
A STUDY OF DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOR AND WITHDRAWAL INTENTIONS IN EDUCATION SECTOR

VIVEK KOTEKAR

Abstract: The aim of current study was a study of deviant workplace behavior and withdrawal intentions in education sector. By using purposive sampling method, 110 students were selected from Gwalior city and outside area. For the purpose of data collection, a standardized questionnaire was utilized. To measure deviant workplace behavior developed by Bennett & Robinson's (2000) and Withdrawal Intention scale of Roodt (2004) were used. The measure would be Likert-type. Cronbach Alpha, Regression analysis, T-test were used for the analysis of collected data. Current study indicates that there is a significant relationship between Deviant Workplace behavior and Withdrawal Intention .

Key concepts: Education Sector, Deviant Workplace behavior ,Withdrawal Intention .

Introduction: Employees' behaviour and attitudes towards work is key for any organisation to achieve its goals and objectives. However, employers of labour must recognise the fact that not all employees embrace good behaviour; some may consciously or unconsciously exhibit unethical and unruly behaviours in the course of work; this regarded as workplace deviant behavior. Behaviour is considered deviant when employees are non-conforming to an organisation's policies, core values, culture etc., and such behaviour impede the vision, welfare and organizational standards, deviant behaviors are believed to be detrimental to the goals and interests of other members of the organisation. Deviant behaviour is counterproductive and whether such behaviour is noticeable or not, it does not only has adverse effects on organizational productivity. Deviant behaviour in the workplace having some basic features that tend to affect the effectiveness of the organisation and her ability to achieve objectives. Some of these features include poor quality of work, destruction of property, sabotage, theft of property, misuse of time and resources, abuse against others, unethical verbal and physical actions, intentionally working slow, or taking long breaks, favouritism, gossiping, harassment and the likes As already stated, all these affect organisation efficiency and performance. these behaviours can undermine the level of organisational performance and its competitive strength. Employees create a set of expectations about their workplace, people tend to make psychological contracts with their organizations. When their expectations are not met, the employee may feel a psychological negativity by their employers. Workplace deviance may arise from the worker's perception that their organization has mistreated him or her in some manner. Employees then resort to misbehaving as a means of avenging their organization for the perceived wrongdoing. Workplace deviance may be viewed as a form of negative reciprocity. the maxim "an eye for an eye" is

a concept that some employees strongly feel is a suitable approach to their problem. However, what is critical in understanding employee deviance is that the employee get being wronged, whether having deviance or not. Workplace deviance is also closely related to abusive supervision. Abusive supervision can change the productive capability of any employee as we can find in organizations. This could be when supervisors pressurize their employees, give them the silent treatment and should remind them their past failures smoothly It may seem like employees who are abused by their supervisor will directly withdraw by quitting the job but in reality many strike out against their employer by engaging in organizational deviant behaviors. Since employees control many of the organization's resources, they often use, or abuse anything they can. This abuse of resources may come in the form of time, office supplies, raw materials, finished products or the services that they provide. This usually occurs in two steps. First step is that commitment is destroyed and employees stop caring about the welfare of the employer. Workplace experiences may fuel the worker to act out. Research has been conducted demonstrating that the perception of not being respected is one of the main causes for workplace deviance; workplace dissatisfaction is also a factor There are two preventive measures that business owners can use to protect themselves. The first is strengthening the employee's commitment by reacting strongly to abusive supervision so that the employee knows that the behavior is not accepted. Holding the employee at high esteem by reminding them of their importance, or setting up programs that communicate concern for the employee may also strengthen employee commitment. Providing a positive ethical climate can also help. Employers can do this by having a clear code of conduct that is applied to both managers and employees alike. Employee silence is also considered a deviant

behavior in the workplace, falling into the realms of becomes employee deviance sometime employee hide some important ideas and also the information which may be useful for organization. The problem occurs if an employee fails to disclose important information, which detrimentally affects the effectiveness of the organization due to poor communication. Workplace deviance may be expressed in various ways. Employees can engage in minor, extreme, nonviolent or violent behavior, which ultimately leads to an organization's decline in productivity. Interpersonal and organizational deviance are two forms of workplace deviance which are directed differently; however, both cause harm to an organization.

