

## Discipline Management Strategies and Compliance Success in the Rivers State Civil Service

<sup>1</sup>Dr Patrick N Nwinyokpugi, <sup>2</sup>Robbinson, Ruebenba Ebbi

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Office and Information Management Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**ABSTRACT:** This study examined the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success of civil service sector in Rivers State. The study was operationalized with the dimensions of discipline management strategies being value communication, organizational justice, consistency, enforcement and penalty appropriateness. Compliance success was measured by order and responsiveness. The study was guided by six research questions and twelve research hypotheses. The study used cross-sectional survey design. The target population of 3200 three thousand two hundred comprised some selected ministry in civil service sector in Rivers State, with a sampling of 356 drawing from the target population with the help of Taro Yamane formula. The content validity of our instrument was achieved using supervisor's vetting and approval. Data was analysed and results presented using tables, mean and standard deviation. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient. The study found that there is a strong significant positive relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success of selected ministries in civil service sector in Rivers State. with the dimensions and measures also showing positive correlation. Organizational culture and leadership also moderate the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success.

**KEYWORDS:** *Consistency, Discipline Management, Enforcement, Organisational Justice, Penalty Appropriateness, Value Communication*

### I. INTRODUCTION

In today's workplace, discipline and documentation go hand in hand. Most disciplinary action policies are progressive. This means that as rule violations increase, so do consequences. Therefore, to protect the organization, adequate documentation of the rule violation and the consequences must exist. Over the years, the concept of employee management discipline has grown. Managers realize that discipline is a part of the job. They also realize that there must be disciplinary action within an organization to maintain some sense of control. Discipline in an organization is intended to promote a minimum acceptable behaviour by employees. It is defined in terms of adherence to the company/organization rules, regulations, systems and processes. Discipline ensures smooth functioning and helps in creating a healthy business environment. Managing a group of people in a workplace is a complex task. Organizational leaders are familiar with the complexities that are in occurrence in managing an organization conflict. It represents between a managers and an employee are most likely a continuous encounter in the workplace. Ensuring a sound relationship between the management and employees depends upon how it is regulated by the manager. One of the conditions for maintaining such relationship is that employees should uphold a particular performance and behavioural standards, (Jegadeesan G, 2008). Organizations over the years have experienced pressures of lack of proper management of discipline among members to such extent that it constitutes challenge for orderly conduct of employees and management alike. One common thing is the presence of disciplinary measures and approach for organisation's balanced behaviour but the other is managing these approaches to agree with acceptable norms and human reference. The success of any disciplinary method can be measures by its compliance status and manifest behavioural change. Also, with the increased in business competition due to open markets and global economy, the civil service is also trending towards the global culture in order to be more relevant in same market. This change disposition is symmetrically gliding away from obsolete archaic and parochial traditional process of doing things, therefore, a new disciplinary approach becomes necessary to curb the arbitrariness in new attitudes that evolves with new technology.

Compliance to rules and regulation is dependent on the degree of enforcement that organisation leadership applies to drive performance and maintain the healthy relationship. However, if the employees do not agree with the manner of implementing disciplinary actions, it can have adverse effect on the rapport between the management and the employees. Managing people for effective compliance to the rules and regulations is a

skill that requires constant planning and development since humans are of diverse spics and indeed dynamic. It is unarguable that no one loves to be dismissing from the organization or described as a failure irrespective of its coloration and/or pigmentation. A manager could be seen as that person who is vested with formal authority over an organization or one of its sub units, (offices), such a one has status that leads to various inter-personal relations and from this comes access to information, which enables the managers to devise strategies, make decisions and implement action towards organizational productivity, (Mintzberg, 1988).

