

¹D. Rama Lingeswara
Sarma²Dr. Pelleti Swarupa³Ms. Harshita Verma

Investigation into Factors Influencing Employee Deviant Behaviour in Workplace.



Abstract: - It is an ordinary wonder these days, in different organizations, to see that the employees abuse the essential authoritative rules, and participate in a behavior, which ends up being hostile to the organization. This sort of behavior, which is a deviation from the rules set some place by the organization is called "Deviational workplace behaviors." This study investigates factors influencing employee deviant behavior in the workplace. The objectives were to determine these factors and rank them based on their impact on deviant behavior. The research employed an exploratory and descriptive approach. Primary data was collected from 100 professors working in deemed universities using a structured questionnaire with 40 questions on a 5-point Likert scale. Secondary data was gathered from various journals. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha, and factor analysis was conducted using SPSS software to determine the relative strength of each factor.

Keywords: Hygiene factors, sexual exploitation, Negative deviational workplace behavior, Interpersonal results, Employee dissatisfaction

I. INTRODUCTION

The issue of employee deviation has received more attention lately (Fagbohungebe, Akinbode, & Ayodeji, 2012). Deviant behaviors in the workplace have been referred to by several names, including workplace aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1998), counterproductive behaviors (Bennet & Robinson, 2000), antisocial behavior (Robinson & Kelly, 1998), organizational misbehavior (Thompson & Ackroyd, 1999), and organizational incivility (Miner, Settles, Pratt-Hyatt, & Brady, 2012). Absenteeism, withdrawal, withholding effort at work, sexual harassment, unethical decision-making, disobeying manager instructions, purposefully slowing down the work cycle, arriving late to work, vandalism, rumor spreading, and corporate sabotage are just a few examples of the deviant behaviors that occur in the workplace (Bennet & Robinson, 2000).

Deviant behavior of employees at work has a big impact on the organizations and members. According to McCardle (2007), these actions can lower organizational efficiency, result in financial losses, and negatively affect workers' social and psychological well-being. Numerous antecedents, both internal and external, have been found to influence employee workplace deviant behaviors. One external factor reported to have an impact is the work environment, including organizational support, supervisory support, role conflict, and job demands, which have been associated with deviant behavior (Balducci, Schaufeli, & Fraccaroli, 2011).

Prior research has shown that the strain of job expectations can exacerbate employee burnout, which can result in a variety of deviant behaviors at work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). This is because workers put in a lot of effort to satisfy expectations that are more than their capacity for coping, which leads to unfavorable reactions like stress and despair and, eventually, unfavorable behaviors. Nevertheless, there is a paucity of empirical research on the impact of job expectations and other work-related stresses on unfavorable employee behaviors (Fransson et al., 2012).

¹ *Corresponding author: *Research Scholar, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, KLH Global Business School Hyderabad, -500084, Telangana, India*

² *Associate professor, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, KLH Global Business School Hyderabad, -500084, Telangana, India*

³ *Student, Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, KLH Global Business School Hyderabad, -500084, Telangana, India*

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Studies on either good or negative behavior consequences have usually focused on these behaviors as distinct entities (Vardi & Weitz, 2004; Peterson, 2002; Tobin, 2000). However, more recent studies (Appelbaum et al., 2007; Galperin, 2002) have started to consider both positive and negative deviant behaviors. Many names have been used to characterize negative behaviors, including misbehavior (Vardi & Weitz, 2004), unproductive behavior (Sackett & DeVore, 2001), and antisocial conduct (Giacolone & Greenberg, 1997).

Deviant conduct frequently happens when an employee feels they have received unjust treatment, whether such abuse was really experienced. According to (Mitchel & Ambrose, 2002), deviant conduct in the workplace might be seen as a type of negative reciprocity, in which a person reacts negatively to treatment in the workplace by acting negatively, comparable to "an eye for an eye." Workplace deviance can originate from several causes, including personal, organizational, and work-related issues, according to (Mazni & Roziah, 2011). Additionally, they opine those aspects of the job itself, the organization, and interpersonal interactions may have an impact on job satisfaction, which may then trigger aberrant behavior. (Bolin & Heatherly, 2001) contend that rather than serious transgressions, discontent frequently results in more minor ones. They clarify that when workers are not getting what they need from their jobs, they may become less productive. Among the individual elements that might contribute to deviant conduct include destructive behavior, dishonesty, and absenteeism. Studies reveal that people with low conscientiousness tend to be careless and unreliable, whereas people with high conscientiousness tend to be dependable, self-controlled, and on time (Mazni & Roziah, 2011).