Interpersonal deviance: Interpersonal deviance can occur when misconduct "target(s) specific stakeholders such as coworkers". Behavior falling within this subgroup of employee deviance includes gossiping about coworkers and assigning blame to them. These minor (but unhealthy) behaviors, directed at others, are believed to occur as some employees perceive "a sense of entitlement often associated with exploitation". In other words, they feel the need to misbehave in ways that will benefit them. Deviant behavior typically aimed directly at the organization is often referred to as organizational deviance. Organizational deviance encompasses production and property deviance. Workplace-deviant behavior may be expressed as tardiness or excessive absenteeism. These behaviors have been cited by some researchers as "withdraw(al) behaviors...such behaviors allow employees to withdraw physically and emotionally from the organization".

Silence: Employee silence is also considered a deviant behavior in the workplace, falling into the realms of both interpersonal and organizational deviance. Silence becomes employee deviance when "an employee intentionally or unintentionally withholds any kind of information that might be useful to the organization". The problem occurs if an employee fails to disclose important information, which detrimentally affects the effectiveness of the organization due to poor communication.

Coworker backstabbing

Coworker backstabbing occurs to some degree in many workplaces. It consists of an employee's doing something to another employee to get a "leg up" on the other employee. Strategies used for backstabbing include dishonesty, blame (or false accusation), discrediting others and taking credit for another's work. Motives for backstabbing include disregarding others' rights in favor of one's own gain, self-image management, revenge, jealousy and personal reasons.

Cyberloafing : A novel form of workplace deviance has emerged in recent years, as technology becomes a

both interpersonal and organizational deviance. bigger part of people's work lives. Internet workplace deviance ("cyberloafing") has become another way for employees to avoid the tasks at hand. This includes surfing the web and doing non-work-related tasks on the internet such as chatting on social-networking sites, online shopping and other activities.

Production deviance: All behaviors in which deviant employees partake ultimately have a negative impact on the overall productivity of the organization. For this reason, all are considered production deviance. Production deviance is "behavior that violates formally prescribed organizational norms with respect to minimal quality and quantity of work to be accomplished as part of one's job".

Property deviance: More serious cases of deviant behavior harmful to an organization concern property deviance. Property deviance is "where employees either damage or acquire tangible assets without authorization". This type of deviance typically involves theft but may include "sabotage, intentional errors in work, misusing expense accounts", among other examples.

Aggressive Behavior: Workplace deviance can take the form of aggressive behavior. Common examples include sexual harassment, intimidation and showing open hostility toward co-workers. In diverse work environments, deviance may occur when employees display intolerance of co-workers of different nationalities or cultures. In work situations where safety is paramount, such as on construction or highway repair sites, aggressive behavior can result from workers performing in a reckless manner that endangers the safety of coworkers.

Unproductive Behavior: Actions that disrupt or limit productivity are also a form of workplace deviance. Workers who waste time by standing around the water cooler, taking the "scenic route" when making sales calls or stretching out the time it takes to complete a task hinder productivity, which costs the company money. Other examples include showing up late for work, calling in sick when in perfect health, sneaking out early or taking extended lunch hours or coffee breaks.

Abuse of Property: Employees who abuse company property are committing deviant acts. Examples include employees who use company vehicles for personal errands when this is prohibited, who damage company equipment or who deface work areas. Abuse of property can also take the form of outright theft, such as when employees take home office supplies or fail to return items they borrowed from the company. Employees

who are responsible for keeping track of the number of hours they work are guilty of property deviance if they "pad" their timesheets.

Organizational Politics: The game of "organization politics" occurs in many workplaces and can be considered a form of workplace deviance. An employee may spread false rumors or gossip about another in an effort to gain a promotion or more favorable work assignment. Supervisors who unfairly favor one employee over another or prevent deserving employees from career advancement are also guilty of committing a deviant act. Employees who regularly engage in gossip sessions can have a negative impact on employee morale.

Withdrawal Intention: Employee intent to move from an organization across the membership boundary. This withdrawal intent may be increased due to few Organizational variables like supervision, climate, and Personal variables including job satisfaction, job expectations for the future.

