

**JOB DEMANDS, SUPERVISION STYLES, AND FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT: EVIDENCE FROM THE NIGERIAN BANKING INDUSTRY**

**Akeem Adekunle Kenku<sup>1\*</sup> & Idowu Michael Ogunkuade<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Office of the Accountant General of the Federation, Treasury House, Garki-Abuja, Nigeria

\*akeemkenku@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT:** This study examined the influence of job demands and supervision styles on financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria, and also investigated whether gender differences exist in financial misconduct. A cross-sectional survey design was adopted, and data were collected from 144 bank employees. Multiple regression analysis and an independent samples t-test were employed to test the study hypotheses. The results revealed that job demands comprising bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures significantly and jointly predicted financial misconduct, accounting for 86.3% of the variance ( $R = .929$ ,  $R^2 = .863$ ,  $F(4,126) = 198.349$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Similarly, supervision styles, verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation significantly predicted financial misconduct, explaining 31.7% of the variance ( $R = .563$ ,  $R^2 = .317$ ,  $F(3,133) = 20.616$ ,  $p < .001$ ). However, the independent samples t-test indicated no significant gender difference in financial misconduct between male ( $M = 101.87$ ,  $SD = 25.04$ ) and female ( $M = 103.42$ ,  $SD = 22.00$ ) bank workers, ( $t(139) = -0.393$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The study concludes that organizational factors particularly job demands and supervisory practices are stronger predictors of financial misconduct than demographic characteristics such as gender. The findings highlight the critical role of workplace structure and managerial behavior in shaping ethical conduct within banking institutions. It is therefore recommended that banks strengthen internal governance systems, reduce excessive bureaucratic and compliance pressures, and promote supportive and ethical supervision practices to minimize the likelihood of financial misconduct among employees.

**Keywords:** Job Demands, Supervision Styles, Financial Misconduct, Banking Sector, Nigeria

## **INTRODUCTION**

The banking industry plays a central role in economic development by mobilizing savings, facilitating financial intermediation, and supporting investment and economic growth. As financial institutions entrusted with public funds, banks are expected to maintain high ethical standards and strong governance structures. However, financial misconduct such as fraud, manipulation of financial records, insider abuse, and unauthorized financial transactions remains a persistent challenge within banking institutions worldwide (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners [ACFE], 2024). In emerging economies such as Nigeria, the issue of unethical financial practices in banks has received considerable scholarly and regulatory attention because of its implications

for financial stability, public trust, and institutional credibility (Adewumi & Ajayi, 2022; NDIC, 2023).

The Nigerian banking industry has experienced several episodes of financial irregularities and insider-related fraud over the past two decades. Regulatory reports indicate that fraudulent activities involving bank staff continue to occur despite strengthened regulatory oversight and corporate governance reforms (NDIC, 2023). For instance, the Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation reported that fraud and forgery cases in deposit money banks amounted to several billions of naira in recent years, with a significant proportion of these incidents linked to insider involvement (NDIC, 2023). Similarly, empirical studies have highlighted that insider abuses such as unauthorized credit approvals, manipulation of financial records, and violations of banking regulations remain major contributors to fraud within Nigerian financial institutions (Okoye & Gbegi, 2020; Adewumi et al., 2022). These developments suggest that financial misconduct in banks cannot be explained solely by technological vulnerabilities or weak regulatory frameworks; rather, organizational and behavioral factors within banking institutions may also play a critical role in shaping unethical conduct among employees.

One organizational factor that has received increasing attention in organizational psychology and management research is job demands. Job demands refer to aspects of work that require sustained physical or psychological effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In modern banking environments, employees are frequently required to operate under demanding conditions characterized by strict regulatory compliance requirements, extensive reporting obligations, bureaucratic procedures, and intense performance monitoring systems. Although these mechanisms are designed to enhance accountability and regulatory compliance, excessive job demands may generate work-related stress and psychological strain among employees. According to the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) model, prolonged exposure to excessive job demands can lead to emotional exhaustion, burnout, and counterproductive workplace behaviors when employees lack adequate resources or organizational support (Bakker et al., 2017; Schaufeli, 2017).

Within the banking sector, such pressures may influence employees' decision-making processes and ethical behavior. Studies in organizational behavior suggest that employees experiencing high levels of job demands may experience frustration, disengagement, and reduced commitment to organizational norms, increasing the likelihood of workplace deviance and unethical conduct (Mackey et al., 2017; Ogunfowora et al., 2022). In financial institutions where employees handle sensitive financial transactions, these behaviors may manifest as financial misconduct, including the manipulation of financial records, unauthorized transactions, or fraud.

Another critical organizational factor influencing employee behavior is supervision style. Supervisors play a significant role in shaping employees' attitudes, ethical standards, and work behaviors because they serve as the immediate representatives of organizational authority. Through their leadership practices and interpersonal interactions, supervisors influence how employees interpret organizational rules, perceive fairness, and respond to workplace pressures (Cropanzano et al., 2017). Supportive supervisory practices can foster ethical work climates and encourage compliance with organizational norms. Conversely, destructive supervision, often conceptualized

as aggressive supervision, may create hostile work environments and weaken employees' commitment to ethical standards (Tepper, 2000; Mackey et al., 2017).