Anger, animosity, and dread are examples of negative affectivity. In support of this, (Gor, 2007) links negative affectivity to actions including avoiding work, undermining attempts, acting abusively, threatening others, and exhibiting blatantly negative views. Workers that exhibit high degrees of negative affectivity are typically more likely to act provocatively. Another interpersonal component is agreeableness; unfriendly, obnoxious, distrustful, and low-self-esteem employees tend to score poorly on this trait. Even so, they can provide unexpected but unexpectedly reliable assistance. According to (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000), emotional intelligence is the sophisticated capacity to use self-awareness and insight into one's own and others' emotions to support cognitive processes and accomplish desired results. High emotional intelligence workers typically perform better and show less hostility, but low emotional intelligence workers are more prone to assign blame for mistakes made by others (Mazni & Roziah, 2011).

Deviant conduct at work might be caused by a variety of individual causes. According to (Chen & Spector, 1992), job stress has several detrimental repercussions on businesses and their workforce. Frequent job transitions, excessive workloads, new technology, elevated job demands, job insecurity, continuous organizational downsizing, and heightened uncertainty are common features of today's workplace. These elements work together to make the workplace more stressful (Belal, 2009). According to (Peterson, 2002), an employee experiences job stress when there is a mismatch between their talents and the requirements, resources, or needs of the job, which can have negative effects on their physical and mental well-being. From a different angle, (Beehr, 1976) defines job stress as a circumstance that causes a person's regular functioning to be disrupted and requires them to depart from their typical working patterns owing to changes in their psychological and/or physiological state. This study will look at three typical aspects of work stresses that are frequently mentioned by academics of organizational behavior (e.g., Robbins, 2003; Rizzo, House & Litzman, 1970): role ambiguity, role conflict, and work overload.

Work overload is defined by (Rizzo, 1970) as having an excessive quantity of work to finish in a set period (Conley & Woosley, 2000). When expectations, time limits, and resources available to achieve those needs are not aligned, work overload results. On the other side, role conflict occurs when there is a mismatch between the performance that is expected of a role and what is seen. Conflicting requests from bosses and clients may give birth to this conflict. A situation of resistance, disagreement, or incompatibility between two or more parties can be broadly defined as conflict. The direct relationship between psychological contracts and organizational trust has not been thoroughly studied in prior study. Nonetheless, Cheung, Wong, and Yuan's (2017) study found that psychological contracts mediated the association between contextual performance and organizational trust. Liu, Huang, Huang, and Chen (2013) looked at the connection between organizational citizenship conduct, psychological contract breach, and organizational trust in the hotel sector in a different study. According to their findings, organizational

trust and organizational citizenship behavior were significantly impacted negatively by psychological contract violations.

Subsequent research has highlighted the fact that abnormal conduct occurs in the workplace frequently without anybody seeing, reporting it, or both (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; King & Hermodson, 2000). Western researchers have proposed that abnormal conduct is more common in public than private institutions (Aquino, 2006; Mayhew & McCarthy, 2005). (Golparvar, Kamkar, & Javadian, 2012) looked at the psychological contract and organizational trust among workers in an industrial organization in Esfahan, Iran. According to their research, psychological contracts are influenced by organizational trust. Similarly, organizational trust and the psychological contract were found to be significantly correlated in a study involving 220 non-executive staff at the Department of Agriculture Malaysia (Sani, David, & Ismail, 2018).

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- 1.To determine the factors affecting employee deviant workplace behavior.
2. To rank those factors that will lead to employee deviant workplace behavior

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was exploratory. A 5-point Likert scale was used in a structured questionnaire with 40 items to collect data. One year or more of experience at their current workplace was a requirement for all 100 academicians who made up the study's sample and were currently employed at acknowledged institutions. Cronbach's alpha was computed to guarantee the data's dependability. Furthermore, the relative strength of each component was ascertained by factor analysis utilizing SPSS software.

