

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR AND WORKPLACE DEVIANCE: A STUDY OF EMPLOYEES IN VARIOUS SECTORS

¹Kandukuri Sai Chetana Reddy

¹ Student

¹ Psychology Department

¹ St. Francis college, Hyderabad, India

ABSTRACT

The performance of a company/ institutions depends upon the attitude of the employees towards their work place and their co-workers. The present study aims at determining the relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Workplace Deviance among the employees of MNC's, NGO's, and Educational Institutions. It aims to study the gender differences that may exist and to study if there exists any difference in the levels of Work Deviance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour between employees of NGOs, MNCs and Educational Institutions. Purposive Sampling and Snowball Sampling techniques were employed to collect the data from 80 employees each from MNCs, NGOs and Educational institutions situated in the metropolitan city of Hyderabad. The Organizational Citizenship Behaviour checklist (Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2012) and the Measure of Workplace Deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) were administered. Data analysis revealed significant differences between the employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, levels of Workplace Deviance between men and women, with men exhibiting high on Workplace Deviance, between men and women working in Educational Institutions with respect to Workplace Deviance, with men exhibiting higher levels of Workplace Deviance. Data analysis also revealed a negative correlation (-.341) between Age and Workplace Deviance which means that older employees exhibit lower levels of Workplace Deviance.

Keywords: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Workplace Deviance, MNC, NGO, Educational Institution.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is defined as "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization". It is also defined as an individual's behaviour that is usually not rewarded but it also acts as a responsible factor for the effective functioning of the organization.(Organ, 1988). Organ (1988), Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2004) and others emphasised the voluntary nature of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: if an individual is following a prescribed role or fulfilling formal job duties, this is not a demonstration of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Such behaviour should be outside the individual's formal role within the organisation, therefore not formally rewarded. Nevertheless, if an individual demonstrates Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, it could leave a positive impression on supervisors that would ultimately lead to workplace benefits, such as increased pay or a promotion (Organ, 1988). Pickford,H.C. (2016).

Workplace Deviance is defined as "voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of the organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). It is the voluntary behaviour against the well-being of the organization and its members. Robinson and Bennett (1995) identified two primary types of Workplace Deviance. One being abusive supervision is defined as the "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which their supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviours, excluding physical contact" and the other being . Interpersonal deviance is measures the individuals behaviour or attitudes towards their co-workers. Organizational deviance measures the individuals behaviour or attitudes towards their Organization. Workplace Deviance is considered as one of the three components of the overall job performances.

LITERATURE REVIEWS:

In a study conducted by Christian M.S et.al. (2011). The reasons for Workplace Deviance are of expanding enthusiasm to organizations. They incorporated psychological and neurocognitive perspectives to examine the effects of sleep deprivation on workplace deviance. They contended that lack of sleep diminishes people's self-control while increasing hostility, bringing about workplace deviance.

In a study conducted by Graves et.al.(2008) reveals that understudies who cheat in school are bound to take part in certain deviant behaviours in the workplace.

A study conducted by Jiing-LihFarh en.al.(2007) reveals that organizational justice (distributive and procedural) is most emphatically identified with citizenship behaviour for people who support less traditional or high modernity, values. Also, they found the relation among justice and citizenship behaviour to be more grounded for men than for women.

Mitchell et.al. (2007) conceptualized abusive supervision as a type of aggression. They also predicted that abusive supervision would be related to supervisor-directed deviance, organizational deviance, and interpersonal deviance. Their hypothesis is that the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance would be stronger when individuals hold higher negative reciprocity beliefs. The results supported the hypothesis.

Judge, T.A. et al. (2006) conducted a study which showed that Narcissism will be adversely identified with self-ratings of workplace deviance. Narcissism was more strongly negatively identified with logical contextual performance than to task performance.

Judge et al. (2006) reveals that change in workplace deviance was inside individual, and this intra-individual difference was anticipated by momentary hostility, interpersonal justice, and job satisfaction. Moreover, attribute trait hostility directed the interpersonal justice– state hostility relation such that perceived injustice was all the more firmly identified with state hostility for people high in quality trait hostility.

A study conducted by Dunlopi, (2004) reveals that workplace deviance is negatively and significantly associated with business unit performance. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, however failed to contribute to the prediction of business unit performance beyond the level that was achieved by Workplace Deviance Behaviour.

In a study conducted by Aquino et al. (2004) hypothesized that the social status factors of progressive position, gender, and race would likewise direct the relation between interactional justice and deviance.