The behavioural modification model or theory was propounded by B.F Skinner in 1992. The theory takes its starting point from the fact that behaviour that is rewarded tends to be repeated, while behaviour that receives no rewards tends to be eliminated. In maintaining discipline one generally rewards good behaviour and punishes bad behaviour (Phillips 1998). Skinner believes that consequences (in other words, what happens to the individual after performing an act) shape an individual's behaviour. He focused his approach on reinforcement and reward. Reinforcers are like rewards; if used in a systematic way, they influence an individual's behaviour in a desired direction (Charles 1989). Skinner made use of terms such as operant behaviour, reinforcing stimuli, schedule of reinforcement, successive approximations, positive and negative reinforcements. Discipline is one strategy that management use to enforce standard of behaviours within the organization employee. The human element of the organization is one very critical productive asset that needs special management. A rationally organized Social Structure involves clearly defined patterns of activity and discipline, which must be functionally related to the purpose of the organization. The social sciences are more fluid and human behaviour more difficult to explain and analyzed. Individuals are unpredictable, unique with distinct characters, attitudes, aspirations, objectives, perceptions, beliefs etc. Accurate and precise prediction of the mind or behaviour of an individual even to the nearest second is difficult. Organizational leaders are familiar with the complexities that are innate in handling the social structure. Issues that likely arose from the inability to organize the social elements embrace conflicts, disorder and failure in goals achievements. Major disconnect that lack of order poses for organization can be imagined in a struggle between two opposing ideas. With this existence, conflicts between a manager and an employee are most likely a continuous encounter in the workplace. Ensuring a sound relationship between the management and employees depends upon how it is regulated by management. One of the conditions for maintaining such relationship is that employees should uphold a particular performance and behavioural standards that support the code of conduct of the organization that enhances healthy relationship between management and employee. Jegadeesan G, (2008). Should the employees/workers do not comply with these standards, it is assumed that disciplinary measures are enforced to improve their performance and maintain the healthy relationship. However, if the employees/workers do not agree with the manner of implementing disciplinary actions, it can have an adverse effect on the rapport between management and the employees. Psychologists generally agree that people have different reasons for doing the things they do, or for behaving the way they do, therefor, there is need for management of organization to be consistent in educating the employees the way that support the organizational behavioural pattern needed for members of the organization. This means in other words, that all human behaviour is designed to achieve certain goals and objectives. It is therefore, a deficiency of something within the individuals, which sparks chains of events leading the individual to engage in one kind of behaviour - good or bad, lawful or unlawful. Clearly, if a rule is unenforceable, it is not worth having. This is an indication that, instead of making rules and regulations that are not enforceable, it is better not to have one that governs the behaviour of the employees at work. Standards of conduct must be maintained but they must be realistic so as to contribute to the proper functioning of the workplace rules and regulations. Rules governing insubordination, theft, vandalism, gambling on company premises, drinking on the job and taking drugs at work, are all related to productivity and the general wellbeing of an organization Eni, (2000). All this contributes to the performance of employees by boosting their moral thereby increasing productivity. But when these products that increasing employee morale is miss use, then, the purpose is defeated. Therefore, management face with the responsibilities of regulating the behaviour of employee. It is believed that the most unpleasant role of an organizational leader is to institute a disciplinary action to an erring worker/employee Franklin and Pagan, (2006). Although the goal is to modify the employees undesirable behaviours, their decisions are often subjected to opposing personal interpretations. Discipline entails a process of learning. One of the positive contributions which discipline can make in our lives is that it brings about knowledge that is cumulative; knowledge that maintains and knowledge that restructures society when applied. And there cannot be an end to learning because society does not operate in a state of static equilibrium but in a state of generativity in terms of idea conception and development.

Discipline is also a training process, but unlike training which is job oriented. The primary purpose of discipline is to teach responsibility rather than to evoke obedience. This means consistently helping employees/workers to understand that life involves choices and consequences. Discipline in the organization consists of setting clearly defined limits for employees/workers. The vast majority of workers in crises often claim to not clearly understand organization's limit, because most of them come from places where discipline was not consistent. Employees/workers discipline for undesirable behaviours only tells them what not to do. It does not tell them what behaviours are preferred. In an exploratory study using the internal dynamics of

disciplinary process made by Rollinson, Handley, Hook and Foot (2007), about the disciplinary experience and its effects on behaviour, it was tentatively concluded that half of those formally disciplined will internalize the rules and the other half have the inclinations of breaking the rules. These behaviours were said to be caused by first; 'conditioning by punishment' paradigm, where punishment stimuli is ineffective in influencing the behaviour. The second cause is attributed to the managerial styles that have created impressions of motives of retaliation on the disciplined person. The severity of disciplinary measures may depend on such considerations as whether the employee/worker is a first time offender, prior tract record, length of service etc. For the minor offenses, the following are included: Failure to obey safety rules, sleeping on duty, smoking in prohibited areas and concealing one's defective work, work output below standard, loafing, leaving job or work area without authorization, quarrelsome manifestations, unexcused absence from work, while for serious offenses embraces amongst others; wilful and malicious damage of company property, indecent conduct, stealing, attacking another with the intent of maiming or causing serious injury, gambling, repeated tardiness and falsification of any kind and drunkenness or found with hard drugs or under its influence. It is not easy to establish the frequency of the occurrence of each of these forms of offenses in the organization. However, it appears that some of these forms of indiscipline or offenses occur more frequently than others and their effects also more noticeable than others. The occurrence of organizational misbehaviours is dependent on the opinions of employees/workers towards the organization. When employees/workers believe that their organization is fair, it is unlikely that they will be involved in misconducts, De Schrijver, et al (2010). Discipline is an action that must be constantly exercised to rehabilitate employees'/workers' misbehaviour due to violation of work policy and standards. Disciplinary guidelines are used for maintaining the work standard that must be imparted to employees through proper communication. According to Franklin and Pagan (2006) culture is an influential factor in making disciplinary decisions. Therefore, management of organizations need to ensure that discipline is a measure things that they need to implement in the organization to enhanced success and avoid misbehaviour in the organization.