Supervision style may manifest through behaviors such as verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation. Verbal aggression involves hostile communication behaviors such as ridicule, insults, and public criticism directed at subordinates. Work interference occurs when supervisors obstruct employees' ability to perform their tasks effectively, for example, by withholding critical information or creating unnecessary obstacles. Supervisor exploitation refers to the misuse of supervisory authority for personal advantage, such as taking credit for employees' work or imposing unreasonable demands. These behaviors can create perceptions of injustice and psychological strain among employees. Organizational research indicates that supervisory behaviors are associated with increased workplace deviance, emotional exhaustion, and unethical conduct among employees (Tepper et al., 2017; Zhang & Liao, 2022).

Empirical studies further demonstrate that supervision may indirectly promote unethical behavior among employees by increasing moral disengagement and weakening organizational ethical climates (Ogunfowora et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022). Employees who experience hostile supervisory treatment may develop retaliatory attitudes toward the organization and may rationalize unethical behavior as a response to perceived injustice. In highly regulated sectors such as banking, where employees are responsible for managing financial resources and complying with strict regulatory standards, supervisor behaviors may manifest in the form of financial misconduct.

Despite growing scholarly attention to financial fraud and workplace deviance, much of the existing literature on banking fraud in Nigeria has focused primarily on structural and regulatory factors such as weak internal control systems, corporate governance failures, and technological vulnerabilities (Okoye et al., 2020; NDIC, 2023). While these factors are important, they provide limited insight into the organizational conditions and behavioral mechanisms that may influence employees' engagement in financial misconduct. Scholars have therefore emphasized the need to examine workplace factors such as job demands and supervisory practices that shape employees' ethical decision-making processes and behavior within financial institutions (Ogunfowora et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022). Based on these considerations, the present study aims to assess the influence of job demands and supervision styles on financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria, while also examining whether gender differences exist in ethical deviance.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Financial misconduct remains a persistent challenge within the Nigerian banking industry despite regulatory reforms and strengthened monitoring mechanisms. Globally, occupational fraud results in substantial financial losses each year. The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE, 2022) estimates that organizations lose approximately 5% of their annual revenue to fraud, with the financial services sector consistently ranking among the industries with the highest reported cases and median losses. Internal fraud, often perpetrated by employees or managers, includes asset misappropriation, financial statement manipulation, and regulatory non-compliance. These patterns underscore the vulnerability of banking institutions to insider-related misconduct despite advancements in audit technologies and governance mechanisms.

In Nigeria, the problem is equally concerning. Recent reports indicate that fraudulent activities continue to impose significant financial losses on banks and their customers. For example, the Nigeria Inter-Bank Settlement System reported that victims lost approximately ₦17.67 billion to banking fraud in 2023, despite a decline in the number of reported incidents, indicating that the financial impact of fraud continues to increase. Similarly, earlier reports from the Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation (2024) revealed that the number of fraud cases in Nigerian banks increased substantially, with over 211,000 fraud incidents recorded in a single year, highlighting the scale of the problem within the sector. Likewise, the Central Bank of Nigeria (2025) has imposed regulatory sanctions and monetary penalties on banks for compliance breaches and unethical practices.

Empirical evidence further suggests that bank employees themselves are frequently implicated in fraudulent activities. For instance, NDIC (2023) reports indicate that hundreds of bank staff were involved in fraud and forgery cases, with about 899 staff implicated in 2022 alone, reflecting the growing concern over insider-related financial misconduct in the sector. While existing studies have largely attributed banking fraud to weak internal controls, technological vulnerabilities, and regulatory lapses, emerging research suggests that organizational factors such as excessive job demands and supervisory practices may also influence employees' engagement in unethical financial behavior. Despite the significance of these workplace conditions, empirical research examining how job demands and supervision styles jointly influence financial misconduct among bank employees in Nigeria remains limited. This gap underscores the need to investigate the organizational and behavioral determinants of financial misconduct within the Nigerian banking industry.

### **Empirical Review**

Job demands refer to the physical, cognitive, emotional, and professional performance-related requirements and expectations embedded in a job that necessitate sustained effort and are therefore associated with psychological and physiological costs (Bakker et al., 2007). Within the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) model, job demands such as excessive workload, time pressure, role ambiguity, role conflict, emotional labour, and performance pressure are conceptualized as aspects of work that can trigger strain and exhaustion when not adequately balanced by job resources (Bakker et al., 2017). Financial misconduct refers to intentional behaviours that violate organizational policies, ethical standards, or legal frameworks for financial gain or financial manipulation. It includes acts such as asset misappropriation, falsification of financial records, unauthorized transactions, bribery, kickbacks, fraudulent reporting, and embezzlement. In organizational psychology, financial misconduct is often treated as a domain-specific form of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) directed toward organizational financial assets (Spector et al., 2006). From the fraud triangle perspective (Cressey, 1953), financial misconduct emerges when individuals experience pressure, perceive opportunity, and rationalize unethical behaviour.

A widely cited quantitative study by Chen et al. (2017) used a cross-sectional survey of 439 employees and analyzed the data with structural equation modeling. The study found that job demands significantly predicted counterproductive work behaviors, and the relationship also operated indirectly through lower psychological detachment and higher job anxiety. Specifically, the sequential indirect effect of job demands on CWB through psychological detachment and job

anxiety was  $\beta = .03$ ,  $p < .05$ , while the direct path from job demands to CWB was also reported as significant. These results suggest that when employees face persistent work pressure, they may become psychologically strained and more likely to engage in harmful or unethical workplace behavior.