A study conducted by Lee K. et al. (2002) reveals that Job affect was associated more strongly than were job cognitions with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour directed at individuals, whereas job cognitions correlated more strongly than did job affect with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour directed at the organization. With respect to Workplace Deviance Behaviour, job cognitions played a more important role in prediction when job affect was represented by 2 general mood variables (positive and negative affect). When discrete emotions were used to represent job affect, however, job affect played as important a role as job cognition variables, strongly suggesting the importance of considering discrete emotions in job affect research.

Zellers, K.L. et al. (2002) found that the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' Organizational Citizenship Behaviour was stronger among subordinates who defined Organizational Citizenship Behaviour as extra-role behaviour (compared with those defining Organizational Citizenship Behaviour as in-role behaviour), and this effect was fully mediated by the interactive effect of procedural justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour role definitions.

A study conducted by Podsakoff (1997) reveals that Organizational Citizenship Behaviours make important commitments to the difference in organizational effectiveness.

A study conducted by Mooram R (1995) recommends that if an individual holds collectivistic values or norms, he/she would, probably perform citizenship behaviours. In addition, this relationship was observed to be vigorous to regular technique impacts and with the impact of the relationship between procedural justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Is there a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour?
2. Is there a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Workplace Deviance?
3. Is there a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Age?
4. Is there a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Gender?
5. Is there a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in MNCs?
6. Is there a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in MNCs?
7. Is there a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in NGOs?
8. Is there a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in NGOs?
9. Is there a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in Educational Institutions?
10. Is there a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in Educational Institutions?

OBJECTIVES

1. To determine if there is a difference between the employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.
2. To determine if there is a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Workplace Deviance.
3. To determine if there is a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Age.
4. To determine if there is a difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Gender.
5. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in MNCs.
6. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in MNCs.
7. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in NGOs.
8. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in NGOs.
9. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in Educational Institutions.
10. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in Educational Institutions.

HYPOTHESIS

1. There is no difference between the employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.
2. There is no difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Workplace Deviance.
3. there is no difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Age.
4. To determine if there is no difference between employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Gender.
5. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in MNCs.
6. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in MNCs.
7. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in NGOs.
8. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in NGOs.
9. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in women working in Educational Institutions.
10. To determine if there is a relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance in men working in Educational Institutions.

METHOD**Research Design**

The present study is a quantitative study in which Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is treated as the Independent variable, and Work Deviance with its dimensions as Interpersonal Deviance and Organizational Deviance is treated as the Dependent Variable. This study adopts a One way Analysis and Correlation, between the groups design to determine whether there is a relationship between OCB and Work Deviance and also to determine the gender differences.

Sample

The sample consisted of 240 employees divided into 3 groups – Group one included 80 individuals, 40 men and 40 women, employees from MNC's, Group two included 80 individuals, 40 men and 40 women, employees from Educational Institutions and Group three included 80 individuals, 40 men and 40 women, employees from NGO's. The Purposive and Snowball Sampling techniques were used to collect the sample from the metropolitan city of Hyderabad.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Employees from: MNCs, NGOs, Educational Institutions.
- Literate: English

Instruments

- Information Schedule

The participants were required to sign an informed consent form and provide certain personal information including age, religion, work related details like workplace and working hours, physical and mental health status of the respondent etc.

- Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Checklist (OCB-C)

The 20 item scale by Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, (2012) was designed to assess the frequency of Organizational Citizenship Behaviours of employees. Initially the test consisted of 42 items. It has since been refined and shortened first to 36 items and then to the final 20 item scale that we recommend (Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2012). The scale has two sub scales Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Organization (OCBO) and acts directed toward co-workers that help with work-related issues (OCBP). The items of OCB-C are scored on a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 1 = Never to 5 = Every day. Scores are computed by summing responses across items. A total score is the sum of responses to all items. Fox et al. (In press) reported co-efficient alphas for the 20-item version of the OCB-C of .89 and .94 for two self-report samples, and .94 for a co-worker sample (co-workers reporting on the target employee).

- Workplace Deviance

The 19 item scale by Robinson & Bennett, (1995) consists of two subscales i.e Interpersonal Deviance and Organizational Deviance scale. The scale had follows a 7 point likert scale which follows: 1(never), 2 (once a year), 3 (twice a year), 4 (several times a year), 5 (monthly), 6 (weekly), and 7 (daily). The scales showed acceptable internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha reliabilities of .81 for the Organizational Deviance scale and .78 for the Interpersonal Deviance scale.