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was used to extract minimum number of factors. In selecting the factor model, factors are extracted in such a way that each factor is independent of all other factors. Therefore, the correlation between the factors is arbitrarily determined to be zero.

Furthermore, to interpret the factors, i.e; with factor loadings which were greater than 0.50 (ignoring the negative signs) and loaded them in the extracted factors (Hair et.al, 2008) Finally, the factors based on appropriateness for representing the underlying dimensions of a particular interpretation were suitably named. They strongly influence the name or level selected to represent a factor. The 40 variables used for the factor analysis were coded. Besides, to study the appropriateness of factor analysis Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test statistic was used. If, the KMO value is greater than 0.6 is considered as adequate (Kaiser and Rice, 1974)

Table 1 KMO and Bartlett’s Test Result for Deviant workplace Behaviour

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.889
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	13044.325
	Df	8200
	Sig.	.000

Source: Computed from Primary Data

From table 1, KMO value is acceptable and Bartlett's test results were significant and thus acceptable.

The items having factor loading less than 0.30 were eliminated (Hair et, al; 1995) Finally, 6 factors comprising 40 items, all having eigen values of unity and above were extracted and the results are shown. Further, to assess the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, the commonalities derived from the factor analysis were reviewed. These were relatively larger (greater than 0.5), suggesting that the data were appropriate (Stewart, 1981)

^[14]. The individual dimensions of proposed instruments explained total variance exceeding 60 percent, suggesting the appropriateness of the process.

Also tested the reliability of items by computing the coefficient of Cronbach alpha test by measuring the internal consistency of the items.

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Number of Items
.861	.863	40

Source: Calculated from Primary Data

From the **table 2**, alpha coefficients value was 0.861, which is higher than 0.7, indicating good consistency among the items and for a measure to be acceptable, coefficient alpha should be above 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978)

The scree plot was used to identify the optimum number of factors that can be extracted. The scree plot demonstrated the eigen values for the initial 40 items of the study. Starting with the first factor, the plot slopes steeply downward initially and then became an approximately horizontal line. The Point at which the curve first begins to straighten out was considered to indicate the number of factors to extract. In the present study, the eigen values more than 1, was considered and found six factors. All factors beyond 1 for which these eigen value level off were excluded from consideration (Cattel and Vogelmann, 1977)

To facilitate factor extraction, the next step involves performing a principal component analysis (PCA) using varimax rotation. 40 factors were included in this study. As a result, six factors (i.e., values surpassing 1) were determined using the eigenvalue criteria. The findings of the factor analysis were obtained by PCA with a given rotation. The final table displays the factor loadings of all variables in addition to eigenvalues, explained variances, and cumulative variances for the factor solution. Understanding of the extracted variables may be gained from the total of the squared loadings from the extraction.

DETERMINANTS OF DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR

Table 3

Item below 0.5 loading were rejected. These factors were named depending upon the contents in each of them.

S.NO	Factors	Variables	Loading
1.	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Friendliness with peers	0.548755
		Helping low skilled workers	0.684567
		Not complaining about supervisors	0.842709
		Taking responsible positions	0.743219
		Accepting accountability	0.632157
		Encouraging through rewards	0.612798
		Leadership	0.624586
2.	Organization culture	Cooperation among workers	0.744052
		Good reward system	0.565898
		Job security	0.659345
		Taking care of personal commitments	0.632985
		Loyalty to employees	0.802376
		Organization goals first than individuals	0.761325
		Knowledge and Innovation	0.682456
3.	Interpersonal relationship	Managerial structure	0.725684
		Communication among peers	0.767799
		Clearly defined tasks	0.615649