Related evidence is provided by Xu et al. (2022), who conducted a two-wave survey of 254 employees to examine how job insecurity, as a pressure-laden aspect of work, influences unethical pro-organizational behavior. Their findings showed that quantitative job insecurity had a significant positive effect on UPB, while qualitative job insecurity did not have a significant direct effect. In the regression model, quantitative job insecurity remained a significant predictor of UPB (coefficient = .313,  $p < .001$ ), and impression management motivation also significantly predicted UPB (.145,  $p < .05$ ). This study is especially relevant because it demonstrates that pressure linked to possible job loss can push employees toward unethical behavior intended to protect themselves or their organization.

Within Nigeria, available evidence points in the same direction. Eze et al. (2019) examined predictors of workplace deviance among 482 bankers and found that perceived job insecurity significantly predicted bankers' deviant behavior ( $\beta = .12$ ,  $t = 2.29$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Although the dependent variable was workplace deviance rather than financial misconduct specifically, the study is relevant because the authors note that banker deviance in Nigeria includes behaviors such as fraud, stealing, sabotage, unauthorized loans, fictitious postings, and fraudulent transfers. This suggests that job-related insecurity may contribute to a wider deviance pattern within Nigerian banking work settings.

More directly, Ametepe et al. (2023) examined fraudulent intentions among bank employees in Lagos Metropolis and reported a significant positive relationship and predictive effect between perceived job insecurity and fraudulent intention, while control climate was negatively related to fraudulent intention. This study is especially valuable for the present research because it moves beyond general deviance and focuses specifically on fraudulent intention within the Nigerian banking sector. Its findings imply that work-related insecurity can heighten employees' readiness to contemplate fraud, especially where organizational control climates are weak

### **Supervision Styles and Financial Misconduct**

Supervision style refers to the pattern of leadership behaviors, interpersonal interactions, and managerial approaches that supervisors adopt when directing and evaluating subordinates in the workplace. Supervisors play a critical role in shaping employees' attitudes, ethical behavior, and organizational commitment because they represent the immediate authority figures responsible for enforcing organizational policies and norms. Positive supervision can encourage ethical conduct and organizational citizenship behaviors, whereas negative or destructive supervisory practices may contribute to workplace deviance and unethical actions among employees (Tepper, 2000; Mackey et al, 2017; Zhang & Liao, 2022).

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that supervision styles, such as supervisor exploitation, are positively associated with unethical behavior, workplace deviance, and misconduct among employees. Although many studies measure related constructs such as

counterproductive work behavior (CWB), workplace deviance, or unethical pro-organizational behavior (UPB), these outcomes are conceptually similar to financial misconduct because they involve violations of organizational rules, ethical standards, or legal norms. A landmark quantitative study by Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) examined the relationship between work interference and workplace deviance among 265 employees using regression analysis. The results showed that abusive supervision significantly predicted organizational deviance ( $\beta = .27, p < .01$ ) and interpersonal deviance ( $\beta = .33, p < .01$ ), indicating that employees who perceived their supervisors as abusive were more likely to engage in behaviors that harm the organization, including theft, rule-breaking, and unethical conduct. The study concluded that hostile supervisory behavior often triggers retaliatory deviant actions among subordinates.

Similarly, Liu et al. (2019) conducted a quantitative study using data from 679 employees and found that verbal aggression was positively associated with employee unethical behavior. Their structural equation model further revealed that turnover intentions significantly mediated the relationship between verbal aggression, supervision, and unethical behavior, suggesting that employees who experience hostile supervision may disengage psychologically from the organization and subsequently engage in unethical acts.

Meta-analytic evidence also supports the relationship between supervision styles and workplace misconduct. Mackey et al. (2017) conducted a large-scale meta-analysis synthesizing results from numerous empirical studies on abusive supervision. The analysis reported significant correlations between verbal aggression supervision and several negative employee outcomes, including workplace deviance and emotional exhaustion. The meta-analysis found that aggressive supervision was strongly associated with emotional exhaustion ( $\rho = .36$ ) and negatively associated with job satisfaction ( $\rho = -.34$ ), both of which are known predictors of unethical workplace behavior and organizational misconduct.

### **Gender Difference in Financial Misconduct**

Empirical studies examining gender differences in financial misconduct and related unethical workplace behaviors have produced mixed findings. For instance, the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE, 2024) reported in its global fraud survey that approximately 72% of perpetrators of occupational fraud were male, while 28% were female. The report further indicated that the median financial loss caused by male perpetrators was about US\$200,000 compared to US\$100,000 for female perpetrators, suggesting that men tend to be involved in fraud cases that produce higher financial losses. These findings have been partly attributed to gender differences in organizational positions and access to financial decision-making roles.

In addition, a quantitative meta-analysis by Benson and Simpson (2018) examining occupational crime found that males were significantly more likely to engage in organizational deviance and fraud-related activities. The study reported that male employees exhibited higher levels of rule-breaking behavior and risk-taking, both of which are often associated with financial misconduct. The authors argued that these differences may be explained by gender-based socialization patterns that encourage higher risk-taking among males.

