WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOURS AMONG DEGREE COLLEGE AND EDUCATIONALCOLLEGE TEACHERS OF PUNJAB-INDIA

Harjeet Kaur

GHG College of Education, Raikot, Ludhiana (India)

ABSTRACT

The existing research was carried out to study the workplace deviant behaviours among the college teachers of Punjab. In this study the researcher had taken college teachers of degree colleges and education colleges of Punjab. The descriptive method was used to acquire accurate and important information. The objective was to find the levels of deviant behaviours in degree colleges and education colleges, difference between the deviant behaviours of degree colleges and Education College, gender and experience related differences in workplace deviant behaviours of degree colleges and education colleges of Punjab. The investigator selected 300 college teachers through stratified random sampling technique (150 from degree colleges and 150 from education colleges). The investigator used Work Place Deviant Behaviour scale by Bennett and Robinson (2000) to collect the data. The result showed that, teachers exhibited High level of workplace deviant behaviours, exhibited Moderate level whereas exhibited Low level of workplace deviant behaviour. teachers differ on their workplace deviant behaviours on the basis of gender. school teachers have approximately equal workplace deviant behaviours asteachers of Punjab.

Keywords*: Workplace Deviant Behaviours, College Teachers, Degree Colleges, Education colleges*

1. INTRODUCTION

Workplace deviance is one of the major problems in the organizations these days. As approximately 70% of the working community is affected by the deviant workplace deviance but this type of behaviours in teaching fraternity is very harmful for the society. According to Robinson and Bennett (2000), the person who is deviant firstly goes against the organization's norms regardless of the norms of the society. Therefore, the term "deviant behaviours" means only that behaviours which deviates from the obvious and desired norms of the organization. Secondly, these types of behaviours threaten the health of an organization, its members, or both. Most important factor is that, the deviance is

voluntary or intentional and is not accidental, means individuals involve in deviant acts intentionally to harm organization. These individuals believe that they have been wronged by someone; they can blame somebody at workplace (Aquino et al., 2001).

Bennett and Robinson (1995) explained that the behavior might be deviant when an "Institutional norms, policies, customs, rules and regulations are violated by an individual staff member or group of staff members that might make vulnerable the well-being of the institution or its teachers". Deviant behavior is any behavior considered deviant by society, which might range from the minimum to the maximum.

According to Rossouw and Van Vuuren (2010), "Deviant behavior is used as a combined term for what is described by different investigators as deviance".

According to Edwards and Greenberg (2012) a new term as Insidious Workplace Behaviour (IWB) is defined as "a form of intentionally harmful workplace behaviour that is legal, subtle, and low level, repeated overtime, and directed at individuals or organizations".

1.1 DIMENSIONSOF WORK DEVIANT BEHAVIOURSGIVEN BY BENNETT &ROBINSON (2003) ARE

(1) **Interpersonal:** It means deviant behaviour with the fellow workers (gossiping, lying).

(2) **Organizational**: It means deviant behaviour towards the organization (lateness or theft of equipment).

Fundamentally, Education is a means of overcoming handicaps and achieving greater equality, wealth and status in the society. Educational institutions are an important section of the society and formal education is the important part of it. Behaviours of the team member are analyzed as the range of actions and manners made by members of these organisms. Teacher is the personality who takes the responsibility of the country on their shoulders. The behaviour of a teacher is ultimately the result of the leadership and its institutional or organizational issues (Cole (2005)). Behavioural study of teachers is very important to understand the problems of current education system.

2. REVIEW OF LITRATURE

Knights and Kennedy (2005) identified that teachers' commitment with their profession had relationship with workplace deviant behaviours. The result concluded that decrease in teachers commitment resulted in high deviant behaviours.

Lawrence and Robinson (2007) explained in the study that when teachers perceived that they were not receiving proper attention or not respected in the institution, they would not respond positively in fulfilling their responsibilities. It would result astheir deviant behaviours in the school.

Thau and Mitchell (2010) explained in the study that when teachers felt thatthey were not treated fairly in the institution, in addition to that when the teachers felt that norms and rules of the institution are not respectful towards them then they showed deviance in the institution.

