

Gender differences in Workplace Deviant Behavior of University Teachers and Modification Techniques

Dr. Muhammad Nadeem Anwar

Assistant Professor, Department of Education

University of Sargodha, Sargodha

E-mail: dr.nadeem@ymail.com

Dr Muhammad Sarwar

Assistant Professor, Department of Education

University of Sargodha, Sargodha

E-mail: drsarwar@ymail.com

Dr. Riffat-un-Nisa Awan

Assistant Professor, Department of Education

University of Sargodha, Sargodha

E-mail: riffarukh@yahoo.com

Muhammad Irfan Arif

Research Scholar, Department of Education

University of Sargodha, Sargodha

Abstract

Any behavior that does not conform to social organizational norms is deviance. This study was conducted to test whether there is any difference in organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance behavior, deviance behavior of male-female university teachers. All teaching staff of the University of Sargodha was target population and for convenience fifty lecturers of post graduate level were selected randomly for the sample. Of these respondents 26 were male and 24 were female. A broad and theoretically derived measure of deviant behavior in the workplace was used. This measure was developed by Rebecca J. Benett (University of Toledo) and Sandra L. Robinson (University of British Columbia). The results of this study reveal that the ratio of organization deviance in the university's workspace is more dominant as compared to interpersonal deviance and the male teaching staff of University of Sargodha is more deviant at workplace as compared to female teaching staff.

Keywords: Gender, Workplace, Deviant Behavior, University Teachers, Behavior Modification Techniques

1. Introduction

Workplace deviance has been defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, threatens the well being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson and Benett, 1955). Workplace deviance refers to voluntary behavior in that employees either lack motivation to conform to, and/or become motivated to violate, normative expectations of the social context (Kalpan, 1975). Organizational norms consist of basic moral standards as well as other traditional community standards, including those prescribed by formal and informal organizational policies, rules and procedures (Feldman, 1984).

Workplace deviance can be captured with two general factors, interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. Interpersonal deviance includes those behaviours which are directly harmful to other individuals within the organization such as sexual harassment, aggression, bullying, and incivility etc, while organizational deviance includes those behaviour which are directly harmful to organization, such as fraud, cyber slaking, sabotage and theft etc.

It is necessary to control such behaviour with proper treatment. One behavior establishes very quickly but to change that is a difficult task, every person cannot change other behaviour. The strategies used to change the undesired behaviour are called behavioral modification techniques.

Some example of behaviour modification techniques are positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, extinction, shaping, discussion, communication, participation, discrimination and proximity with verbal and non-verbal cues, warning and punishment.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Sexual harassment

Sexual harassment is a form of aggression and unethical behavior. This misbehavior takes the form of unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

Sexual harassment occurs because of power differences, lust, and for reasons that are not entirely understood. Sexual harassment occurs across gender lines and across sexual orientation lines. It is not only misbehavior but it is also illegal.

Flirting, joking, bantering, and other sexual interactions are daily occurrences in work settings. Not all of these interactions constitute sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment misbehavior includes three facets: gender harassment (crude and rude expressions and behavior), unwanted sexual advances, and sexual coercion (quid pro quo harassment).

2.2 Aggression

Aggression in work is the effort of an individual, to inflict harm on others with whom the person has worked for or currently works for or on the organization itself. The attempt to bring harm is intentional and includes psychological as well as physical injury.

Buss (1961) categorized aggression along physical, verbal, active, passive, direct, and indirect dimensions. His framework for classifying aggression is shown in the exhibit. Physical forms of aggression could involve an attack with fists, pushing, slapping, or a weapon. Verbal aggression is inflicted by words, gossip, or innuendo.

Active aggression brings harm through a specific behavior, while passive aggression is accomplished through the withholding of something desired (e.g., deserved praise, information, resources). The direct form of aggression is found when the aggressor delivers harm personally. In indirect aggression another person 'produces the harm. Spreading a damaging rumor that harms an employee's chance to be promoted is an example of indirect aggression.

2.3 Bullying

Bullying is defined as repeated actions that are directed to another worker that are unwanted and that whether done deliberately or unconsciously clearly cause humiliation and distress and create an unpleasant work setting. Bullies have been known to possess high levels of aggression. The behaviors of a bully are either intended to be hostile actions are considered by the victim to be hostile.

