

# A STUDY OF WORK PLACE DEVIANCES WITH RESPECT TO AGE AND GENDER

-Sangeeta Malik, Professor, Maharaja Agarsen Institute of Management Studies, Rohini, Delhi

---

## ABSTRACT

Workplace deviances have always been critical issues in organization among researchers and managers. The occurrence of deviant behavior involves deception, employees thievery (stealing & shoplifting), squashing, unexcused absences, taking long breaks, rude violent behavior, and sexual abuses at the workplace accounts a big task for organizations. The impact of these behaviors is enormous on organization and individual & such behavior incur massive economic loss. To make organization productive & effective, we need to work hard to get over with this problem and bring harmony among them and in the organization. Keeping in mind the present study aims to study workplace deviant behavior in private sector among the working professionals. A sample of 60 working professional were taken from private sector undertaking and tested on the two aspects of workplace deviances ie., interpersonal deviances and organizational deviances. The aim of this paper is to study the impact of age and gender on workplace deviances. The age & gender has shown significant relation with interpersonal deviances than organizational deviances.

**Keywords:** *Workplace deviances, organizational deviances, Interpersonal deviances, age and gender.*

## INTRODUCTION

Today, workplace deviant behavior is one of the major concern for the organization and also a focal area of further study and attention (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). Research support several studies of the past that the negative workplace behavior do not impact financial concerns only but social and psychological impacts are more on the organization productivity (Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Murphy, 1993). This includes deliberate malicious attempt to harm organization by causing problems at the workplace. Deviant behavior are of two types, interpersonal deviances, which involves spreading rumors, gossiping, yelling at someone, aggressive behavior, lying, bullying, blaming others for their own mistake, abusive supervisors, substance use at workplace .Organizational deviances such as reporting late ,lying about hours worked ,theft of organizational property, sabotage etc. It has been found that between 33 to 75 percent employees have found indulging in offenses like stealing, embezzlement, damage, and disruption (Harper, 1990). The less frequent aggressive behaviours were lying (DePaulo & DePaulo, 1989), spreading rumors (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Fox & Spector, 1999), with holding effort (Kidwell and Bennett, 1993) and absenteeism

(Johns, 1997). These behaviors disrupt workplace norms and ethics and therefore labeled antisocial behavior (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). These immoral deviant behavior are predominating and impacting organization culture and productivity.

## GAP

Numerous past research have examined deviant behavior with many reasons leads to become deviant (Bennett and Robinson ,2003) other studied correlates of personality with environment (Farhadi et al.,2012). To date, very little empirical researches have been conducted which is directly focused on deviant behavior .The concept of deviant behavior usually misinterpreted and often ignore to study employee behavior (Vardi & Wiener,1996). Very less study conducted on the demographic variables i.e., age gender, marital status income etc. Therefore, keeping in mind the need of the research, an attempt has been made to understand the impact of demographic variables such as gender and age on workplace deviances. The findings will help organizations to understand the different categories & age group people are engaged in deviant behavior. This will also justify the need of the research.

## METHOD

In the current study a random sample of 110 respondent from the private sector undertaking were initially taken from Delhi & NCR region. A pool of mass email generated, where out of 110 only 60 people responded back. The study was conducted by sending out a mass e-mail to the above sample. A 19 item questionnaire

developed by Robinson and Bennett is used in the present study, which comprise 7 item on interpersonal deviances & 12 items on organizational deviances. The respondents were instructed to mark their responses on a 7-point likert scale in the questionnaire. The internal reliability of this scale is found to be .81& .78 respectively. A personal interview taken from the entire respondent as they were reluctant to give genuine response for the one-to-one analysis. The results were analyzed through SPSS.

## HYPOTHESIS

- There are no differences between males and females with respect to their work place deviances.
- No difference between males & Females regarding organizational deviances
- No differences between males & females regarding interpersonal deviances
- Age do not have significant differences on workplace deviances(organizational and Interpersonal)

## PROCEDURE

A 19 item questionnaire was sent through e-mail to 60 participants, but only 58 participants responded back. The concept & purpose of this study was communicated to all the participants earlier and questionnaire circulated to them only on agreement to participate in the study and assured them to keep their identity unknown to their organizations. The data was treated in SPSS. This study enabled the researchers to examine the potential influence of gender & age on the deviant behavior of the participant.