		Delegation of authority and responsibility	0.516423
		Owing the process	0.812319
		Good understanding among workers	0.752430
		Sincere workers	0.712963
4.	Job satisfaction	Work life balance.	0.876344
		Salary	0.713855
		Quality of working conditions	0.615327
		Work relations	0.632459
		Supervisory support	0.723756
		Autonomy	0.541983
		Work itself	0.621453
5.	Workplace disruption	Goal setting	0.748236
		Performance feedback	0.670708
		Technology and rules	0.560732
		Communication system	0.719234
		supervisory support	0.815420
		Defined process	0.823195
		Work intensity	0.754861
6.	Lack of interest	Income level	0.797555
		Marital status	0.521673
		Psychology and background	0.736316
		Education	0.825536
		Social security Income	0.813765
		Proper planning	0.671389

Source: primary data

Table 3 exhibited 40 items based upon their appropriateness for representing the underlying dimensions of a particular focus have been summarized into six factors. These factors were named as

FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS

Table 4

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Organization culture	Interpersonal relationship	Job satisfaction	Workplace disruption	Lack of interest
Eigen Value (EV)	5.568	3.975	2.803	1.672	1.568	1.495
Total Variance	33.094	7.257	4.399	4.078	3.826	3.645
Cumulative EV	33.094	40.350	44.749	48.827	52.653	56.298

Source: Computed from primary data

From the above **table 4**, it can be observed that organizational Citizenship Behavior with eigen value 5.568 which is highest indicating factor influencing deviant workplace behavior with variance 33.094. The eigen value for organization culture is 3.975 with variance 7.257. For interpersonal relationships, the eigen value is 2.803 with variance 4.399. The eigen value for job satisfaction is 1.672 with variance 4.078. For workplace disruption, the eigen value is 1.568 with variance 3.826. Finally, for lack of interest the eigen value is 1.495 with variance 3.645.

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

The reliability of scales internal consistency was tested, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Ideally, this coefficient value should be above 0.7. From the table, the scales are used to determine employee's deviational workplace behavior levels of consistency. The Reliability of the scale used to determine employee's deviant workplace behavior is given below in the **table 5**.

Table 5 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS FOR DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR

Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of items
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	0.907	6
Organization culture	0.831	7
Interpersonal relationship	0.813	10
Job satisfaction	0.796	5
Workplace disruption	0.905	6
Lack of interest	0.749	6
Total Items		40

Source: Calculated from Primary Data

The present study adopted 40 items that were grouped into six factors. They are organizational citizenship behavior, organizational culture, interpersonal relationship, job satisfaction, workplace disruption, lack of interest. The Cronbach's Alpha of all the items shown above 0.7 indicates highly reliable in identifying the determinants of deviant workplace behavior. In all the six factors, OCB and Workplace disruption have high coefficients.

From the literature review, various factors were found influencing deviant workplace behavior of professors working in universities. These studies were related to professors working in different departments. Moreover, studies that were related to professors are foreign context. The present study helped in finding the factors influencing deviant workplace behavior of professors working in universities. Next, the questionnaire was prepared, tested, and distributed to professors. To know the relative strength of each factor and the number of factors to be extracted, the factor analysis and reliability test was performed with the help of SPSS software version-15.

VI. CONCLUSION

These results highlight the importance of deviant work place behaviour as a serious problem. The present study helped in identifying the determinants of employee's deviant workplace behavior organizational citizenship behavior, organizational culture, interpersonal relationship, job satisfaction, workplace disruption, lack of interest.

According to Mackenzie et al. (2011), HRD has the knowledge and abilities to question current procedures and support businesses in upholding good governance by reducing aberrant behavior. Deviant conduct at work may have a detrimental effect on the relationships between coworkers, the exchange of knowledge, and the ethical culture, all of which can affect how well employees perform and grow. HRD can better understand aberrant behavior and create policies and procedures to deal with and eradicate it by researching the characteristics and factors that influence it.

VII. REFERENCES

- [1] Naseer Abbas Khan, Determinants of Proactive Work Behavior of Employees during the Covid-19 Crisis, *European Journal Of Psychology Open* ,2021,80(1–2), 77–87.
- [2] Azham Bin Bachok, Jeffrey Lawrence D'silva, Ismi Ariff Ismail, Workplace Deviant Behavior: A Theoretical Highlights, *International Journal Of Academic Research In Business & Social Sciences*, Vol. 12, No. 7, 2022, Pg. 1950 – 1963.
- [3] Shao-Ping Wang1 , Miao-Sheng Chen1 And Mou-Jian Li, Key Factors Affecting Deviant Workplace Behavior, *African Journal Of Business Management*, Vol. 12(10), Pp. 258-266, 28 May, 2018.