### Value Communication

Communication no doubt is a very vital tool in carrying out day to day activities. Everyone needs communication around to share experiences, jobs frustration, hopes and fears from every sectors of the organization. We learn how to communicate as members, we are able to recognise and identify happiness and annoyance in our management faces. As noted by Kraker, (2005), in most organizations, people are influenced to behave in certain fashions from a variety of different forces. Good leadership, peer pressure, organizational system or infrastructure enabling characteristics, position power, fear, etc. can all influence people's behaviour. He further states that the higher the position, the higher the perception that the role is not the norm. Because it is not likely, in one's mind, that one will ever have that roles, one assumes that the person who has that role has got something special about him or her that justifies that person having that higher role. All people have a personal communication style that tends to give them their own unique level of intent. Some people are perceived to be very silly, full of wild crazy ideas to a fault. It would seem that these individuals do not think through their ideas before they speak. In addition, these people usually do not expect that their ideas will be taken seriously. Sillars (2008), reiterates that, however carefully an organization or an individual plans acts of communication, it is inevitable that the breakdowns will sometimes occur. They can be classified into two groups as follows; those caused by people or organizations concerned with communicating, and those which are due to external factors. Saiyadain (2000), identifies three categories of communication barriers namely; human factors, context or mode factors and organizational factors and explained them as follows; Human Factors include filtering, that is, the information is manipulated to suit the receiver. The major determinant of filtering is the number of levels in an organization structure. Another factor is the selective perception where the receivers selectively see and hear as on their needs, motivation, experience, background and other personal characteristics. The context factors are included in the content, process of encoding and decoding and the mode of content communication. Among the factors, communication overload where individuals have more information than they can sort out and use. They tend to select out, ignore, pass over or forget information. Regardless of the cause, the result is lost information and therefore less effective communication. Organizational Factors are factors such as hierarchy, status and overall climate, which contribute to the pattern of communication in the organization. Singhal (1993), states that the level in bureaucracies distorts and delays information due to screening or additional information relating to idiosyncrasies. With all the problems, potential and real, in the communication process, it is obvious that a "perfect" communication system is unlikely. Although perfection might not be achieved, organizations can have mechanisms by which they can attempt to keep the communication system as clear as possible. Downs (2004) indicates that several devices can be available to reduce the distortions and other complications in the communication process. Some organizations have turned to "project groups" as a means of solving communication problems. These groups consist of personnel from a variety of organizational units who develop a new product of service for the organization. Hall (2003), states that advanced communication technology was not the cure for organizational communication

problems. These problems are rooted in the nature of organizations, their participants, and their interactions with their environments.

### **Organizational justice**

This refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedure, interactions, and outcomes to be fair in nature. Justice is a key issue for understanding organizational behaviour (Van den Bos, 2001). The importance of studying organizational justice in the workplace has been underscored by findings that caused a sense of working for justice or lack of fairness in the workplace, which can lead to a decline in levels or organizational performance. Employee who perceived unfairness in the workplace may exhibit varying degrees of negative behaviour. It can influence the employees' commitment to the organization and implementation of performance. Organizational change is any single action or set of actions that result in a shift in direction or process that affects the way the organization works. Change may affect the strategies an organization uses to carry out its mission, the process for implementing strategies, the tasks and functions performed by the people in the organization, and the relationships between people.

Organizational justice is an umbrella term used to refer to individuals' perceptions about the fairness of decisions and decision-making processes within organizations and the influences of those perceptions on behaviour (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007). Justice scholars have identified three or four specific type justice, each referring to fairness perceptions in a specific set of work contexts: distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (sometimes broken down further into informational justice. Organizational justice research, which focuses on the role of fairness as a consideration in the workplace, has demonstrated that fair treatment has important effect on individual employee attitudes, such as satisfaction, absenteeism, and commitment (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). In many studies, it has been suggested that fairness affects several employee attitudes and behaviour such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, sabotage, turnover intention, stress, organizational citizenship behaviour, job performance, and trust.

### **Consistency**

Consistency can be defined as the reliability or logical adherence of successive events or results. Within the context of this study, consistency refers to the same set of rules being applied to all employees within the organisation, regardless of age, gender, position, seniority or any other criteria similar to this. It is thus important that employers apply the same rules to all employees at all times. Unfortunately, this is not always the case within the workplace, as some employees get off "lighter" than others for committing the same misconduct or breach of rule. "An employer is guilty of an unfair labour practice if he acts unfairly when suspending an employee or imposing a disciplinary sanction short of dismissal (Du Plessis & Fouche, 2006). Employers thus have to ensure that they act in a correct manner when dealing with disciplinary cases, and their behaviour should be applied to all in a reliable manner. If this is not forthcoming, it could harm the trust relationship which has been built between the employer and employees. Trust is relevant in situations where the truster is dependent on the trustee's action(s) in the future to achieve his/her own goals and objectives (Six, 2005). Trust is seen as an integral part of the employment relationship as "this dependence implies that the truster, when acting on his/her trust, makes him-/herself vulnerable to the actions of the trustee. The actions and decisions of the leadership responsible for effecting disciplinary action should thus ensure that the application is fair, reliable and transparent. If these are not present, not only will the trust relationship between employer and employee be breached, but there may also be major implications on the organisation, and the effective functioning of its operations. The implications of inconsistent and unfair disciplinary action on the organisations often pay a hefty price as a result of poor disciplinary application and procedures. This refers not only to monetary expenses, but also to the loss of morale, intellectual property and motivation on the part of employees. "Workers typically respond to the oppressive situation in the only way open to them as individuals: by withdrawal from the source of the discontent, or, in the case of certain forms of sabotage or indiscipline, by reacting against the immediate manifestation of oppression" (Blyton & Turnbull, 1998). As a result, employers may lose valuable employees because of supervisor or manager bias, and not even be aware of this. Supervisors may apply a certain rule to an individual that he/she primarily dislikes, and apply the same rule completely different to an individual in his/her social circle or if an inherent friendship is present. At times, leaders may make a genuine mistake in applying a certain rule. Imel, (2011), notes that "we are all human and at one time or another, all humans make mistakes. How significant these mistakes are and how often they occur are a direct result of each individuals own self-discipline. Sometimes the mistake made involves violating a rule, policy, procedure or standard of conduct in the workplace". Then there are other occasions where these leaders blatantly abuse their power, and seek to punish individuals they dislike and attempt to push them out of the organisation.