Iqbal (2012) concluded in the study that when the teachers were unappreciated, overworked and humiliated in the organizations then they felt frustrated at their organization ultimately that made the behaviours of the teachers' deviant.

Skellern, J., Johnson, P., & Thomson, M. (2016) explained that the psychosocial distance, management of teachers and the structuring distance from teachers was to assess the relationship between emotional institutional commitment and institutional citizenship behaviours. The teachers' trust in administrators was expected to mediate these relationships. In addition, the accuracy of communication and openness and participation in decision making were expected to reduce the psychological distance. Management of Psychosocial Distance for Teachers and OAC had a bad effect on trust. Confidence in management had a positive effect on AC, and trust in supervisors had a positive effect on AC. Structural distance did not affect teachers' results. Participation in communication and decision-making reduced the psychological distance from managers to teachers. The discussion focused on the impact of outcomes on improving the effectiveness of schools.

Barkhordari-Sharifabad, M., et. al. (2017) concluded in their research the relation between organizational climate and employee's deviant workplace behaviours. Ethical organizational climate reduced the workplace deviant behaviours of the employees.

Olajide, J. L., Oladele, I. O., Odeyemi, O. J., &Babarinsa, S. O. (2017)) explained that the diverse cultures work force which had significant influence on the behaviours of employees. It was found that organization cultures relationship with other organizational variables like commitment, satisfaction, leadership, organizational performance and employee turnover were established by this literature review study. Research revealed that possession of similar norms and values by the organization and its employees improved the behaviours of the employees towards achieving the goals of the organization.

Marasi, S., Bennett, R. J., &Budden, H. (2018) analyzed organizational structure as predictors of workplace deviance. Reactance theory suggested a negative relationship between participation in decision-making (centralization) and workplace deviance, as well as a positive relationship between hierarchy of authority (centralization) and workplace deviance. Situational strength theory, formalization was expected to have a negative relationship with workplace deviance. Additionally, hypotheses were developed based on social exchange theory, Results showed each of the organizational structure components had significant relationships with workplace deviance, as well as had higher effect levels with organizational deviance than interpersonal deviance.

Kanwal, I., Lodhi, R. N., &Kashif, M. (2019) examined critical associations of transformational leadership, Laissez-faire leadership, transactional leadership, and authoritative leadership styles to predict perceived workplace ostracism among frontline employees. The authoritative leadership, transactional leadership, and Laissez-Faire leadership styles were found to positively relate to workplace ostracism while transformational leadership style was found to negatively relate to workplace ostracism. The managers working in customer service organizations in general and telecom sector in particular should offer leadership training programs to transform supervisors by re-shaping their thinking as visionary leaders of future.

Grant, M., Chaudhry, Z., Shawe-Taylor, M. J., & Lam, J. (2020) revealed the direct effect of authoritarian leadership on employee deviant behavior and the moderated roles of benevolent leadership and moral leadership, also analyzed the mediated mechanism of self-interest oriented ethical climate and rule oriented ethical climate. The results showed that the higher the degree of authority leaders showed in the organization, the easier to

stimulate workplace deviance of employee, self-interest oriented ethical climate and rule oriented ethical climate played mediated role between authoritarian leadership and workplace deviant behavior. The interaction of benevolent leadership and moral leadership with authoritarian leadership could weaken the self-interest oriented ethical climate but had nothing to do with rule orient ethical climate.

Nasib Dar(2020) explained thatthe intentions of employees about their current job played an important role in enabling organizations.The results exhibited that if overqualified employees perceived their current job as a career job then there werea more likelihood that they would be involved in some innovative and creative behaviour instead of deviating negatively from the organization norms.

Workplace deviance among teachers has become a great problem in educational institutions these days. When teachers have these types of behaviours than it goes to the students and ultimately it goes in the society. Robinson and Greenberg (1998), "There is currently no generally accepted definition or terminology regarding teacher deviance".Higher education is the backbone of the society so the teachers at this level affect the youth very closely. In Punjab (India) there exist variety of colleges, but in this study the researcher is considering to assess the level of workplace deviance among the teachers of Degree College and educational college teachers. The researcher is also comparing the workplace deviance among Degree College and educational college teachers. In addition to it the gender and experience related differences among these two types of institutions are also going to be calculated in this study.