## RESULT AND DATA INTERPRETATION

Table 1

Gender	Number	Mean	Std. deviation	Std.Error Mean	t-value	Remark
Work Place Deviances						
Male	28	35.46	8.505	-3.636	1.498	P> .05
Female	30	39.10	9.813	2.428		

An independent sample t-Test was conducted to examine age & gender differences on workplace deviances. From the data, it shows that male (M=35.46,SD 8.505,N=28) and female (F=39.10,SD 9.813,N=30) do not have much differences with respect to work place deviances. It is evident from the table 1.1, the t-value is -1.498, which is not significant at 0.05 and at 0.001 level with Degrees of freedom 56. It reflects that mean value of work place deviances of males and females did not differ significantly. In this context the null hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the mean score of work place deviances of male and female employees” is not rejected.

Table 2

Gender	Number	Mean	Std. deviation	Std.Error Mean	t-value	Remark
Organizational Deviances						
Male	28	22.71	5.855			
Female	30	22.80	6.810	-.086	.958	P>.05

From table 2, For the second hypothesis, we find Male having (M=22.71,SD= 5.855) & female having (M=22.80,SD=6.810) from table 1.2, do not have much difference with respect to organisational deviances. The t value is .958 at 56 Df is not significant at 0.05 and 0.01. The mean scores of organizational deviances of males and female did not differ significantly, therefore the null hypothesis “there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Organizational deviances of male and female teachers” is accepted.

Table 3

Gender	Number	Mean	Std. deviation	Std.Error Mean	t-value	Remark
Interpersonal Deviances						
Male	28	12.75	5.407	-4.217	-2.696	P<.05
Female	30	16.97	5.404			

Regarding third hypothesis, from table 3, we observed that Males ( $M=12.75$ ,  $SD=5.407$  & Females  $M=16.97$  &  $SD=5.404$ ) having significant differences in their scores, The t test calculated  $-2.969$  at 56 df higher at 0.05 and .01 level, the mean scores of males and females on interpersonal deviances are significantly different, therefore we reject null hypothesis of “there is no significant difference in the mean score of interpersonal deviances of males and females teachers” and accept alternative hypothesis of, there is significant difference in the mean scores of interpersonal deviances of males and females.

Table 4

Work place Deviances	Age	No.	Mean	Std. deviation	Std.Error Mean	t-value	Remark
Org deviances	(Age-1) 35-45	37	22.78	6.721	.557	.320	$P>.05$
	(Age-2) 46-51	21	22.23	5.992	.320	$P>.05$	
Interpersonal Deviances	Age-1	37	16.22	5.945	3.807		
	Age-2	21	12.41	4.797		2.691	$P<.05$

The fourth hypothesis is Age do not have significant difference on organizational and Interpersonal deviances. From table 4, we observe that employees who are between 35-45 years of Age, denoted by Age 1, have mean 22.78 &  $SD=6.721$ , whereas people between 46-51, who are denoted by Age 2, having mean=22.23 &  $SD=5.992$  do not significantly different on the organizational deviance, the t value is .320, which is not significant at .05 & .001 level at 56 df. The null hypothesis is accepted here which says that “there is no difference between the organizational deviances scores of Age -1 and Age-2 employees.

But when we compare the interpersonal deviance scores of Age-1 and Age-2 employees. The mean score for Age-1 is 16.22 &  $SD$  is 5.945, whereas the mean scores for Age-2 is 12.41 &  $SD = 4.797$ . There is a significant differences between the two groups. The t value calculated is 2.691, which is much significant at .05 and .001 level at 56 Df. The difference of mean is 3.807. We observe that these two age groups stand different on interpersonal workplace deviances. Thus we reject null hypotheses, which says that there is no difference between the means of two groups on interpersonal deviances and accept alternative hypothesis that the Age -1 & Age -2 are different in their mean scores on interpersonal workplace deviances.