Review Of Literature: Graeme K. Mitchell (2004) pointed out that when there were high levels of perceived supervisor support and the remarks of pay equity then negative office behaviors were low and organization citizenship performances were high. Marco Elikem Mensah, Eric Delle , Bernard Nmashie Nmai(2015) found that principled climate had a significant affect and it negatively anticipated the turnover intentions. Akikibofori Jacob (2013) observed that the aim to quit, displeasure and companies abhorrence has an positive effect on the unusual workplace behavior whereas dissatisfaction has a positive consequence on the aim to leave and therefore nonstandard workplace behavior has a negative effect on the personality& performance. Bamikole. O. Fagbohunbe, Gabriel A. Akinbode (2015) stated that the strength of interpersonal influence , self- effectiveness and the connection between managerial reactions and deviant deeds, elevated levels of negative reactions worsened illusory behaviors for male clusters in contrast to female associates. Ghulam Abid, Binish Khan , Zeeshan Rafiq, Alia Ahmed (2015) studied that almost all individualities are victims of some form of discourtesy at the place of work. However, there is no substantial distinction in the institute that adds on the foundation of vulgarity. Muafi (2011) showed that the objective to quit, displeasure and company disapproval have an confirmatory effect on deviant workplace behavior, unhappiness also has a encouraging effect on readiness to give up but deviant workplace deeds has negative consequence on person& presentation. Kristoffer Holm, (2016) found that discourteous behaviors are not fully into protection nowadays. keeping out from the society and not being valued for their aptitude, and pompous

behavior are impolite behaviors usually allied with provisional agency work. Yoav Vardi, and Ely weitz (2002) sustained the theory of logical deeds in forecasting unenthusiastic workplace activities. Both approach and prejudice norms help in explanation of organizational misconducts. Ana Marta Braga Rodrigues, established that the relationship between perceived politics and task presentation was intruded by validity. The relationship between apparent politics and supervisor-rated unpredicted behavior was mediated by poignant commitment to the institute.. Sandra L. Robinson, Rebecca J. Bennett(1995) brought into being deviant workplace behaviors varied along two features : small against severe, and interpersonal in opposition to organizational. On the basis of these two aspects, workers - deviances comes into view to descend into four different categories: making deviance, belongings deviance, biased deviance, and individual antagonism. Jesus F. Salgado, (2002) found that meticulousness forecasted unusual behaviors and proceedings, and companionability, frankness, friendliness and disturbing constancy predicted the turnover principles. Kibeom Lee and Natalie J. Allen (2002) screened that work recognition plays an vital role in predicting when job influence is symbolized by two general frames of mind up-and-down (positive and negative affect). When separate sentiments were used to symbolize job influence, job suffering plays as imperative role as job acknowledgment variables, strongly advise the importance of taking into consideration distinct emotions in job concern research. Patrick d. Dunlop and kibeom lee (2004) established the presence of unusual employees behavior among industry elements encroached upon the show of the business piece as a whole, whereas OCBs had moderately little effect. Daniel P. Skarlicki and Robert Folger(1994) brought into being the allocation,procedural, and interface impartiality interacted to forecast organizational revengeful behavior. A next of kin between distributive justice and retaliation was found only when there was low interactional and procedural justice. Hui liao, Aparna Joshi and Aichia Chuang (2004)The results revealed that dissimilarities in civilization, amicability, and sincerity to practice were significantly related to organizational deviance; dissimilarities in gender, meticulousness, and Extraversion were considerably linked to interpersonal deviance. In addition, cultural distinction negatively envisaged POS and organizational commitment, maturity distinctions positively predicted apparent coworker support, Extraversion dissimilarity positively predicted coworker satisfaction,. Lisa Penney and Paul E. Spector(2003) indicated that impoliteness, organizational restriction, and interpersonal

disagreement were negatively related to job pleasure and positively related to CWB. sustainability was also found for the role of unconstructive affectivity as judicious. David J. Mellor, Kathleen A. MooreClaude Loquet(2004)said that the objective to quit is largely predisposed by job disappointment, lack of obligation to the organization and feelings of tension, which in the current model are inclined by job stressors. Aminah Ahmad, Zoharah Omar(2013), found that insulting supervision could boost up the intensity of work-family clashes experienced by employees, which in turn could translate into unexpected behaviors which are harmful to organizations. L a m a r c u s b o l t o n c & m a t t h e w j . G r a w i t c h (2011) concluded that there is escalating confirmation that organizations may be unintentionally promoting a dysfunctional ethnicity of deviancy, which finally eases, rather than holds back, such harmful behaviors

Objectives Of The Study

1. To modify and restandardize the measures of deviant workplace behavior.
2. To evaluate the impact of Deviant Workplace behavior on Withdrawal Intentions.
3. To identify the difference in deviant workplace behaviors across the gender.