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To find the levels of deviant behaviours in degree colleges and education colleges teachers in Punjab.
2. To find the difference between the deviant behaviours of degree colleges and Education College teachers in Punjab.
3. To find the gender related difference in workplace deviant behaviours of degree colleges and education colleges of Punjab.

4. HYPOTHESIS

Following hypothesis were tested in the present study:

Ho: 1 There is no significant difference between the deviant behaviours of degree colleges and Education College teachers in Punjab.

Ho: 2 There is no significant gender related difference between in workplace deviant behaviours of degree colleges and education colleges of Punjab.

5. METHODOLOGY

In the present study descriptive method of research was used. The population of the study comprise of teachers of degree colleges and education colleges of Punjab. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 300 teachers of degree colleges and education colleges' teachers, 150 from degree colleges and 150 education college teachers of Punjab. Further Male and Female teachers ofdegree colleges and education colleges were selected. The scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) was used for data collection of workplace Deviant Behaviour in the current study.

6. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

1). The first objective of the study was to find different levels of the workplace deviant behaviours among Degree College and education college teachers of Punjab are given in Table 1

Table 1: Levels of workplace deviant behaviors among degree college teachers

Levels of workplace deviant behaviours	Scores	Number of Teachers	Percentage
Low	19-56	95	63.33%
Moderate	57-95	42	28%
High	96-133	13	8.67%
Total		**150**	**100%**

Table1 indicated that 8.67% teachers of degree colleges exhibited high level of workplace deviant behaviours, 28%exhibited moderate level whereas 63.33% exhibited low level of workplace deviant behaviours.

Table 2: Levels of workplace deviant behaviors among education college teachers

Levels of workplace deviant behaviours	Scores	Number of Students	Percentage
Low	19-56	37	24.66%
Moderate	57-95	69	46%
High	96-133	44	29.34%
Total		**150**	**100%**

Table 2 indicated that 29.34% teachers of education colleges exhibited high level of workplace deviant behaviours, 46% exhibited moderate level whereas 24.66% exhibited low level of workplace deviant behaviours.

It could be concluded that teachers of Education College had higher levels of deviant behaviours than teachers of Degree College.

2) The second objective was to find the difference between the deviant behaviours of degree colleges and Education College teachers in Punjab. Mean scores, S.D. and t-value were designed and prepared in table 3.

Table 3: Difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab

Group Statistics

	INSTITUTIONS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCORE	DEGREE COLLEGE	150	46.79	20.935	1.709
	EDUCATION COLLEGE	150	61.09	19.300	1.576

**Significant at 0.01 Level

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SCORE Equal variances assumed	13.189	.000	-6.151	298	.000	-14.300	2.325	-18.875	-9.725
Equal variances not assumed			-6.151	296.051	.000	-14.300	2.325	-18.875	-9.725

Table 3 indicated that t-value (-6.151) for the difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab was significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, it could be interpreted that there existed a significant difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab. Education college teachers were exhibiting more work place deviant behaviors as compared to their counterparts. Thus, the hypothesis that there exists a significance difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab was accepted.

3. The third objective was to find the difference among degree college and education college teachers on the basis of gender of their workplace deviant behaviours. Mean scores, S.D. and t-value were designed and prepared in table 4.

Table 4: Gender related differences among degree college and education college teachers in their work place deviant behaviours

Group Statistics

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCORE	MALE	150	53.19	21.770	1.777
	FEMALE	150	54.69	20.945	1.710

**Significant at 0.01 Level

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SCORE	Equal variances assumed	2.694	.102	-.608	298	.544	-1.500	2.467	-6.354	3.354
	Equal variances not assumed			-.608	297.557	.544	-1.500	2.467	-6.354	3.354

Table 4 indicated that t-value (-.608) for the difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab was not significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, it could be interpreted that there existed no significant difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab. Thus, the hypothesis that there existed no significance difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers in Punjab was accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

Following conclusions were drawn on the basis of analysis and interpretation of data:

1. 8.67% teachers of degree colleges exhibited high level of workplace deviant behaviours, 28% exhibited moderate level whereas 63.33% exhibited low level of workplace deviant behaviours. 29.34% teachers of education colleges exhibited high level of workplace deviant behaviours, 46% exhibited moderate level whereas 24.66% exhibited low level of workplace deviant behaviours.