However, other empirical studies have found that gender differences in workplace deviance are relatively small or statistically insignificant. For example, Berry et al. (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of workplace deviance and reported that gender differences in organizational deviance were minimal, with effect sizes below .10, indicating only weak differences between male and female employees. The study concluded that situational and organizational factors often play a more important role than demographic characteristics in predicting workplace misconduct.

Within the Nigerian context, available evidence also indicates mixed results regarding gender and workplace deviance. Eze et al. (2019) examined predictors of workplace deviance among 482 bank employees in Nigeria and found that demographic variables, such as gender, had no significant predictive effect on deviant workplace behavior, whereas organizational factors, such as job insecurity and organizational injustice, were significant predictors. The authors concluded that misconduct behaviors in Nigerian banking institutions are more strongly influenced by workplace conditions than by demographic characteristics. Moreover, Okoye et al. (2020) examined fraud management in Nigerian banks and reported that, while employees of both genders were implicated in fraudulent activities, gender differences were not statistically significant when job pressure, internal control weaknesses, and opportunity structures were considered. The study emphasized that organizational pressures and control mechanisms were stronger determinants of fraudulent behavior than gender.

### **Research Questions**

Based on the objectives of the study, the following research questions are formulated:

1. To what extent do job demands (bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures) predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria?
2. To what extent do supervision styles (verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation) predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria?
3. What is the gender difference in financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria?

### **Research Hypotheses**

Based on the study's objective to examine the predictive roles of job demands and supervision styles on financial misconduct, and to determine gender differences among bank workers in Nigeria, the following alternative hypotheses are formulated:

- i. Job demands (bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures) will significantly predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria.
- ii. Supervision styles (verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation) will significantly predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria.
- iii. There will be a significant gender difference in financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study employed a cross-sectional, ex post facto design to examine the predictive roles of job demands and supervision styles in financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. The ex post facto approach was appropriate because the dependent variable, financial misconduct, had already occurred, as respondents were officially convicted or administratively sanctioned. The design enabled the examination of relationships between prior workplace conditions and misconduct severity without manipulating variables.

### **Participants and Sampling**

The study targeted 205 bank workers in Nigeria who had been formally sanctioned for financial misconduct, using disciplinary and compliance records as a credible sampling frame. Applying Taro Yamane's formula with a 5% margin of error produced a minimum sample size of 136, which was increased to 144 to improve statistical power and address potential non-response. A proportionate stratified sampling technique (based on gender) and systematic selection were used to obtain the final sample. The ex post facto design is appropriate, given that misconduct had already occurred, and the use of official records strengthens the study's validity. However, a key limitation is that all respondents were offenders, meaning findings are based on retrospective self-reports, which may introduce bias.

### **Measures**

#### ***Section A: Demographic Characteristics***

Demographic information was collected to describe the characteristics of the respondents and to control for potential confounding effects in the analysis. Participants were requested to provide information on selected socio-demographic variables commonly associated with workplace behaviour and ethical decision-making. The demographic variables included age, gender, educational level, job position, years of work experience, and marital status.

#### ***Section B: Job Demands***

Job demands were measured using an adapted version of items derived from the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) model developed by Demerouti et al. (2001) and later expanded by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). Responses to the job demands items were measured using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating higher perceived levels of job demands. Previous studies using the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) framework have reported acceptable reliability coefficients, with Cronbach's alpha values typically ranging between .78 and .88 across different occupational settings (Bakker et al., 2007; Schaufeli & Taris, 2014), indicating satisfactory internal consistency of job demand measures. In the present study, internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for both the overall scale and its constituent domains. The analysis indicated that the overall job

demands scale demonstrated good internal consistency ( $\alpha = .80$ ). Reliability estimates for the individual domains also indicated acceptable levels of internal consistency: bureaucratic procedures ( $\alpha = .77$ ), performance monitoring ( $\alpha = .75$ ), reporting requirements ( $\alpha = .73$ ), and compliance pressures ( $\alpha = .71$ ). These values exceed the commonly recommended threshold of .70 for acceptable reliability in social science research (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), suggesting that the items consistently measured the different dimensions of job demands among the respondents. Overall, the reliability results indicate that the adapted job demands scale is a reliable instrument for assessing perceived professional demands within the study context.

### ***Section C: Supervision Styles***

Supervision styles were measured using an adapted version of the Abusive Supervision Scale developed by Tepper (2000), which captures negative supervisory behaviors including verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation. Responses to the supervision styles items were recorded on a five-point frequency scale, ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often), with higher scores indicating greater exposure to negative supervisory practices. Previous studies using the Abusive Supervision Scale have reported strong reliability and validity across different organizational contexts. For example, Tepper (2000) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .97 for the original scale, while subsequent studies have reported reliability coefficients ranging between .90 and .97, indicating excellent internal consistency (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). In the present study, internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for both the overall scale and its constituent domains. The analysis revealed that the overall supervision styles scale demonstrated acceptable internal consistency ( $\alpha = .79$ ). In addition, reliability estimates for the individual domains indicated satisfactory levels of internal consistency: verbal aggression ( $\alpha = .76$ ), work interference ( $\alpha = .74$ ), and supervisor exploitation ( $\alpha = .71$ ). These values exceed the recommended threshold of .70 for acceptable reliability in social science research (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), suggesting that the items consistently measured the underlying dimensions of supervision styles among the respondents. In this light, the reliability results indicate that the adapted supervision styles scale is a dependable instrument for assessing negative supervisory behaviors within the study context.