- [4] R. ARZU KALEMCI, IPEK KALEMCI-TUZUN, ELA OZKAN-CANBOLAT (2019), EMPLOYEE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR: ROLE OF CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL RELEVANT SUPPORT, EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ECONOMICS, VOL. 28 NO. 2, PP. 126-14.
- [5] Dr. S. Yuvaraj, R. Nadheya, 2018, A Study On The Role Of Technology On Employee Behaviour And Their Performance, International Journal Of Mechanical Engineering And Technology (Ijmet) Volume 9, Issue 7, July 2018.
- [6] DETERMINANTS OF INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR AND JOB PERFORMANCE: MODERATING ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING, MUHAMMAD FARIS HUSSAIN,, HANIRUZILA HANIFAH,ALI VAFAEI-ZADEH
- [7] Hasliza Abdul Halim , International Journal Of Innovation And Technology Management vol. 20, No. 01, 2250037 (2023)
- [8] A Study On Impact Of Job Satisfaction On Workplace Behaviour Of Employee With Special Reference To It Industry, Coimbatore Dr. M.Maheswari, 2018 Ijct | Volume 6, Issue 2 April 2018.
- [9] 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*, 7(5), 207–221
- [10] Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360.
- [11] Thompson, P. & Ackyord, S.(1999). *Organizational misbehaviour*. Sage.
- [12] [12]. Miner, K. N., Settles, I. H., Pratt-Hyatt, J. S., & Brady, C. C. (2012). Experiencing incivility in organizations: the buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(2), 340–372.
- [13] Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
- [14] Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Rhenen, W. V. A. N. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout , work engagement , and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 893–917
- [15] Fransson, E. I., Nyberg, S. T., Heikkilä, K., Alfredsson, L., Bacquer, D. D., Batty, G. D., Kivimäki, M. (2012). Comparison of alternative versions of the job demand-control scales in 17 European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1), 62.
- [16] Clark, D. M. T., & Loxton, N. J. (2012). Fear, psychological acceptance, job demands and employee work engagement: An integrative moderated mediation model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(8), 893–897.
- [17] Robinson SL, Bennett RJ (1995) A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Acad J Manage*, 38: 555-572.
- [18] Griffin RW, Lopez YP (2005) Bad behaviour in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *J Manage* 31: 988-1005.
- [19] Bashir S, Nasir M, Qayyum S, Bashir A (2012) Dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviors in public sector organizations of Pakistan. *Public Org Rev* 12: 357-366.
- [20] Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. London, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [21] Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J., & Lay, M. (2005). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behavior. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 5(4), 43-55.
- [22] Appelbaum, S. H., & Shapiro, B. T. (2006). Diagnosis and remedies for deviant workplace behaviors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 9(2), 14-20.
- [23] Appelbaum, S. H., Laconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts and solutions. *Corporate Governance*, 7(5), 586-598.
- [24] Mazni, A. & Roziah, M.R. (2011). Towards developing a theoretical model on the determinants of workplace deviance among support personnel in the Malaysian Public Service Organisations. <http://www.google.co.zw/#hl=ensfclient=psy-abl.3/06/2012>
- [25] Bolin, A. and Heatherly L. (2001). Predictors of employee deviance. The relationship between bad attitudes and bad behaviours. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 15 (3): 405-415
- [26] Gor, A. (2007). An attributional analysis of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) in response to occupational stress. Unpublish Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of South Florida.
- [27] Peterson, D.K. (2002a). Deviant Workplace Behavior and the Organization's Ethical Climate", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 7, 47-61.
- [28] Rizzo, J.R., House, R.J. & Lirtzman, S.I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations.
- [29] Bennett, R.J. and Robinson, S.L. (2003), "The past, present and future of workplace deviance research", in Greenberg, J. (Ed.),