## DISCUSSION

Workplace deviant behavior has been a critical issue for any organizational success. Organizations experienced heavy losses in terms of financial, productivity and adverse impact on human efficiency. It has gained popularity in recent times and wide scope of further research (Bennett and Robinson, 2003).

In this present study, we have attempted to examine the impact of Workplace deviance on gender and age. There are two type of deviances; constructive and destructive. Under destructive deviances there are further two types- interpersonal and organizational deviances. In the present study, significant difference found between interpersonal deviances and organizational deviances. An interpersonal deviance did show significant difference at workplace with respect to gender & age. Male and female significantly differ in their interpersonal deviances. Age is also contributing in interpersonal deviances. The common interpersonal deviances includes making funny comments on coworkers, derogatory remarks rude behaviors', minor mistakes becomes a major issues on job, defying supervisors' instruction (under political deviances). Under personal aggression (cussing at coworkers, degrading & bullying subordinates, sexual harassment, saying inappropriate things and hitting them). Interpersonal deviances may be treated less important unless until it is reported. It's treated by employees as part and parcel of the organization's day to day affair. It is considered unhealthy because many times it becomes a cause and costs to employees for quitting their jobs. Early identification needs

to notice and take remedial measure to control. Employees often get favor doing so in spreading false rumors about others to gain attention, promotion and coming in close contact with their superiors'. Supervisors who favors one over the others for undue things prompt deserving candidate to commit deviant act. Thereby the moral and productivity of the other employees automatically gets down. The manager and HR practioners must be aware of these impacts on organizational culture and climate and take stern steps to control such unhealthy behavior in organization for further growth and prospect.

On the other hand we did not find any significant difference of gender and age on organizational deviances. This can be interpreted that male and female employees were same in organizational deviances. Productive deviances (leaving early and taking long breaks) as well as Property deviances (stealing company's property, lying about hours worked and damaging equipment) were prevalent among male and female and different age group employees.

## CONCLUSION

Workplace deviant behavior is a phenomenal with each and every organizations. WPD has significant direct economic consequences on the organization's productivity. Researchers in past have used different terms to describe workplace deviances as less productive and non-effective workplace behaviors, which has a direct relationship to harm organization brand and its members output. Therefore, managers and researchers should take a serious note to ruminate the effect of deviant behavior in organizations work life.

The conclusion of this study is that gender and age did not show significant impact on organizational work place deviances, whereas significant results obtained in interpersonal deviances. There were mixed results obtained by the earlier researchers. (Farhadi et al., 2012) This finding will further help organizations to consider

WPD as a serious issue and prepare in advance in order to have better understanding and timely relevant solutions of deviant behaviors. It will further help them to frame and formulate policy for any such misconduct for future. The upcoming research prospect in this area is also very wide and immense scope for further research.

## References

1. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. 2000. Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 349-360.
2. Bennett R, Robinson S. (2003) The Past, Present, and future of workplace deviance research. In: Greenberg J, editor. *Organisational Behaviour: The state of the science*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; pp. 247-281
3. DePaulo, P. J., & DePaulo, B. M. (1989). Can attempted deception by salespersons and customers be detected through nonverbal behavioral cues? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 1552–1577
4. Farhadi, H., Omar, F., Barazandeh, A., & Farhadi, S. (2011). The Role of conscientiousness as an antecedent of workplace deviant behaviour. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Science Journal*.
5. Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 915–931
6. Harper, D. 1990. Spotlight abuse-Save profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79: 47-51.
7. Hollinger C, Clark P. (1982) Formal and Informal social controls of employees deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23:333-343
8. Johns, G. (1997). Contemporary research on absence from work: Correlates, causes, and consequences. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 115–174.
9. Kidwell, R. E., & Bennett, N. 1993. Employee propensity to withhold effort: A conceptual model to intersect three avenues of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 429-456.
10. Murphy, K. R. 1993. *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
11. Robinson S, Bennett R. (1995) A Typology of deviant workplace behaviours : A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*; 38:555-572
12. Skarlicki, D.P. and Folger, R. (1997) Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.434>
13. Vardi, Y. and Wiener, Y. (1996) Misbehavior in Organizations: A Motivational Framework. *Organization Science*, 7, 151-165. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.2.151>