### ***Section D: Financial Misconduct Severity Index***

Financial misconduct was measured using a Financial Misconduct Severity Index adapted from workplace deviance frameworks proposed by Hollinger and Clark (1982) and Bennett and Robinson (2000). The scale assessed the severity and pattern of misconduct behaviors such as misuse of organizational funds, manipulation of financial records, and fraudulent financial activities. Responses were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High), with higher scores indicating greater severity of financial misconduct. Previous studies have reported reliability coefficients ranging between .80 and .92 for measures of workplace deviance and misconduct (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Berry et al., 2007). In the present study, reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha produced a coefficient of  $\alpha = .88$ , indicating good internal consistency and suggesting that the items reliably measured financial misconduct among the respondents.

*Validity and Reliability*

Content validity was established through expert review by specialists in organizational psychology and banking compliance. Construct validity was assessed using exploratory factor analysis, with acceptable criteria set at Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) values  $\geq .70$ , significant Bartlett’s test of sphericity ( $p < .05$ ), and factor loadings  $\geq .50$ . Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, with  $\alpha \geq .70$  considered acceptable.

**Procedure and Data Analysis**

Ethical clearance was obtained prior to data collection. Permission was secured from relevant banking authorities and compliance units. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and anonymity was assured. No identifying information was collected. Questionnaires were administered confidentially and coded numerically for analysis. Data were analyzed using SPSS. Preliminary analyses included descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, and diagnostic checks for normality and multicollinearity (Variance Inflation Factor  $< 5$ ). Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine predictive relationships. Gender differences in financial misconduct were examined using an independent samples t-test, with effect sizes computed using Cohen’s d. Statistical significance was set at  $p < .05$ .

**RESULTS**

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents as shown in Table 1. The analysis includes age, gender, ethnicity, religion, and marital status of the 144 bank workers surveyed.

**Table 1: Frequency Table Representing Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

S/No	Items	Group	Frequency	Percentage
1	Age	21 – 39	141	97.9
		Missing	3	2.1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100.00</b>
2	Gender	Male	68	47.2
		Female	73	50.7
		Missing	3	2.1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100.00</b>
3	Ethnicity	Yoruba	13	9.0
		Igbo	19	13.2
		Hausa	26	18.1
		Others	82	56.9
		Missing	4	2.8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100.00</b>
4	Religion	Muslim	46	31.9
		Christians	73	50.7
		Others	15	10.4

		Missing	10	6.9
		<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100.00</b>
5	Marital Status	Single	119	82.6
		Married	18	12.5
		Divorced	5	3.5
		Missing	2	1.4
		<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100.00</b>

### Hypothesis One

Hypothesis One stated that job demands (bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures) will significantly predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. To test this hypothesis, multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the extent to which the dimensions of professional demands predict financial misconduct. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Summary of Multiple Regression Showing Job Demands (bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures) as Predictors of Financial Misconduct among Bank Workers.**

DV	Predictor(s)	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	df	$\beta$	t	p
Financial Misconduct	Constant	.929	.863	198.349**	4, 126			
	Bureaucratic procedures					-.072	-2.175	<.05
	Performance monitoring					.312	2.081	<.05
	Reporting requirements					-.068	-1.999	<.05
	Compliance pressures					.626	4.192	<.001

*Model Summary: R = .929, R<sup>2</sup> = .863, F(4, 126) = 198.349, p < .01*

*Note. DV = Financial Misconduct. B = Unstandardised coefficient;  $\beta$  = Standardised coefficient. R<sup>2</sup> = .863 indicates that 86.3% of the variance in financial misconduct is explained by job demands. p < .01.*

Hypothesis one was tested using multiple regression analysis, and the overall model was statistically significant,  $F(4, 126) = 198.349, p < .01$ . The results showed a very strong relationship between job demands and financial misconduct ( $R = .929$ ), with 86.3% of the variance explained ( $R^2 = .863$ ). At the individual level, bureaucratic procedures ( $\beta = -.072, t = -2.175, p < .05$ ) and reporting requirements ( $\beta = -.068, t = -1.999, p < .05$ ) significantly and negatively predicted financial misconduct. In contrast, performance monitoring ( $\beta = .312, t = 2.081, p < .05$ ) and compliance pressures ( $\beta = .626, t = 4.192, p < .001$ ) significantly and positively predicted financial misconduct, with compliance pressures emerging as the strongest predictor. Therefore, hypothesis one was supported and accepted.

### Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two stated that supervision styles (verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation) will significantly predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis to examine the predictive effects of the dimensions of supervision styles on financial misconduct. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Supervision Styles (verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation) as Predictors of Financial Misconduct among Bank Workers in Nigeria**

DV	Predictor(s)	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	df	β	t	p
<b>Financial Misconduct</b>	Constant	.563	.317	20.616**	3,			
					133			
	Verbal aggression					-.939	-5.916	<.001
	Work interference					-.239	-3.289	<.001
	Supervisor exploitation					-.507	-3.386	<.01

\*\*  $p < .001$

This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis. The results indicated that the overall regression model was statistically significant,  $F(3, 133) = 20.616, p < .01$ . The multiple correlation coefficient was  $R = .563$ , indicating a moderate relationship between supervision styles and financial misconduct. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = .317$ ) shows that approximately 31.7% of the variance in financial misconduct was jointly explained by verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation. On an independent basis, the results indicated that only verbal aggression ( $\beta = -.939, t = -5.916, p < .001$ ), work interference ( $\beta = -.239, t = -3.289, p < .001$ ), and supervisor exploitation ( $\beta = -.507, t = -3.386, p < .01$ ) significantly and independently predicted financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. Based on these findings, hypothesis two, which stated that supervision styles (verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation) would significantly predict financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria, was supported and therefore accepted.

### Hypothesis Three

This hypothesis stated that there would be a significant difference between male and female bank workers in financial misconduct. The hypothesis was tested using an independent samples t-test, and the results are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Summary of Independent Sample T-test Showing the Gender Difference on Financial Misconduct among Bank Workers in Nigeria**

DV	Gender	N	Mean	SD	SE	t	df	p
Financial Misconduct	Male	68	101.87	25.04	3.04	-.393	139	>.05
	Female	73	103.42	22.00	2.58			

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine gender differences in financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. As presented in Table 4, male bank workers ( $n = 68$ ,  $M = 101.87$ ,  $SD = 25.04$ ) and female bank workers ( $n = 73$ ,  $M = 103.42$ ,  $SD = 22.00$ ) did not significantly differ in their levels of financial misconduct,  $t(139) = -.393$ ,  $p > .05$ . This result indicates that gender does not significantly influence financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. Therefore, the hypothesis proposing a significant gender difference in financial misconduct was not supported.

## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section discusses the findings of the study in relation to the research objectives, existing empirical literature, and theoretical explanations. The results of the regression analysis revealed that job demands comprising bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures significantly and jointly predicted financial misconduct, accounting for a substantial proportion of the variance in financial misconduct among the respondents. This finding suggests that job demands within the banking environment may increase the likelihood of unethical financial practices among employees. A probable explanation for this finding is that banking employees often operate under intense work pressure resulting from strict regulatory compliance, performance targets, extensive reporting obligations, and bureaucratic administrative procedures. When such demands become excessive, they may create psychological strain, job stress, and pressure to meet organizational expectations. Under these conditions, employees may engage in unethical financial practices as coping strategies or as shortcuts to achieve work targets. This finding is consistent with the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) theory, which posits that excessive job demands can lead to strain, emotional exhaustion, and counterproductive workplace behaviors when employees lack sufficient resources to manage those demands (Bakker et al., 2017). Empirical evidence also supports this relationship. For instance, Chen et al. (2017) found that job demands significantly predicted counterproductive work behaviors among employees through psychological strain and job anxiety. Similarly, Xu et al. (2022) reported that work-related insecurity and job pressure significantly increased employees' engagement in unethical pro-organizational behavior.

Another objective of this study was to determine whether supervision styles significantly predict financial misconduct among bank workers. The results indicated that supervision styles, verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation significantly predicted financial misconduct. However, contrary to theoretical expectations and prior empirical evidence, all three dimensions produced negative beta coefficients, indicating that higher levels of these supervisory behaviors were associated with lower levels of financial misconduct. This inverse relationship is

counterintuitive, particularly given the study's grounding in Social Exchange Theory, which posits that employees reciprocate negative treatment with deviant or retaliatory behaviors. Instead of supporting this assumption, the present findings suggest a different behavioral dynamic within the study context. A plausible explanation for this pattern is that abusive or controlling supervisory behaviors may function as deterrent mechanisms in highly regulated environments such as the banking sector. Employees exposed to verbal aggression, strict monitoring, or exploitative supervision may become more cautious and risk-averse, thereby reducing their likelihood of engaging in financial misconduct due to fear of detection, sanctions, or punitive consequences. In this sense, such supervisory practices may inadvertently reinforce compliance, even if they undermine employee well-being.

This interpretation aligns with deterrence-based perspectives and aspects of organizational control theory, where strict oversight and perceived consequences can suppress deviant behavior. It also suggests that, in certain institutional contexts, particularly those characterized by high surveillance, compliance requirements, and disciplinary enforcement, negative supervisory styles may produce behavioral conformity rather than retaliation. Nevertheless, this finding does not imply that abusive supervision is desirable or beneficial. Extensive literature, including studies by Tepper et al. (2017) demonstrates that abusive supervision is associated with numerous adverse outcomes such as emotional exhaustion, reduced job satisfaction, and long-term counterproductive work behaviors. Similarly, studies such as Zhang and Liao (2022) have found that verbal aggression supervision increases unethical behavior through mechanisms like moral disengagement. The divergence observed in the present study may therefore reflect context-specific factors, including organizational culture, enforcement intensity, or employees' perceived lack of opportunity to engage in misconduct under strict supervision. Furthermore, it is important to consider that compliance-driven environments may suppress overt misconduct without addressing underlying attitudes, meaning that employees may refrain from unethical acts not because of internalized ethical standards but due to external pressure. This raises important concerns about the sustainability of such behavioral control and its implications for organizational climate and employee psychological well-being.