## Enforcement

It is the process of ensuring compliance with laws, regulations, rules, standards, or social norms. By enforcing laws and regulations, organizations attempt to effectuate successful implementations of policies, Amalia, (2011). Enforcement serves a number of functions; the enforcement of social norms can ensure conformity within organizational work environment and communities. The enforcements of laws can maximize social benefits and protect the employee's interest, Zachay, (2016). Enforcement also serves the self-interest of the institutions (organizations) that oversee enforcement of the rules and regulations that guide the conduct of employees in the organization to behave in accordance with the laydown ethics of the organizations. Margaret, (2014), stated that, enforcement can be effectuated by public or private organizations and non-governmental actors. This is often accomplished through coercive means or by utilizing power disparities to constrain action. It is also true that institutions enforce rules when deciding when and how to apply laws and regulations. Some organizations management may choose to exercise discretion, thereby enforcing laws, regulations, or norms only in selective circumstances. However, scholars like Margeret H., Lemos & Alex., (2010), have suggested that strategic enforcement is a cost effective method of achieving social benefits; by focusing enforcement on the worst violators downscale their activities so that they don't appear to be worst enforcers.

**Penalty Appropriateness** In course of this study, we will use the Douglas-Factors-In-Depth analysis to explain the penalty appropriateness of discipline on all members of the organization that violates the rules and regulation of the organization standards of behaviours. The Douglas factors-in-depths explain the procedural steps that disciplinary action on employees need to take in other to consider the decision/penalty appropriate on all employees. Douglas considers these factors as follows:- **Seriousness of the Offense:** In determining the appropriate penalty, a manager should consider primarily the nature and seriousness of the misconduct and its relation to the employee's duties, position, and responsibilities. This Douglas Factor provides some guidance in determining the seriousness of an offense. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct, an offense is more severe if it was intentional rather than inadvertent and if it was frequently repeated rather than being an isolated incident. Misconduct is also considered more severe if it is done maliciously or for personal gain. The table of Penalties might range from the types of offense been committed and action regarding the severity of the misconduct. For example, sleeping on duty is a serious offense. However, it is considered more serious as provided in our table of penalties where safety of personnel or property is endangered. **The Employee's Position:** This factor recognizes a relationship between the employee's position and the misconduct. Factors considered are the employee's job level and the type of employment which may include a supervisory or fiduciary role, contacts with the public, and prominence of the position. It is a well-recognized principle that a supervisor occupies a position of trust and responsibility and is held to a higher standard of conduct than non-supervisory employees. **Prior Discipline :** In order to use prior discipline as a basis to enhance a current penalty, three criteria must be met. First, the employee must have been informed of the action in writing; second, the employee must have been given an opportunity to dispute the action by having it reviewed, on the merits, by an authority different from the one that took the action; and third, the action must be a matter of record. In deciding to use prior discipline, individuals must be aware of the decision, which held that prior discipline that is the subject of an on-going appeal may not be used to support an enhanced penalty. Once you've determined that a prior disciplinary action meets the requirements to be available for use, you will need to decide how much weight to give it. If prior discipline is going to be used as an aggravating factor, it must be cited in the proposed notice. Non-disciplinary sanctions such as counselling and non-disciplinary instructional material may be relied upon for imposing an enhance penalty and need to be cited as well in the proposed notice. **Length of Service and Prior Work Record:** This factor is especially likely to prompt justification. An employee's length of service and prior work record must be evaluated and be balanced against the seriousness of the offense. An employee with many years of exemplary service and numerous commendations may deserve to have his/her penalty mitigated. However, the seriousness of the offense and an evaluation of other Douglas Factors may outweigh an employee's positive work record. It is interesting to note that third parties have rejected the argument that long service supports a stiff penalty since the employee arguable should have acknowledged better. So, if someone is thinking about that rationale – forget it! An interesting dilemma sometimes occurs when an organization justifies a penalty in part due to what it believes is an employee's past poor performance, but the employee's appraisals demonstrate good or excellent performance. In this case, third parties favour relying upon official appraisals and agency contentions to the contrary are provided little weight in determining the reasonableness of the penalty. **Erosion of Supervisory Confidence:** The analysis of this factor involves much more than a supervisor's statement that he/she has lost confidence in the employee. Specific evidence/testimony as to why an employee can no longer be trusted is critical. Conclusiveness and vague statements do not hold much weight with third parties. It is critical for the agency to articulate a relationship between the misconduct and the employee's position and responsibilities. We need to specifically state why there is an erosion of supervisory confidence. A supervisor cannot just say it; he/she has to prove it. There is a clear inter-relationship between this factor and Factor 2 – Employee's Position. For instance, misconduct by a supervisor will undermine his/her ability to require subordinates to adhere to organizations policies and regulations. **Disparate Treatment:** This factor is one