2.4 Incivility

Workplace incivility involves acting rudely, discourteously, or in a demeaning manner toward others. It is on the low end of the continuum of abuse. Incivility isn't violence or harassment, but it is a lack of respect for others.

Incivility has taken on a vast number of behaviors, such as condescending remarks; being disruptive in meetings, ignoring; others, insulting another person, being abrupt, giving negative eye contact, not answering when asked a question, refusing to say "thank you" or "please," interrupting another person who is speaking.

2.5 Fraud

Fraud is defined as the intentional act of deceiving or misrepresenting in order to induce another individual or group to give up something of value. The researchers concluded that the most common reason for committing fraud was motivation. The concept of "wages in kind" suggests that the more dissatisfied the employee, the more motivated the individual will be to engage in fraud.

2.6 Substance Abuse at Work

Substance abuse among workers represents billions of dollars in organizational financial loss. Illicit drug use costs over many 'billion annually because of Lost productivity, premature and preventable health problems" increased workers' compensation claims, and behavioral problems. A survey of full-time workers who reported illicit drug use were more likely than non-drug users to have worked for three or more employers in the past year, taken unexcused absences from work, and either voluntarily left the employer or been terminated in the past year.

2.7 Cyber slacking

The Internet has provided a technology feature that enables many employees to slack off their regular work. Employees have used the Internet for prohibited non work usage. Surfing the Internet for personal reasons is apparently widespread." Personal e-mails, online shopping, recreational surfing listening to music, vacation planning, and house or apartment hunting are performed during work hours. The use of the Internet for personal reasons is a form of virtual goldbricking or "cyber-slacking." This behavior costs organizations in terms of time and energy devoted to non-organization matters.

2.8 Sabotage

A potentially costly form of misbehavior is sabotage, which involves damaging or destroying an organization's, or colleague's equipment, workspace, or data. Sabotage is a tangible expression of aggression or violence.

Sabotage at its extreme is a form of violence. It has been described as misbehavior that includes a bit of revenge. The person resorting to sabotage is attempting to disrupt, destroy or dismiss the organization.

Three types of sabotage targets exist: people, equipment and operations v' In sabotaging people the objective is to destroy the person's career, progress, reputation, or work area. The sabotage of equipment or operations involves physically destroying something.

2.9 Theft

Theft is defined as the unauthorized taking, consuming, or transferring of money or goods owned by the organization. This definition of theft should indicate that stealing is not limited to tangible property. Data, information, and intellectual property can and are stolen as well.

2.10 Behaviour Modification

Behavior modification (or B Mod) involves making specific behavior occur more or less often by systematically managing its cue's and consequences. Behavior modification strategies are systematic antecedents and consequences to change the undesired behaviour. Behaviour strategies are the best medium to decrease the undesired behaviours of employees and make them able to show suitable learning, emotional, social and psychological behaviour.

Positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, extinction, shaping, discussion, communication, participation, discrimination and proximity with verbal and non-verbal cues, warning and punishment are available behaviour modification techniques for the supervisors to modify the deviant workplace behaviour of their subordinates.

Among all behaviour modification techniques positive reinforcement is positive technique to overcome problem behaviours of employees. Positive reinforcement includes rewards, incentives, feedback, motivation and appreciation. Positive reinforcement increases the occurrence of an appropriate response. Shaping, discussion, communication, participation and discrimination strategies are used to encourage employees to show their behaviour perfectly. Sometimes, unwanted behaviour cannot be reduced with positive reinforcement then negative consequences are used like punishment, extinction, warning etc.

3. Research Questions

Following research questions were asked in the study.

What is the ratio of work place deviance in male and female teaching staff?

What is the ratio of interpersonal deviance in male and female teaching staff of university of Sargodha?

What is the ratio of organizational deviance in male and female teaching staff of university of Sargodha?

What is ratio of interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance in comparison?

4. Method

To answer the research questions. A survey research was conducted. Whole teaching staff was target population and for convenience fifty lecturers of post graduate level were selected randomly for the sample. Of these respondents 26 were male and 24 were female.

5. Instrument

A broad and theoretically derived measure of deviant behaviour in the workplace was used. This measure was developed by Rebecca J. Bennett (University of Toledo) and Sandra L. Robinson (University of British Columbia).