The third objective of this study was to examine whether there are significant gender differences in financial misconduct among bank workers. The findings revealed no significant gender difference in financial misconduct between male and female employees. A probable explanation for this finding could be that financial misconduct in banking institutions may be influenced more by organizational factors such as job demands, supervision styles, and opportunity structures than by demographic characteristics such as gender. In highly regulated work environments where employees perform similar roles and operate under similar organizational pressures, gender differences in unethical behavior may become less pronounced. This finding is consistent with previous empirical studies. For instance, Berry et al. (2007) reported that gender differences in workplace deviance were relatively small, with effect sizes below .10. Meanwhile, Eze et al. (2019) found no significant gender differences in deviant workplace behavior among Nigerian bank employees, suggesting that organizational conditions were more influential predictors of misconduct than demographic factors. However, some global studies present contrasting findings. The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE, 2024) reports that males account for a larger proportion of occupational fraud cases worldwide. This difference has often been attributed to men

occupying higher managerial positions that provide greater opportunities to commit financial fraud. Nevertheless, the ACFE report also emphasizes that gender differences may diminish when employees perform similar roles with comparable levels of access to financial resources. Therefore, the absence of significant gender differences in the present study suggests that financial misconduct among bank workers is primarily driven by organizational and situational factors rather than by demographic characteristics.

### **Implications for Financial Institutions**

The findings of this study have important implications for financial institutions, particularly within the Nigerian banking sector, where ethical conduct and compliance with regulatory standards are critical for institutional credibility and financial stability. The findings of this study suggest that financial misconduct in banking institutions is strongly influenced by organizational conditions rather than demographic factors. Job demands such as bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance pressures may create work-related stress that increases employees' likelihood of engaging in unethical financial practices. Financial institutions should therefore ensure that operational procedures and regulatory requirements are balanced with manageable workloads. The study also highlights the critical role of supervisory practices. Supervision styles characterized by verbal aggression, work interference, and supervisor exploitation may foster hostile work environments and encourage deviant behaviors among employees. Banks should therefore promote ethical leadership, supportive supervisory practices, and professional management training. Taken together, financial institutions should strengthen organizational ethical climates, provide employee support systems, and implement effective internal control mechanisms to reduce opportunities and motivations for financial misconduct.

### **Conclusion**

This study examined the influence of job demands and supervision styles on financial misconduct among bank workers in Nigeria. The findings demonstrate that job demands, particularly compliance pressures, play a significant role in shaping unethical workplace behavior. Specifically, compliance pressures emerged as the strongest predictor of financial misconduct, suggesting that excessive regulatory and performance demands may inadvertently contribute to the very misconduct they are designed to prevent. In addition, supervision styles were found to significantly predict financial misconduct; however, contrary to theoretical expectations, all supervision dimensions exhibited negative relationships with misconduct. This indicates that coercive or intrusive supervisory practices may suppress unethical behavior through deterrence mechanisms rather than through positive relational processes. Overall, the study highlights the complex and context-dependent nature of workplace behavior in highly regulated environments such as the banking sector. The findings underscore the need for organizations to move beyond rigid control systems and adopt more balanced approaches that integrate compliance with employee support and ethical leadership. Importantly, this study consistently uses the term job demands to refer to workplace pressures, including bureaucratic procedures, performance monitoring, reporting requirements, and compliance requirements, to maintain conceptual clarity throughout the research.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Banking institutions should review operational procedures to ensure that bureaucratic processes, reporting obligations, and compliance requirements do not place excessive pressure on employees. Management should streamline administrative procedures and ensure realistic performance targets in order to reduce work-related stress that may encourage unethical practices.
2. Organizations should provide support systems such as counseling services, stress management programs, and mentorship initiatives to help employees cope with work-related pressures arising from job demands.
3. Banks should encourage supervisors and managers to adopt ethical, respectful, and supportive leadership styles. Training programs on ethical leadership, communication skills, and employee relations should be implemented to reduce destructive supervisory behaviors such as verbal aggression, work interference, and exploitation.
4. Although the study found no significant gender difference in financial misconduct among bank employees, financial institutions should continue to promote gender-inclusive and equitable workplace policies that ensure equal access to opportunities, responsibilities, and ethical training for both male and female employees

## Limitations of the Study

Despite its contributions, this study is subject to certain limitations that should be carefully considered when interpreting the findings. First, the cross-sectional design of the study limits the ability to draw causal inferences between job demands, supervision styles, and financial misconduct. Although the results demonstrate significant relationships among the variables, the temporal order of these relationships cannot be established. Consequently, it is not possible to determine whether job demands and supervision styles directly lead to financial misconduct or whether other underlying factors may influence these associations. The findings should therefore be interpreted as indicative of relationships rather than definitive evidence of causation.

Furthermore, the use of a cross-sectional approach restricts the ability to capture changes in employee behavior over time. Financial misconduct and workplace dynamics are often influenced by evolving organizational conditions, policy changes, and individual experiences. As such, the study may not fully reflect the dynamic and longitudinal nature of these relationships within the banking sector. In addition, the study is context-specific, focusing exclusively on banking institutions within Nigeria. While this enhances the contextual relevance and provides valuable insights into the Nigerian financial sector, it may limit the generalizability of the findings to other industries or cultural settings. Organizational structures, regulatory frameworks, and workplace norms vary significantly across sectors and countries, and these differences may influence how job demands and supervision styles affect employee behavior. Therefore, caution should be exercised when applying the findings of this study to different organizational or cultural contexts. Moreover, the regulatory intensity and compliance requirements characteristic of the Nigerian banking sector may uniquely shape employee responses to job demands and supervision styles. In environments

with less stringent regulatory oversight or different cultural expectations regarding authority and workplace behavior, the observed relationships may differ. Future studies should therefore consider examining similar variables across diverse sectors and cultural contexts to enhance the external validity of the findings.

