psychological (Amin, Shamsudin, & Shahril, 2018; Egidi & Adewoyin, 2020; Grace & Akeke, 2020). Interpersonal (Bhatti et al., 2015; Gabriel, 2016; Noermijati et al., 2021; Okeke et al., 2022) and Job-related factors (Adeoti et al., 2021). For instance, literature has argued that "The Big Five," or different personality types, are reflected in deviant workplace conduct (Amin, Shamsuddin, & Razimi 2018; Braje et al., 2020), demonstrating coherently that those who are emotionally secure, tolerant, reliable, and responsible are more likely to exhibit low levels of deviant workplace behaviour (Braje et al., 2020). Another important indicator is the conflict between work and family obligations (Malisetty & Vasanthi, 2016; Sayyida & Untarini, 2020). Similarly, spirituality and religion can have an impact on how employees behave in the workplace (Akanni et al.,

2019; Haldorai et al., 2020). However, it's clear from literature domain in Nigeria that most of studies have focused on interpersonal and individual-related antecedents of employee deviance. While empirically, organizational and situational factors establish the atmosphere in which such behaviours occur (Lugosi, 2019). Therefore, organizational factors are significant and demand the greatest empirical attention for a greater understanding of deviant workplace behaviours. Additionally, empirical data indicates that organizations are more vulnerable to situational influences since employee behaviour is a reaction to emotionally charged workplace environments (Chand & Chand, 2014; Patanjali & Bhatta, 2022). Recent studies have shown that deviant workplace behaviour is an emotional reaction to the current organizational climates which include motivational mechanisms, and perceived organizational support (Sarwar et al., 2020) and formal control and leadership style (Zheng et al., 2020). Consequently, these aspects require academic investigation if we are to get a comprehensive and detailed comprehension of the issue. Even though works of research typically supports the primary effects of organizational elements on organizational outcomes (Patanjali & Bhatta, 2022). However, they play a very little role in examining their influence on deviant workplace behaviour, leaving a significant knowledge gap that this study aims to close.

An in-depth assessment of the literature reveals that little is known about an employee's first and most important workplace experience, which influences his behaviour and job outcomes. In this regard, employee onboarding, a training program designed to acquaint new hires with the norms and procedures of their firm (Klein et al., 2015), is crucial in our quest to look into the under-researched causes of disruptive behaviour at work. According to past studies, organizations that formally onboard their

new workers by providing them with structured training on their jobs, the organization's values and expectations for behaviour, and other topics have been shown to be more successful and freer of counterproductive employee behaviour than those that do not (Bauer, 2010; Clouse, 2020; Klein et al., 2015; Meyer & Bartels, 2017). But surprisingly, the influence of this important factor on organisational deviance is either unclear or has not been empirically investigated. Few traceable studies on staff induction training have mainly focused on employee performance (Adejare et al., 2014; Asfaw et al., 2015; Olaniyan & Ojo, 2008).

Secondly, several studies have found that performance evaluation, compensation and disciplinary processes, and especially employee supervision, are more effective in regulating employee behaviour than alternative forms of management (Chen et al., 2012; Flamholtz, 1996; Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Kura et al., 2017; Parilla et al., 1988; Zheng et al., 2020). However, very limited empirical works of research have investigated the effects of reward and disciplinary systems on deviant workplace behaviour, and they are largely carried out in the information system industry (Hovav & D'Arcy, 2012; Ifinedo & Idemudia, 2017; Siponen & Vance, 2010; Vance et al., 2013). Such apathy is regrettable because, to a significant extent, control mechanisms are implemented in every organisation and have a direct impact on employees' decisions to take part in or avoid engaging in anomalous behaviour (Carlsmith et al., 2002; Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Trang & Brendel, 2019; Ugrin & Michael, 2013). Furthermore, A review of the literature revealed that most studies on the organisational controls are mainly focused on specific forms of deviant behaviour such as employee theft (Detert et al., 2007; Greenberg, 1990; Hollinger & Clark, 1983) and cyberloafing (Aku, 2017; Khansa et al., 2017), or their focus is mainly

on procedural and outcome controls which does not clearly address the main problem of organisational deviance (Kura et al., 2017; Shamsudin et al., 2012).