of the more technically difficult to apply. One of the basic tenets of the administration of “just cause” is the even-handed application of discipline. However, the principle of “like penalties for like offenses” does not require perfect consistency. On the surface, many incidents of misconduct may seem to be similar. However, a thorough investigation and evaluation may lead to a determination that the misconduct was not substantially similar. And even if the circumstances surrounding the misconduct incident may be substantially similar, the penalty imposed may be different based upon an independent evaluation of the other Douglas Factors. **Clarity of Notice:** How well the organization informed an employee of the rule that was violated is a factor that may have to be considered in determining the penalty. Breaking an obscure rule will be viewed less harshly than breaking one that is well publicized, and particularly one on which the employee was given specific notice. Non-disciplinary counselling and letters of expectations are methods to communicate what are the requirements of conduct in the workplace. Even with all the turmoil surrounding the decision consideration may be given to prior disciplinary actions that are currently challenged, not as a second or third action under progressive discipline principles but for the purpose of establishing clear notice. **Potential for Rehabilitation:** Potential for rehabilitation can be both major aggravating and mitigating factor. An employee with a significant disciplinary record most likely would have poor potential for rehabilitation. However, an employee with no prior disciplinary record, good prior performance and job dedication would probably have good potential for rehabilitation.

An employee’s recognition of a personal problem that may negatively affect conduct weighs favourably in determining an employee’s potential for rehabilitation. Willingness to seek counselling assistance through an Employee Assistance Program or any self-help activity to deal, for instance, with an anger management problem or a family situation which is negatively affecting attendance are good indicators of a potential for rehabilitation. Simply put, recognizing one has a problem and doing something about it, are factors, which may influence mitigation. Mitigation means sometimes “you have to say you are sorry.” Apologizing for misconduct usually helps. Recognizing a mistake and taking responsibility for one’s misconduct are factors that are clearly mitigating. An employee’s admission of wrongdoing on his/her own also constitutes a mitigating factor and the earlier the better for possible mitigation. There is no guarantee the truth will set an employee free, but it may result in reducing a penalty. **Mitigating Circumstances** Unusual job tensions, personality problems, mental impairment, harassment, or bad faith, malice, or provocation on the part of others involved in an incident are mitigating circumstances, which should be checked.

Personal problems, which may place an employee under considerable stress, may be significant to warrant mitigation. The death of a spouse and a serious illness of family member are “life-shaking” events are examples of such stressors. Specific evidence should be presented how the misconduct was directly related to the personal problems and the subsequent stress. **Adequacy and Effectiveness of Alternative Sanctions** What needs to be done to deter the conduct in the future by the employee or others? This factor is listed last because this consideration should occur after a thorough analysis of all the other Douglas Factors. Remember, there is only one absolute penalty, which can be given without a Douglas analysis – the 30-day suspension required under law for misuse of a organizational vehicle. All other penalty determinations should undergo thorough reasoning under the Douglas Factors. However, demotion to a non-supervisory position instead of a removal may be the appropriate penalty for a supervisor who failed to discharge his/her required supervisory responsibilities but had a good record in non-supervisory positions. The deciding official must be prepared to support a penalty and communicate why it is the appropriate penalty. Remember, making an example of an employee is not an appropriate result of the disciplinary process. Applying these factors in determining the appropriate penalty is the objective.

Managing people for effective compliance to the rules and regulations is a skill that requires constant planning and development since humans are of diverse species and indeed dynamic. It is unarguable that no one loves to be dismissing from the organization or described as a failure irrespective of its coloration and/or pigmentation. A manager could be seen as that person who is vested with formal authority over an organization or one of its sub units, (offices), such a one has status that leads to various inter-personal relations and from this comes access to information, which enables the managers to devise strategies, make decisions and implement action towards organizational productivity.

## II. METHODOLOGY

In this study, the research involved the use of primary and secondary data sources, in which cross sectional survey method with the use of questionnaire was employed. The sample size of three hundred and fifty six (356) for this study was determined from the total population of 3200 of six selected civil service ministries in Rivers State using the Taro Yamane statistic for determination of sample from a finite population. As a result of the estimated sample size of the study, 356 structured questionnaire copies; constituting a 100% of the total estimate; were personally administered to staff of the target ministries civil service sector in Rivers State. Out of the 356 copies distributed, 333 copies were successfully retrieved indicating a retrieval success rate of 94%. All retrieved questionnaire copies were thereafter thoroughly cleaned and examined for error and blank incidences;

this process rendered 23 of the questionnaire useless and unsuitable for inclusion in the study analysis amounted to 6%. At the end, only 333 questionnaire copies; accounting for 94% were considered useful and thereafter served as a representative model for the population. The reliability of the structured questionnaire was ascertained through Test-re-test in which a pilot administration of the questionnaire was made on a portion of the chosen sample and administered after 3 weeks and relationship between the two results determined by correlation coefficient, through SPSS version 20.