### **Suggestions for Future Studies**

In light of the identified limitations, several directions are recommended for future research. First, future studies should adopt longitudinal research designs in order to better understand the causal relationships between job demands, supervision styles, and financial misconduct over time. Such approaches would allow researchers to examine how these variables evolve and interact across different time periods, thereby providing stronger evidence of causality. In addition, there is a need to incorporate multi-source data in future investigations. Relying solely on self-reported measures may introduce bias; therefore, subsequent studies should integrate objective organizational records, supervisor evaluations, or peer assessments to enhance the validity and reliability of findings. Future research should also expand sample diversity by including both sanctioned and non-sanctioned employees. This would enable comparative analyses and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that differentiate employees who engage in financial misconduct from those who do not, thereby improving the generalizability of results. Moreover, further studies should examine potential moderating and mediating variables that may influence the relationship between job demands, supervision styles, and financial misconduct. Factors such as organizational culture, ethical climate, power distance, and emotional exhaustion may provide deeper insights into the mechanisms underlying these relationships. There is also a need to investigate sectoral and cross-cultural differences. Comparative research across different industries and national contexts would help determine whether the findings of this study are specific to the Nigerian banking sector or applicable to broader organizational settings. Finally, future research should explore hidden or less detectable forms of misconduct. Given that strict supervision may suppress overt deviant behaviors, employees may engage in more covert or subtle forms of unethical conduct. Understanding these hidden dynamics would contribute to a more nuanced understanding of workplace misconduct and organizational control systems.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adewumi, S., & Ajayi, A. O. (2022). Corporate governance and fraud prevention in Nigerian deposit money banks. *Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*, 8(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.56201/jafm.v8.no2.2022.pg45.60>
- Ametepe, W., Banwo, A., & Arilesere, T. (2023). Amoral behavior and control climate as predictors of fraudulent intention among bank employees in Lagos Metropolis. *Journal of Financial Crime*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-09-2022-0205>
- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE). (2022). *Report to the Nations: Occupational fraud and abuse*. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. <https://www.acfe.com/report-to-the-nations>

- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE). (2024). *Occupational fraud 2024: A report to the nations*. ACFE. <https://www.acfe.com/report-to-the-nations>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- 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>
- Benson, M. L., & Simpson, S. S. (2018). *White-collar crime: An opportunity perspective*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686240>
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 410–424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410>
- Central Bank of Nigeria. (2025). *CBN financial stability report*. Central Bank of Nigeria. <https://www.cbn.gov.ng>
- Chen, Y., Li, S., & Zhou, M. (2017). How job demands affect employees' counterproductive work behavior: The role of psychological detachment and job anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1890. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01890>
- Cressey, D. R. (1953). *Other people's money: A study in the social psychology of embezzlement*. Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14407-000>
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 479–516. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Eze, J. E., Okonkwo, E. N., & Nwosu, H. E. (2019). Job insecurity and workplace deviance among bank employees in Nigeria. *Psychological Perspectives*, 2(1), 45–58.
- Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls of employee deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 333–343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1982.tb01016.x>

- Liu, X., Liao, H., & Loi, R. (2019). The dark side of leadership: A three-level investigation of abusive supervision and employee unethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158(2), 509–522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3742-3>
- Mackey, J. D., Frieder, R. E., Brees, J. R., & Martinko, M. J. (2017). Abusive supervision: A meta-analysis and empirical review. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1940–1965. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315573997>
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance: The moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159>
- Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation (NDIC). (2023). *NDIC annual report and statement of accounts*. NDIC. <https://www.ndic.gov.ng>
- Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation (NDIC). (2024). *NDIC annual report and financial statements*. NDIC. <https://www.ndic.gov.ng>
- Nigeria Inter-Bank Settlement System (NIBSS). (2024). *Fraud landscape report 2023*. NIBSS. <https://www.nibss-plc.com.ng>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Ogunfowora, B., Bourdage, J. S., & Nguyen, B. (2022). Unethical leadership and employee unethical behaviour: The roles of moral disengagement and organizational identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 176(2), 413–430. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04543-0>
- Okoye, E. I., & Gbegi, D. O. (2020). Fraud management and prevention in the Nigerian banking sector. *International Journal of Accounting and Finance Research*, 9(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijafr.v9n2p1>
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands–Resources model: A ‘how to’ guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 120–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the Job Demands–Resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In G. F. Bauer & O. Hämmig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp. 43–68). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3_4)
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446–460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005>

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375>

Tepper, B. J., Simon, L., & Park, H. M. (2017). Abusive supervision. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 123–152. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062539>

Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C. K., & Miao, Q. (2022). Job insecurity and unethical pro-organizational behavior: The mediating role of impression management motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 953774. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.953774>

Zhang, Y., & Liao, Z. (2022). Abusive supervision and employee unethical behavior: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 179(2), 455–472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04826-6>