

A Comparative Study Of Deviant Workplace Behaviour Of Bank Employees Of Public And Private Sector

M. Sudha Rani, Research scholar, GITAM (Deemed to be University) ¹

Dr. T. Sowdamini, Asst Prof, GITAM (Deemed to be University) ²

ABSTRACT

Workplace deviant behaviour can be expressed in different ways by an individual in the organization. Employees may engage in extreme, minor, violent and non-violent behaviours that cause harm to the organization which ultimately leads to decline in the organization productivity. Simply deviant behaviour is defined as “voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization”. The purpose of this study is to compare the deviant behaviour of bank employees working in private and public sector. Survey research was conducted in order to investigate the deviant behaviour of bank employees. Two public and two private banks were selected and from these banks. One hundred and sixty (30 from public sector and 30 from private sector) were selected randomly. A standardized questionnaire was distributed among the employees of bank. Questionnaire composed of 15 components and employees were asked to indicate on 5 point Likert scale ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Data analysis was done on the collected data. The results shown that there is a significant difference between deviant behaviour of employees in public bank and private bank. The rate of deviance of employees working public sector is greater than the employees working private sector.

Keywords: Workplace Deviant behaviour, Organization, Production deviance, Property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace deviance is the most common problem that has been seen in any type of organization. Individuals or employees or a group inside the organization who acts against to the organization norms results in deviance at workplace. Many researchers defined workplace deviance in different ways. Robinson and Benett (1995) defined that workplace deviance is a voluntary behaviour that violates significant organization norms and, in doing so, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members or both. The reasons for such behaviour may include many reasons such as lack of motivation, abusive supervision, individual personality and attitude and many more. Robinson and benett proposed a typology of workplace deviance depending on the type of behaviour and also basing on the outcome of such behaviour. Workplace deviance is also known as counter-productive behaviour and negative behaviour.

Researches have been conceptually focused on the different types of deviant behaviours such as theft, absenteeism, sexual harassment, sabotage and exclusively on unethical decision makings. The result of deviance is cost effective. Some researchers have found that employee thefts resulted in loss of \$5 billion to \$10 billion annually and all the deviance together resulted approximately \$40 billion. Workplace deviance also results in significant human cost, employee performance, morale, well-being of organization environment.

This study totally focused on the employees of public and private bank sector behaviour at workplace and also to compare the deviance at public and private sector. The purpose of the study is to identify which type of deviance is more in both organization basing on the Robinson and Benett model of typology. They proposed Workplace deviance In two different types shown in figure 1 below. The first type is organizational deviance and the other is interpersonal deviance. Production deviance and property deviance comes under the first type that is organizational deviance whereas political deviance and property deviance falls under interpersonal deviance.

TYPOLGY OF WORKPLACE DEVIANCE

FIGURE 1: ROBINSON AND BENETT (1995) TYPOLOGY OF WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

According to Robinson and Benett workplace deviance is differentiated basing on two dimensions. One is severity of the deviance and the other one is depending on the circumstances.

Organizational vs Interpersonal deviance

Organizational deviance is the deviance caused by employee which results loss to the organisation resources and property. Both production and property deviance comes under organizational deviance. Political and personnel aggression comes under interpersonal deviance.

Minor vs major

Basing on the severity of loss the deviance is diversified into two categories. Both production and political deviance comes under minor as it causes less damage and personal aggression is a serious issue as it disturbs the whole environment inside the organization.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

To understand the concept of workplace deviance behaviour

To know the different types of deviance at workplace

To compare the rate of deviance at workplace in public and private banks.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample size

60 respondent questionnaires were collected from employees from both public and private sector banks.

3.2. Data collection

Primary data was collected from bank employees in which 30 belongs to public sector and 30 belongs to private sector bank.

3.3. Analysing the collected data

Collected data was analysed using the tools like mean, standard deviation, t-test and Annova using SPSS analytical tool.

4. HYPOTHESIS

H0: 1 there is no significant difference of public and private bank employees at their deviant workplace behaviour.

H0: 2 there is no significant difference of public and private bank employees at their production deviant workplace behaviour.

H0; 3 there is no significant difference of public and private bank employees at their property deviant workplace behaviour.

H0; 4 there is no significant difference of public and private bank employees at their political deviant workplace behaviour.

H0: 5 there is no significant difference of public and private bank employees at their personnel aggressionworkplace behaviour.

H0: 6 there is a significant difference in their behaviours of different designations at workplace

H0: 7 there is a significant difference in their behaviour of different age groups at workplace.

H0: 8 there is a significant difference in their behaviour of different genders at workplace.

5. PROCEDURE

The researchers aimed to get the result by distributing questionnaire containing 15 components and 30 questionnaires were given to two public banks and 30 questionnaires

were distributed among two private banks to find the rate of deviance at workplace in public and private bank. The banks selected for data collection were Andhra bank and SBI bank from public sector and Axis bank and ICICI bank from private sector. From each bank 15 samples were collected for generalization of result. The researcher used a standardised questionnaire from Robinson and Benett instrument that was broad and derived theoretically from measure of workplace deviant behaviour. The survey comprised four parts, part one comprised of 4 items (1 to 4) that show production deviance and part two comprised of 3 items (5 to 7) that show property deviance and part three comprised of 3 items (7 to 10) that shows political deviance and part four comprised of 5 items (11 to 15) that shows personnel aggression type of behaviour and also based on the effect caused by deviances it was again differentiated into two types, one is organizational deviance and the other is interpersonal deviance. Seven items (1 to 7) shows the deviance that causes harm to the organization and 8 items (8 to 15) shows the deviance that cause harm to relations inside the organization.

6. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

TABLE 1:Mean and standard deviation of public sector bank employees

S.NO.	COMPONENTS	MEAN	DEVIATION
1.	Worked on a personal matter instead of your employee	1.896	0.973
2.	Called in sick when you were not	1.793	0.626
3.	Taken additional longer breakthan is acceptable at your workplace	1.655	0.668
4.	Come in late or left early at your workplace without permission	1.137	0.345
5.	Taken property from workplace without permission	1.931	0.959
6.	Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for money than you spent on business expenses	1.931	0.868
7.	Littered your work environment	1	0
8.	Showing favouritism among co-workers	2.275	0.449
9.	Blaming someone at your workplace for your deeds	1.551	0.507
10.	Repeated rumour or gossip about your company	1.310	0.466
11.	Acted rudely towards someone at workplace	1.172	0.379
12.	Made a obscene comment at workplace	1	0
13.	Lost temper at workplace	2	0.182
14.	Made a ethnic, religious or racial remark or joke at your workplace	1	0
15.	Cursed someone at workplace	1.517	0.508

TABLE 2: Mean and standard deviation of private sector bank employees

S.NO.	COMPONENTS	MEAN	DEVIATION
1.	Worked on a personal matter instead of your employee	1.6	0.674
2.	Called in sick when you were not	1.5	0.776
3.	Taken additional longer break than is acceptable at your workplace	1.266	0.449
4.	Come in late or left early at your workplace without permission	1.166	0.379
5.	Taken property from workplace without permission	1.266	0.520
6.	Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for money than you spent on business expenses	2.033	1.884
7.	Littered your work environment	1	0
8.	Showing favouritism among co-workers	1.766	0.773
9.	Blaming someone at your workplace for your deeds	1.433	0.504
10.	Repeated rumour or gossip about your company	1.266	0.449
11.	Acted rudely towards someone at workplace	1.066	0.253
12.	Made a obscene comment at workplace	1	0
13.	Lost temper at workplace	1.266	0.449
14.	Made a ethnic, religious or racial remark or joke at your workplace	1	0
15.	Cursed someone at workplace	1.666	0.479

T - Value = 0.083, the above table shows that there is a significant difference in the rate of deviance between the public and private sector bank employees. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Demographic factors were taken to calculate the impact of the values on the components taken. Three demographic factors are taken into consideration. Factors like designation, sex, age.

TABLE 3:

ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	0.247521	1	0.247521	1.578571	0.219348	4.195972
Within Groups	4.390417	28	0.156801			
Total	4.637938	29				

The above table shows that there is a significant difference in their deviant behaviour according to their designation. The p-value is greater than the significant value $p > 0.05$ so the null hypothesis is accepted. That means there is an impact of designation factor on their deviant behaviour at workplace.

TABLE 4:

ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	2.217378329	2	1.108689164	3.040562314	0.058447795	3.219942293
Within Groups	15.31458332	42	0.364632936			
Total	17.53196165	44				

The above table shows that there is an impact of age on their behaviour at workplace. The p-value is equal to 0.05 so the significant value of p is equal hence the null hypothesis is accepted. And it is mathematically proved that there is significant difference of age group in their behaviours at workplace.

TABLE 5

ANOVA						
<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	0.016818	1	0.016818	0.138694	0.712387	4.195972
Within Groups	3.395275	28	0.12126			
Total	3.412093	29				

In the above table it is shown that the p-value is greater than significant value of p. so the $p > 0.05$ hence it is proved that there is a significant difference in the behaviour of gender at workplace. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

FINDINGS

- There is insignificant difference between employee deviant workplace behaviour of public bank and private
- While comparing the rate of different types of behaviour both property deviance and political deviance are more than the production and personal aggression deviance in both public and private banks
- For the hypothesis 3,4,5,6 production, property, personal aggression and political deviances are significantly different from public to private sector banks as the t-values for all the types are 0.243, 0.349, 0.525 and 0.156 respectively
- Demographic factors that shows impact on the components are age, sex and designation.

CONCLUSION

Workplace deviant behaviour is a negative behaviour that causes harm to the organization and also there will not be a good relation among the employees in the organization, so one has to act ethically and sincerely in the organization to avoid loss to management and also to avoid unhealthy environment in the organization. The result of the study showed that the employees of public sector bank exhibit more workplace deviance than private bank employees.

SUGGESTIONS

Workplace deviant behaviour is a serious issue that should be handled by managers in order to reduce loss to the organization. Banking sector is a service sector in which employees will have lot of stress which leads to such type of negative behaviours. Such negative behaviour can be handled by taking ethical lectures and some other training programmes. This study is only limited to banking sector with a few number of banks so one can research further for more findings which helps the organization to address them prior.

REFERENCES

- Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1995)** A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: a multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.38, pp.555-572
- Robinson, S., & Greenberg, J. (1999)** Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance.
- Robinson, S., & Greenberg, J. (1999)** Workplace deviance: its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, Vol.6, pp.3-2

Baron, R.A., & Neuman, J.H. (1996) Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behaviour*, Vol.22, pp.161-173. D.M. Rousseau & C. Cooper (Eds.) *Trends in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-23). New York: Wiley.

Ackroyd, S., & Thomson, P. (1999) *Organizational Misbehaviour*. Thousand Oak, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1998). Workplace aggression - The iceberg beneath the tip of workplace violence: Evidence on its forms, frequency and targets. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 21(4), 446-464,

Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrik, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 559-609.

Erkutlu, Hakan and Chafra, Jamel (2013) Effects of trust and psychological contract violation on authentic leadership and organizational deviance, *Management Research Review*, 36 (9). 828 – 848.

Golparvan, M., Kamkar, M., & Javadian, Z. (2012). Moderating Effects of Job Stress in Emotional Exhaustion and Feeling of Energy Relationships with Positive and Negative Behaviors: Job Stress Multiple Functions Approach. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 4 (4); 99-112