2. Education college teachers were exhibiting more work place deviant behaviors as compared to the teachers of Degree College.

3. There was no difference between the deviant behaviours of degree college and education college teachers on the basis of gender.

REFERENCES

Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., &Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, *7*(5), 586-598.

Aquino, K., Galperin, B. L., & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34(5), 1001-1029.

Baron, R. A., &Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, *22*(3), 161-173.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). The development of a measure of workplace deviance. Journal of Applied Psychology 85(3), 349-360.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), Organizational Behaviour: The State of the Science (2nd ed., pp. 247-281).

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.

Bolin, A., &Heatherly, L. (2001). Predictors of employee deviance: The relationship between bad attitudes and bad behaviour. Journal of Business and Psychology, 15(3), 405-18.

Bowling, N. A., &Eschleman, K. J. (2010). Employee personality as a moderator of the relationships between work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *15*(1), 91.

Casimir, G., McCormack, D., Djurkovic, N., &Nsubuga-Kyobe, A. (2012). Psychosomatic model of workplace bullying: Australian and Ugandan schoolteachers. Employee Relations, 34(4), 411-428.

De Vos, A., &Meganck, A. (2009). What HR managers do versus what employees value. Personnel Review.

Desrumaux, P., Machado, T., Przygodzki-Lionet, N., &Lourel, M. (2015). Workplace bullying and victims' prosocial or antisocial behaviors: What are the effects on equity, responsibility judgments, and help giving? Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 25(6), 509-521.

Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 25(1), 67-80.

Earle, H. A. (2003). Building a workplace of choice: Using the work environment to attract and retention. Journal of Facilities Management, 2(3), 244- 257.

Fagbohungbe, 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, 7(5), 207.

Gruys, M. L., &Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International journal of selection and assessment*, *11*(1), 30-42.

Gruys, M. L., &Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International journal of selection and assessment*, *11*(1), 30-42.

Howladar, M. H. R., Rahman, S., & Uddin, A. (2018). Deviant workplace behavior and job performance: the moderating effect of transformational leadership. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, *11*(1), 147-183.

Huiras, J., Uggen, C., &McMorris, B. (2000). Career jobs, survival jobs, and employee deviance: A social investment model of workplace misconduct. *The sociological quarterly*, *41*(2), 245-263.

Luthans, F. (2012). Psychological capital: Implications for HRD, retrospective analysis, and future directions. *Human resource development quarterly*, *23*(1), 1-8.

Mark, H.E. (1996). Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior. (Erie
document reproduetionserviee No. ED415573) .

Nasir, M., & Bashir, A. (2012). Examining workplace deviance in public sector
organizations of Pakistan. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *39*(4), 240-
253.

Rotundo, M., &Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and
counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-
capturing approach. *Journal of applied psychology*, *87*(1), 66

Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality
and relationships with facets of job performance. *International journal of selection
and assessment*, *10*(1-2), 5-11.

Stone, P. R., &Sharpley, R. (2013). Deviance, dark tourism and 'dark leisure': Towards a
(re) configuration of morality and the taboo in secular society. In *Contemporary
Perspectives in Leisure* (pp. 76-86). Routledge.

Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage. Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant Workplace Behaviour and
the Organization's Ethical Climate, Journal of Business and Psychology, 17(1),
47-56.

Vardi, Y. (2001). The effects of organizational and ethical climates on misconduct at
work. *Journal of Business ethics*, *29*(4), 325-337.

Wells, M., &Thelen, L. (2002) What does your workspace say about you? The influence of
personality, status and workspace on personalization." Environment and Behavior,
3: 300-321.