### Methods of Data Analysis

Based on the nature of the study, which tends to find the relationship between two variables, (discipline management strategies and compliance success), the Pearson's product moment correlation co-efficient will be used to analysed the data. However, the analysis we be categorized under three headings: primary analysis, secondary analysis and tertiary analysis.

Table 1: Showing Descriptive Statistics For Discipline Management Strategies

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Discipline Management Strategies	333	1.00	4.00	3.6846	.842
Compliance success	333	1.00	4.00	3.4692	.735
Organizational culture	333	1.00	4.00	3.3735	.726
Leadership	333	1.00	4.00	3.4293	.721
Valid N (listwise)	333				

Source: Research Data 2018 (SPSS output version 20.0)

The data in table 1 above illustrate the descriptive statistics summary for the study variables which are discipline management strategies (independent variable), compliance success (dependent variable) which organizational culture and leadership (moderating variable).

### Presentation of Results on the Test of Hypotheses

We had proposed twelve research hypotheses for this study to seek explanation to the relationship enquiry between discipline management strategies and compliance success as well as the moderating influence of organizational culture and leadership in such relationship. The Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient statistics was calculated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 to establish the relationship among the empirical referents of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable. Correlation coefficients can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value 0.00 represents a lack of correlation. In testing hypothesis 1 – 12, the following rules were upheld in accepting or rejecting the alternate hypotheses. All the coefficient values that indicate levels of significance (\* or \*\*) as calculated using SPSS were accepted and therefore, our null-hypotheses rejected; when no significance is indicated in the coefficient (r) value, we reject alternate hypotheses and accept the null-hypotheses. Our confidence interval was set at the 0.05 (two tailed) level of significance to test the statistical significance of the data in this study.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix Of Value Communication On Compliance Success

		Value communication	Order	Responsiveness
Value communication	Pearson Correlation	1	.634**	.749**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.001
	N	333	333	333
Order	Pearson Correlation	.634**	1	.907**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	333	333	333
Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.749**	.907**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	
	N	333	333	333

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 2 above shows the correlation in hypotheses one and two. The correlation for hypothesis one shows a significant correlation at  $r = .634^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{01}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between value communication and order.

The correlation for hypothesis two shows a significant correlation at  $r = .749^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the non-hypothesis ( $H_{02}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between value communication and responsiveness.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix For Organizational Justice On Compliance Success

		Organizational Justice	Order	Responsiveness
Organizational justice	Pearson Correlation	1	.747**	.849**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.000
	N	333	333	333
Order	Pearson Correlation	.747**	1	.907**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.000
	N	333	333	333
Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.849**	.907**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	333	333	333

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 3 above also showed the correlation coefficients in hypotheses three and four. The correlation for hypothesis three shows a significant correlation at  $r = .747^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{02}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between organizational justice and order. The correlation for hypothesis five shows a significant correlation at  $r = .849^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{04}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between organizational justice and responsiveness.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix For Consistency On Compliance Success

		Consistency	Order	Responsiveness
Consistency	Pearson Correlation	1	.919**	.892**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	333	333	333
Order	Pearson Correlation	.919**	1	.907**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	333	333	333
Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.892**	.907**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	333	333	333

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 4 above shows the correlation coefficient in hypotheses five and six. The correlation for hypothesis five shows a significant correlation at  $r = .919^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{05}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between consistency and order.

The correlation for hypothesis six shows a significant correlation at  $r = .892^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{06}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between consistency and responsiveness.



Table 5: Correlation Matrix For Enforcement On Compliance Success

		Enforcement	Order	Responsiveness
Enforcement	Pearson Correlation	1	.887**	.889**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	333	333	333
Order	Pearson Correlation	.887**	1	.907**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	333	333	333
Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.889**	.907**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	333	333	333

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 4 shows the correlation of hypotheses seven and eight. The correlation for hypothesis seven shows a significant correlation at  $r = .887^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{07}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between enforcement and order. The correlation for hypothesis eight shows a significant correlation at  $r = .889^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{08}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between enforcement and responsiveness.

Table 5: Correlation Matrix For Penalty Appropriateness On Compliance Success

		Penalty appropriateness	Order	Responsiveness
Penalty appropriateness	Pearson Correlation	1	.973**	.870**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	333	333	333
Order	Pearson Correlation	.973**	1	.907**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	333	333	333
Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.870**	.907**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	333	333	333

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 5 above represents the correlation in hypotheses nine and ten. The correlation for hypothesis nine shows a significant correlation at  $r = .973^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{09}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between penalty appropriateness and order. The correlation for hypothesis ten shows a significant correlation at  $r = .870^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ( $H_{10}$ ), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between penalty appropriateness and responsiveness.