Research Methodology: The study is causal in nature and survey was used to complete it. The

Results And Discussion

Reliability Test of Deviant Workplace Behavior and Withdrawal Intention

The reliability was computed by using PASW software. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was applied to compute reliability coefficients for all the items in the questionnaire.

No. of variable	Name of Variable	Croanbach Alpha	No. of Items
Variable 1	DwB	0.833	19
Variable 2	WI	0.790	3

It is considered that the reliability value more than 0.7 is considered good enough. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability value of Deviant Workplace Behavior and Withdrawal Intention were found to be 0.833 and 0.790 which values are higher than the standard value 0.7. therefore, the Questionnaire can be treated as reliable for the study. **Regression Analysis Ho: There is no cause and effect relationship**

sampling design taken considers all the employees of education industry as population for the study. The individual respondent was the sampling element. A sample size of 110 respondents were taken to conduct the study. The non-probability Purposive sampling method was used.

Tools Used For Data Collection: For the purpose of data collection, a standardized questionnaire was utilized. To measure deviant workplace behavior developed by Bennett & Robinson's (2000) and Withdrawal Intention scale of Roodt (2004) were used. The measure would be Likert-type and would possess a sensitivity of 5, where the extreme values namely 1 and 5 would represent strongly disagree and strongly agree respectively.

Tools Used For Data Analysis

1. Reliability test was applied to check the reliability of the questionnaires with the help of Cronbach Alpha.
2. Regression analysis was applied to find the relationship between workplace deviant bhaviors and withdrawal intention.
3. T-test was applied for measuring the difference of opinion for the variable across demographic.

between Independent variable and dependent variable. The linear regression analysis was applied to establish cause and effect relationship between Deviant Workplace Behavior and Withdrawal Intention. Here in this regression equation, DwB was taken as independent variable and Withdrawal Intention was treated as dependent variable.

Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.389	.151	.143	3.15696

The result of Model summary indicated through R² value which was found to be 0.151, indicating that DwB having 15.1% impact on Withdrawal Intention.

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	191.493	1	191.493	19.214	.000 ^a
	Residual	1076.370	108	9.966		
	Total	1267.864	109			

a. Predictors: (Constant), DwB

b. Dependent Variable: WI

The goodness fit of the model was tested using ANOVA and the F-value was found to be 19.214 which is significant at the .000 level of significance, indicating that the model is showing good fit.

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	4.644	.680		6.827	.000
DwB	.084	.019	.389	4.383	.000

a. Dependent Variable: WI

The contribution of independent variable was evaluated through computation of β value for the independent variable DwB was 0.389 with the T-Test value of 4.383 which was significant at 0.000, indicating that DwB contribute significantly to Withdrawal Intention. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis was rejected, indicating that there is a positive cause and effect relationship between DwB and WI.

T-test for difference between Male and Female

T-test was applied to find the differences between Male and Female on Deviant Workplace Behavior and Withdrawal Intention.

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
DwB	Male	56	32.2500	17.39410	2.32438
	Female	54	31.4259	14.07340	1.91515
WI	Male	56	8.1250	3.44865	.46085
	Female	54	6.4815	3.19044	.43416

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.633	.428	.273	108	.786	.82407	3.02329	-5.16862	6.81676
Equal variances not assumed			.274	104.869	.785	.82407	3.01173	-5.14773	6.79587
Equal variances assumed	2.154	.145	2.592	108	.011	1.64352	.63405	.38672	2.90032
Equal variances not assumed			2.596	107.818	.011	1.64352	.63315	.38849	2.89855