Thirdly, several works of research across cultures, and different contexts have reported a strong influence of organisational commitment on the variety of employees' behaviour (Baysal et al., 2020; Iftikhar et al., 2016; Manikandan, 2013; Qazi et al., 2019; Tian et al., 2014). For instance, Demir (2011) investigated the influence of organisational commitment among the employee of the hotel industry in Turkey. The result of the mixed-mode research design indicated a robust negative relationship between all the dimensions of organisational commitment and deviant workplace behaviour. But ironically, there is a severe lack of research on the topic of organisational commitment and its impact on antisocial conduct in the workplace in the academic setting. For instance, in Nigeria, such few studies are largely carried out in the banking industry, and core ministries and most of them are not without conflicting and mixed findings see (Abasilim et al., 2019; Akeem, 2020; Fasola et al., 2013). little is therefore known about how organisational commitment can influence negative behaviours of academicians in the polytechnic sector. It is on these notes, that this study uses Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964) which provides an explicit explanation for the rationale behind attitudinal and behavioural exchange in a workplace relationship and Deterrence Theory(DT)(Gibbs, 1968), to addresses the identified gap in the literature by investigating the impact of an employee onboarding program on organisational deviance among academic staff at Nigerian polytechnics, as well as studying the efficacy of control measures such as rewards and other deterrent mechanisms (punishment certainty, punishment severity and punishment celerity) in mitigating unproductive employee behaviours. Furthermore, this research work also seeks

to add to the existing body of knowledge in the literature by investigating the effect of organisational commitment on employee deviance.

Furthermore, according to the preliminary study above, ineffective leadership is one of the factors responsible for the identified deviant behaviours among polytechnic staff. Similarly, relevant works of literature have indicated that leadership style is a well-established component that has a considerable impact on several employee behavioural outcomes (Abasilim et al., 2019; Amin, Shamsuddin, & Razimi 2018; Labrague et al., 2020; Lee & Wei, 2017; Zheng et al., 2020). Transactional leadership style, in particular, has been shown to have a significant impact on valued organisational outcomes such as low employee deviance, reduced absenteeism, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and organisational performance in empirical investigations (Abasilim et al., 2019; Adekanmbi, 2019; Akeem, 2020; Dariush et al., 2016; Erkutlu & Chafra, 2013; Walumbwa et al., 2008)

Therefore, first, the study investigates the influence of transactional leadership behaviour on deviant workplace behaviour. Similarly, based on certain key characteristics of transactional leadership and other empirical studies, this study suggests transactional leadership as a moderating variable. (Bass & Bass, 2008; Podsakoff et al., 1982; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Besides that, the construct has been chosen because of its potential moderating effect on constructs like onboarding and organisational controls, which could help the researcher gain a better theoretical grasp of transactional leadership style and provide empirical evidence to support it. Hence, it was expected that the influence of employee onboarding training program, organisational controls, organisational commitment on the deviant workplace behaviours in the Nigeria polytechnic system

would be likely stronger in a school with transactional leadership behaviour (Lee & Wei, 2017).

1.6 Research Question

Based on the problem stated above and the preliminary study conducted, this research work intends to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Do levels of onboarding training (compliance, clarification, culture, and connection) influence deviant workplace behaviour?
- 2) Do organisational control dimensions (punishment certainty, punishment severity, punishment celerity, and contingent reward) influence deviant workplace behaviour?
- 3) Do organisational commitment dimensions (affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment) determine deviant workplace behaviour?
- 4) Does transactional leadership style influence deviant workplace behaviour?
- 5) Does transaction leadership style moderate the relationship between onboarding training levels (compliance, clarification, culture, connection) and deviant workplace behaviour?
- 6) Does transactional leadership style moderate the relationship between organisational control (punishment certainty, punishment severity, punishment celerity, contingent reward) and deviant workplace behaviour?