Table 6: Partial Correlations For The Role Of Organizational Culture

Control Variables			Discipline Management Strategies	Compliance Success	Organizational Culture
-none- <sup>a</sup>	Discipline Management Strategies	Correlation	1.000	.787	.972
		Significance (2-tailed)		.000	.000
		Df	0	331	331
	Compliance	Correlation	.787	1.000	.857

Culture	Organizational Culture	Significance tailed)	(2-.000	.	.000
		Df	331	0	331
	Discipline Management Strategies	Correlation	.972	.857	1.000
		Significance tailed)	(2-.000	.000	.
	Compliance Success	Df	331	331	0
		Correlation	1.000	.382	
	Leadership	Significance tailed)	(2-.000	.000	.
		Df	0	330	
	Leadership	Correlation	.382	1.000	
		Significance tailed)	(2-.000	.	
Leadership	Df	330	0		

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In table 6, the zero-order partial correlation between discipline management strategies and compliance success shows the correlation coefficient where organizational culture is not moderating the relationship; and this is, indeed, both very high (0.972) and statistically significant (P-value(= 0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for organizational culture however is (.382) and statistically significant (P-value (= 0.000) < 0.05).The observed positive ‘relationship’ between discipline management strategies is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and organizational culture.Looking at the zero correlation, we find that both reward structure management are highly positively correlated with organizational culture, the control variable.Removing the effect this control variable reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be (.382) and it is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , therefore, we reject the null hypotheses and conclude that: organizational culture significantly moderates the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success of selected ministry in civil service sector in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

Table 7: Partial Correlations For The Role Of Leadership

Control Variables			Discipline Management Strategies	Compliance success	Leadership
-none- <sup>a</sup>	Discipline Management Strategies	Correlation	1.000	.787	.952
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	331	331
	Compliance Success	Correlation	.787	1.000	.883
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		Df	331	0	331
Leadership	Leadership	Correlation	.952	.883	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		Df	331	331	0
	Discipline Management Strategies	Correlation	1.000	.378	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		Df	0	330	
Compliance success	Correlation	.378	1.000		
	Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.		
	Df	330	0		

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In table 7, the zero-order partial correlation between discipline management strategies and compliance success shows the correlation coefficient where leadership is not moderating the relationship; and this is, indeed, both very high (0.952) and statistically significant (P-value(= 0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for leadership however is (.378) and statistically significant (P-value (= 0.000) < 0.05).The observed positive ‘relationship’ between discipline management strategies is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and leadership. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that both discipline management strategies are highly positively correlated with leadership, the control variable. Removing the effect this control variable reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be (.378) and it is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , therefore, we reject the null hypotheses and conclude that: leadership

significantly moderates the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success of selected ministry in civil service sector in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

#### IV. MAIN DISCUSSION

This study, using descriptive and inferential statistics methods investigated the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success of selected ministries in the civil service sector in Port Harcourt, Rivers State as well as the moderating effects of organizational culture and leadership. The findings revealed a positive and significant relationship between Discipline Management Strategies and Compliance Success using Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient tool at 95% confidence interval. The relationship of the dimensions of the discipline management strategies = value communication, The moderating variables of organizational culture and leadership were also moderated. Discipline in an organization is intended to promote a minimum acceptable behaviour by employees. Discipline ensures smooth functioning and helps in creating a healthy business environment. Managing a group of people in a workplace is a complex task. Organizational leaders are familiar with the complexities that are in occurrence in managing an organization conflict. It represents between a managers and an employee are most likely a continuous encounter in the workplace. Ensuring a sound relationship between the management and employees depends upon how it is regulated by the manager. One of the conditions for maintaining such relationship is that employees should uphold a particular performance and behavioural standards.

The test of hypothesis one in table 1 shows a significant relationship between value communication and order in civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, communicating the value of discipline to the civil servants provides better knowledge that promotes voluntary compliance. This finding supports Hall (2003), who stated that advanced communication technology was not the cure for organizational communication problems but in the value that the messages convey. The table also shows a significant relationship between value communication and responsiveness in the character of the civil servants in Rivers State.

The test of hypothesis three in table 2 shows a significant relationship between organizational justice and order in civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, organizational management that encourages equity and fairness among civil creates a work climate of order and responsiveness. This supports the findings of Karriker (2009), maintained that, organizational justice builds an atmosphere of trust and confidence, Additionally, the impact of organizational justice perceptions on performance compliance is believed to awareness that equity and fairness exist

The test of hypothesis five in table 3 shows a significant relationship between consistency and order in civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, organization that consistently applies healthy discipline measure on all case of unethical standards discourages noncompliance to rules and s well instils voluntary abeyance to civil service rules. In this way, order is restored and compliant behaviour manifests. The table 3 in the test of hypothesis six also shows a significant relationship between consistency and responsiveness in civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, public sector ministries that allow consistency in their disciplinary approach earn responsive behaviour from the civil servants. These support the findings of Blyton & Turnball, 1998 and Imel, (2011).

The test of hypotheses seven and eight as presented in table 4 shows significant positive relationships between enforcement and order as well as responsiveness in civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that the public sector ministries that enforce the rules and regulations certainly earns order and performance responsiveness behaviour. This supports the findings of Amalia, (2011) who asserts that by enforcing laws and regulations, organization attempt to effectuate successful implementations of policies.

The test of hypotheses nine and ten in table 5 show significant relationship between penalty appropriateness and order as well as responsiveness in compliance behaviour of the civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, public sector ministries that apply penalties that are appropriately in correspondence with default standards encourages an atmosphere of satisfaction and equity amongst the employees of the state government. This is assumed to bring voluntary loyalty and compliance to rule of engagement at work.