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was checked through F-test and value of F-test was found to be 0.633 significant at 0.428 indicating that the groups form on the basis of male and female were having equal variances and therefore the value of t- test assuming equal variances was taken. The t- test value of equal variances assumed was .273 significant at 0.786s indicating that there was no significant difference between the male and female respondents on Deviant Workplace behavior. The group statistics table indicated that male have high Deviant Workplace behavior than female indicated by mean

value of male 32.2500 in comparison to mean value of female i.e. 31.4259 Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was checked through F-test and value of F-test was found to be 2.154 significant at .145 indicating that the groups form on the basis of male and female were having equal variances and therefore the value of t- test assuming equal variances was taken. The t- test value of equal variances assumed was 2.592 significant at 0.011 indicating that there was significant difference between the male and female respondents on Withdrawal Intention. The group statistics table indicated that male have higher

withdrawal intention than female indicated by mean value of male 8.1250 in comparison to mean value of female ie. 6.4815.

Conclusion: The conclusion of the current study indicates that there is a significant relationship between Deviant Workplace behavior and

Withdrawal Intention i.e. it is the possibility that the individuals displaying deviant workplace behavior are intent to leave the organization and vice-versa may also be possible. The gender difference was observed in Withdrawal Intention but, not seen in Deviant Workplace behavior.

References:

- Anwar, M.N., Sarwar, M. & et.al (2011). Gender differences in workplace deviant behavior of University teachers and modification techniques. *International Education Studies* Vol4(1), 193-197.
- Chikwature, W., Oyedele, V. (2016). Effect of deviant behavior on academic performance in mutare urban primary schools in Mutare district. *European Journal of psychological research* Vol 3(1), 35-45. ISSN 2057-4794
- Fagbohunbe, B.O., Akinbode, G.A. & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organizational Determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management* Vol 7(5), 207-221 ISSN 1833-3850 E-ISSN 1833-8119
- Javed, R., Amjad, M. & et.al (2014). Investigating factors affecting employee workplace deviant behavior. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies* Vol.9(3), 1073-1078, ISSN 2028-9324
- Jacob, S. A. (2013). *Work Place Deviant Behaviour: A Case Study of Intels Nigeria Limited*, Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol.3 (22), 49-57.
- Abidi Ghulam, Khan, Rafiq, Zeeshan Binish, Ahmed, Alia. (2015). *Workplace Incivility: Uncivil Activities, Antecedents, Consequences; And Level Of Incivility*, *Sci.Int.(Lahore)*, 27(6), 6361-6366.
- Mitchell, K. Graeme. (2004). *Organizational Correlates Of Negative Workplace Behavior: A Field Study*, A Thesis Presented for the Master of Arts Degree The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Liao Hui, Joshi Aparna, Chuang Aichia. (2004). *Sticking Out Like A Sore Thumb: Employee Dissimilarity And Deviance At Work* *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 969-1000.
- Lee Kibeom and Allen J. Natalie. (2002). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions*, *Journal of Applied Psychology* Copyright 2002 by the American Psychological Association, , Vol. 87 (1), 131-142.
- Mensah Elikem Marco, Delle Eric, Nmai Nmashe Bernard. (2015). *Ethical Climate as a Predictor of Counterproductive Work Behaviours and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Level of Education* *The International Journal Of Business & Management*, 30.
- Dunlop D. Patrick and Lee Kibeom (2004). *Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel* *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 25, 67-80
- Muafi (2011). *Causes and Consequence Deviant Workplace Behavior*, *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 2, PG 123-126
- Holm Kristoffer, Torkelson Eva, Bäckström Martin (2016). *New Types of Employment, New Ways to Be Uncivil? A Thematic Analysis of Temporary Agency Workers' Exposure to Workplace Incivility* *Bäckström Psychology*, 2016, 7, Pg 74-84
- BOLTON LAMARCUS & GRAWITCH J.MATTHEW. (2011). *When Good Employees Go Bad: How Organizational Incivility May Influence Workplace Deviance*, *Organizational Health Initiative*
- Robinson L. Sandra; Bennett J. Rebecca (1995). *A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study*, *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38 (2), 555-572.
- Penney M. Lisa AND SPECTOR E. PAUL E. (2005). *Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): the moderating role of negative affectivity*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 777-796.
- Daniel P. Skarlicki, Folger Robert. (1994). *Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice* *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 82(3), 434-443.

Vivek Kotekar
Student, Rajaram College Maharashtra