Procedure

After selecting the measures, a few arrangements were made for data collection. The questionnaires and information sheet were prepared and organized. The individuals who fit the criteria were identified by the researcher, rapport was established with them and they were made aware that their participation in the study was purely voluntary. They were assured of maintaining confidentiality throughout the study. The individuals who agreed to participate in the study were requested to sign an 'Informed Consent Form'. Next, the demographic sheet was administered. Based on the information schedule, the participants who fit the sampling criteria were selected. After the appropriate participants were screened out, instructions for the questionnaires were given first and the participants were requested to respond to the items. There was no fixed time limit for the questionnaire.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

After completion of data collection, the responses were scored using the data analysis software IBM SPSS version 20, according to the manuals. Then the statistical treatments of the scores were done. Means and Standard Deviation of Organizational Citizenship

Behaviour along with its two dimensions and Workplace Deviance along with its two dimensions were calculated for the employees from MNC's, NGO's, and Educational Institutions, for the total men and for the total women. The data was analysed using One way Anovawas for testing the significant difference for the categorizing variables and gender. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was computed to determine whether there was any significant correlation between Organisation Citizenship Behaviour and Work Deviance along with its two dimensions.

Results

These are the following findings from the data analysis.

- There is a significant difference (.018) between the employees of MNCs, NGOs and Educational Institutions with respect to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.
- There is a significant difference in the levels of Workplace Deviance between men and women, with men exhibiting high on Workplace Deviance.
- There is a significant difference between men and women working in Educational Institutions with respect to Workplace Deviance, with men exhibiting higher levels of Workplace Deviance.
- There is a negative correlation (-.341) between Age and Workplace Deviance which means that older employees exhibit lower levels of Workplace Deviance.

CONCLUSION

From the above study it can be concluded that men are exhibiting higher levels of Workplace deviance. This could be because of lesser levels of patience and higher levels of aggression are exhibited by men. It can also be concluded that as individuals grow older they exhibit lower levels of workplace deviance which could be a result of gaining more responsibilities in the organisations which necessitate the individual to be less deviant.

REFERENCES

1. Aquino, K., Galperin, B. L., & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. (2004nd ed., Vols. 34 - 5, pp. 1001-1029). N.p.: Journal of Applied Social Psychology.
2. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
3. Christian, M.S., Ellis, A. P. (2011). Examining the effects of sleep deprivation on workplace deviance: a self-regulatory perspective. (2011th ed., Vols. 54 - 5, pp. 913-934). N.p.: Academy of Management Journal
4. Dunlop, P. D., Lee, K. (2004) Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. (2004th ed., Vols. 25, pp. 67-80). N.p.: Journal of Organizational Behaviour.
5. Frah, J. L., Earley, C. P., & Lin, S.C. (2007) Impetus for action: a cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in chinese society. (2007th ed., Vols. 42 - 3, pp. 421-444). N.p.: Administrative Science Quarterly.
6. Graves, S. M. (2008). Student cheating habits: a predictor of workplace deviance. (2008th ed., Vols. 3 - 1). N.p.: Journal of Diversity Management - First Quarter.
7. Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006) Loving yourself abundantly: relationship of the narcissistic personality to self and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. (2006th ed., Vols. 91 - 4, pp. 762-776). N.p.: Journal of Applied Psychology.
8. Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006) Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: test of a multilevel model performance. (2006th ed., Vols. 91 - 1, pp. 126-138). N.p.: Journal of Applied Psychology.
9. Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behaviour and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions. (2002^{ed.}, Vols. 87, pp.131-142) *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
10. Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. (Vol. 50, pp. 123-150). N.p.: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*.
11. Mitchell, M. S., Ambrose, M. L. (2007) Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. (2007th ed., Vols. 92 - 4, pp. 1159-1168). N.p.: Journal of Applied Psychology.
12. Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G.L. (1995) Individualism- collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour. (1995th ed., Vols. 16, pp. 127-142). N.p.: Journal of Organizational Behaviour.
13. Pickford, H.C., Joy, G. (2016). Organizational citizenship behaviour: definitions and dimensions.
14. Punam, S. (2015). Psychology theories and practice. (pp. 216-253).
15. Spector, P.E (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior checklist (OCB-C).
16. Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour. (2002th ed., Vols. 87 - 6, pp. 1068-1076). N.p.: Journal of Applied Psychology.