In the tests of moderating roles of organizational culture and Leadership on disciplinary compliance success in the Rivers State civil service, the test of partial correlation of hypothesis eleven in table 6 shows a correlation coefficient result indicating that organizational culture significantly moderate the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success in civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, the public sector ministries with positive organizational culture attract loyal and self compliance work team. This is also shown in the test of partial correlation in hypothesis twelve where a correlation coefficient result indicated that the leadership of organizations significantly moderate the relationship between discipline management strategies and disciplinary compliance success in the civil service sector in Rivers State. This implies that, leadership of organizations hold the value of the institutions that enable organizations to be successful. Organizations with the right leaders that understand the disciplinary procedures among employees of organizations enhance compliance success.

#### IV CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the relationship between discipline management strategies and compliance success in Rivers State civil service.. Accordingly, the study strategies and methodology were designed in a way that points towards the achievement of the study objectives. The concluded that discipline management strategies through the use of value communication, organizational justice, consistency, enforcement and penalty appropriateness significantly influence compliance success(order and responsiveness) in the studied ministries in the Rivers State Civil service. This study therefore recommended based on the findings that:

- i. That the public sector ministries leadership should embrace the communication of disciplinary values to the employees through result driven channels and contents. When the civil servants are not constantly reminded about the consequences of defaulting rules and regulation as well as the necessity of compliance, the possibility of undermining rules is certain.
- ii. Organisational justice gives every civil servant the confidence of healthy workplace and thus enhances compliant commitment as well creating a responsive behavioural work team. The public sector ministries should be seen to have this instilled in the character of the workforce. Workers must be seen not learnt to be treated fairly without bias when applying disciplinary consequences in the ministries.
- iii. Consistency in disciplinary actions and processes serve as good strategy for discipline management and should be upheld to encourage voluntary compliance from the workforce.
- iv. That permanent secretaries of the public sector ministries should ensure enforcement of rules and regulations so as to control deviance frequency and regulate the behaviour and conduct of employees towards performance, order and responsive behaviour..
- v. The application of disciplinary measures should be appropriate and correspond with the nature and status of the offence. It becomes uncanny to punish a staff that came to work late with termination and same to the staff who defrauds the state of her funds. All these can be achieved when leadership id disciplined and positive workplace culture enshrined to drive the strategies that are recommended.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Amalia M. (2011). Does Temporary Affirmative Action Produce Persistent Effects? A Study of Black and Female Employment in Law Enforcement. *Journal of population of Economics*.
- [2] Sillars, A. (2008). Attributions and Communication in Roommate Conflicts. *Communication monographs* 47,(3): 180 – 200.
- [3] Blyton, P., & Turnbull, D. (1998). *The Dynamics of Employee Relations*, Hampshire, NY: Palgrave.
- [4] Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- [5] Du Plessis, J.V., & Fouche, M.A. (2006). *A Practical Guide to Labour Law*, (6th edition). Durban, SA: Lexis Nexis.
- [6] De Schrijver, A; Delbeke, K, Maesschalck, J; Pleysier, S., (2010) Fairness, Perceptions and Organizational Misbehaviour. *The American Review of Public Administration* 3, 230-249.
- [7] Downs, C., and Adrian, A.D., (2004). *Assessing Organization Communication: Strategic Communication Audits*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- [8] Hall, S. (2003). Codification/Decodification. In: SOVIK, L. (Org).
- [9] Eni (2000). Disciplinary Practice and Procedures in Employment. Available at <https://www.gov.im/media/622907/codeofpracticeondisciplinary.pdf>. Retrieved on 18<sup>th</sup> of February, 2018.
- [10] Franklin and Pagan (2006). Organization Culture as an Explanation for Employee Discipline Practices. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 26 (1) 52-73.
- [11] Imel, J.L. (2011). Organizational Effects of Inconsistent Discipline. Retrieved from <http://www.usfa.fema.gov/pdf/eford/efo45603.pdf>.
- [12] Jegadeesan, G. (2008). Employee Discipline: Concepts and Issues. *Human Resource Management series*.
- [13] Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a Multi-foci Approach to the Study of Justice, Social Exchange, and Citizenship Behaviour: The Target Similarity Model. *Journal of Management* 33, 841–866.
- [14] Margaret L.H., (2014). State Enforcement of Federal Law. *New York University Law Review*, Vol., 86, 2011, Cardoza Legal Studies Research Paper No. 313. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com>
- [15] Margaret, L H. & Alex S, (2010). Strategic Enforcement. *Minnesota Law Review*, 95, 2011, Cardoza Legal Studies Research Paper No. 305.
- [16] Rollinson, Handley, Hook and Foot (2007). *Understanding Employment Relations*, McGraw-Hill Education, UK.

- [17] Six, F. (2005). *The Trouble with Trust: The Dynamics of Interpersonal Trust Building*. Massachusetts, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [18] Van den Bos, K. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Assessing the information to which people are reacting has a pivotal role in understanding organizational justice. In S. Gilliland, D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice* (pp.63–84). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- [19] Zachary C., (2016). Law Enforcement as Political Questions. Available at: <https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndllr/vol.91/iss4/11>. Retrieved on the 18<sup>th</sup> of March, 2018.