The survey comprised of two parts, part one comprised of 7 items (1-7) that show the interpersonal deviance (deviant behavior directly harmful to other individuals within the organization). Part two comprised of 12 items that show organizational deviance (deviant behavior directly harmful to organization).

Respondents were requested to indicate the extent to which they are engaged in each of the behaviours on a 7-point Likert scale. The scale anchors were as follows:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never	Once a year	Twice a year	Several times a year	Monthly	Weekly	Daily

The data collected in terms of participants ranking responses were analyzed by calculating the mean of participant's scores.

6. Results

Table 1 shows that the mean score of overall workplace deviance of male staff was found to be 60.23 and that of female staff was found to be 39.54. So it was concluded that the male teaching staff of university of Sargodha is more deviant than the female teaching staff.

Table 2 shows that the mean score of males exhibiting interpersonal deviance was found to be 22.35 and that of female was found to be 15.00. The difference was significant. So it was concluded that the male teaching staff of university of Sargodha exhibit more interpersonal deviance than female teaching staff of university of Sargodha.

Table 3 shows that the mean score of males exhibiting organizational deviance was found to be 37.88 and that of female was found to be 24.54. So it was concluded that there was a significant difference between the two scores and male exhibits more organizational deviance as compare to females.

Table 4 shows that the mean score of interpersonal deviance was found to be 18.82 and that of organizational deviance was found to be 31.48. So it was concluded that organizational deviance in teaching staff of university of Sargodha is more dominant as compare to interpersonal deviance.

7. Discussion.

The results of this study reveal that the ratio of organization deviance in the university's workspace is more dominant as compared to interpersonal deviance and the male teaching staff of University of Sargodha is more deviant at workplace as compared to female teaching staff. The findings of the study alarm the higher authorities of the University of Sargodha to have a quick check on this matter especially "organizational deviance" is much freighting issue for the higher authorities of University in which the teaching staff is not fully sincere with the university, their commitment towards the university is lacking to great extents. But, such type of problem can be overcomes by the proper use of "behaviour modification techniques identified in the study.

Through preview of related literature several behaviour modification techniques were identified and it is suggested that positive reinforcement is positive technique to over come problem behaviours of employees. Positive reinforcement includes rewards, incentives, feedback, motivation and appreciation. Positive reinforcement increases the occurrence of an appropriate response. Shaping, discussion, communication, participation and discrimination strategies are used to encourage employees to show their behaviour perfectly. Sometimes, unwanted behaviour cannot be reducing with positive reinforcement then negative consequences are used like punishment, extinction, warning etc.

References

- Akers, R.L. (1973). *Deviant Behaviour: A social learning approach*. Belmont, MA: Wadsworth.
- Baron, R.A. & Neuman, J.H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 22, 161-173
- D.M. Rousseau & C. Cooper (Eds.) *Trends in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-23). New York: Wiley.
- Donenstein, E. & Hatfield, E. (1982). Aggression and inequity. In J. Greenberg & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behaviour* (pp. 309-336). New York: Academic Press.
- Greenberg, J. & Scott, K.S. (1996). Why do workers bite the hands that feed them? Employee theft as a social exchange process. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 18, pp. 111-156) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kaplan, H.B. (1975). *Self-attitudes and deviant behaviour*, Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Lehman, W. & Simposn, D. (1992). Employee substance abuse and on-the-job behaviours. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 309-321.
- Murphy, K.R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship behaviour*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Rebecca J.B. & Sandra L.R. (2000) Development of measures of workplace deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*. Vol. 85 pp 3, 349-360

Robinson, S. & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: a multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 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*, 6, 3-27

Williams, L.J. & Andersen, S.E (1991) Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617

Table 1. Ratio of Overall workplace deviance between male and female teaching staff of university of Sargodha.

Gender	Mean score
Male	60.23
Female	39.54

Table 2. Ratio of Interpersonal deviance between male and female teaching staff of university of Sargodha.

Gender	Mean score
Male	22.35
Female	15.00

Table 3. Ratio of Organizational deviance between male and female teaching staff of university of Sargodha.

Gender	Mean score
Male	37.88
Female	24.54

Table 4. Comparison of Interpersonal deviance versus organizational deviance.

Dimension	Mean score
Interpersonal	18.82
Organizational	31.48