

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321162318>

# Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy as Predictors of Workplace Deviance in Service Organizations: India's Experience

Article in *Indian Journal of Public Health Research and Development* · October 2017

DOI: 10.5958/0976-5506.2017.00302.3

CITATIONS

4

READS

897

2 authors:



Sainath Malisetty

Vels University

17 PUBLICATIONS 70 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Vasanthi Kumari

SRM Institute of Science and Technology

11 PUBLICATIONS 64 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

# Detention, Nepotism and Truancy as Predictors of Workplace Deviance in Service Organizations: India's Experience

Sainath Malisetty<sup>1</sup>, K Vasanthi Kumari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Management, VELS University, Chennai,

<sup>2</sup>HOD, Asst. Professor, GTM College, Guddiyatam

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** This study reconnoiters influence of Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy on workplace deviance of Service Organization employees with aim of ascertaining their relative and combined contributions.

**Analysis:** A descriptive survey analysis design was adopted for study. Using Proportionate sampling technique, a cluster of 600 respondents was selected for study. Four standardized instruments were used for information assortment. Using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Statistics and regression analysis, hypotheses generated for study were tested at 0.05 alpha ( $\alpha$ ) levels.

**Findings:** From this study, highlights are as follows:

1. Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy were found to ownconjointly contributed to employees' deviance conduct in service based organizations of India.
2. Also, nepotism was found to be foremost potent predictor of employees' deviance conduct.

**Novelty:** Its entreated that managers should not favor any employee, however, acknowledge and reward diligence supported job performance.

**Keywords:** *Detention, Nepotism, Truancy, Workplace Deviance, Service Organization Employees.*

## INTRODUCTION

Employees are devices through which organizations will accomplish their objectives. Therefore, employees' association with their organization is significant since it will decide advancement of workplace deviance<sup>1</sup>. Conduct is called Deviant when "an individual or gathering of individuals damages organization's traditions, methods or inner controls, imperiling prosperity of organization or its natives"<sup>2</sup>. Deviant conduct speaks to acts bestowed by hierarchical people that have or are expected to own impact of harming associates, directors or organization itself<sup>3</sup>.

Recent researches created enthusiasm for investigation of workplace deviance since its regular among employees and what is more poses very

troublesome problems for organizations<sup>4,5</sup>. It was accounted for that 33% to 78% of all employees have occupied with one form of deviance conduct or other<sup>6</sup>. Therefore this study expects to seek out impact of Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy on deviance conduct of service organization employees in India.

## DETENTION

Detention has been portrayed as "arriving late to work or leaving early"<sup>7</sup>. Coming late to work can be frightful to organization. When people don't show up on time, they are at risk of Detention. Detention is connected with exchanged off definitive efficiency which oppositely impacts creation. Diverse pros may endeavor to mimic late employees by coming to work late themselves if not particularly controlled by organization.

## Nepotism

Nepotism in workplace can be dangerous and counterproductive. It is portrayed that Nepotism as exhibition of showing preference toward an exceptional individual or group<sup>8</sup>. It moreover views Nepotism as happening when pioneer demonstrates unique treatment towards employees their character socially connected with to damage of various employees and general performance of organization<sup>9</sup>. Nepotism can be intentional or surprising. Nevertheless, paying little mind to whether Ponder or surprising, it is unlawful, de-pushing, cuts down trust, isolating and can provoke employee deviant practices, for instance, employees despising work, withholding of information, uncertainty, abhor, sharpness, bits of chatter, longing and conflicts, scheming and undue progressions to favored employees<sup>10</sup>. It can similarly impact prosperity, nature of work and employees general proficiency<sup>11</sup>.

## Truancy

Distinctive makers have portrayed Truancy in different ways<sup>12</sup>. Non-participation implies Truancy of an employee from work with no elucidation, without endorsement and intentionally. A maker bear witness to that unexcused unfortunate insufficiencies cut down productivity, results to low confirmation and is an extra stress for various employees which impacts both employees and organization. The testimony regarding that non-appearance is unfavorably related to job satisfaction and obligation especially satisfaction with work itself and could be an indication of regulatory issues like negative deviance which is indication of poor performance. It was in like manner announced that non-appearance at work is a break of understanding among supervisor and employees. It is moreover a creation variation from norm and an indication of issues at work.

It was seen that employees are truant due to remedial reasons while others don't appear in light of way that they are not content with their work. In like way, Personal Fund Report shows that illness, tormenting and goading, burnout, stress and low resolve, tyke care and senior care, wretchedness, partition, wounds, work pursuing and inadequate developments could be a segment of purposes behind employees being truant from their commitments while Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development absence report viewed stress as most basic explanation behind whole deal truancy.

## Research Hypothesis

- i. There is no significant joint contribution of Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy on service organizations employee deviance conduct.
- ii. Gender will not significantly moderate combined contribution of Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy on service organizations employee deviance conduct.
- iii. There is no significant relative contribution of Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy on service organizations employee deviance conduct.
- iv. There is no significant direct relationship between Detention, Nepotism and Truancy and deviance conduct among employees of service organizations.

## METHODOLOGY

**Review Design:** This review embraced clear plan of *ex-post facto* sort. This is on account of researchers did not control any of factors, but instead, analyst watched and portrayed impact of effectively existing free factors (Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy) on reliant variable (workplace deviance).

**Sample Size:** Populace for review contained all employees (including administration association employees) working in Bangalore, India. A multi-stage inspecting system was utilized to choose six organizations (3 IT and 3 BPO/KPO) that partake in review. Multi-stage examining procedure was picked on grounds that it is a phase-by-stage arrangement of testing strategy. In particular, sample for this review comprised of 600 employees (498 direct individuals and 102 managers).

**Inspection:** 600 questionnaires were offered to all participating organizations. Out of 600 surveys conveyed, 12 were not appropriately rounded or passed up a major opportunity over span of recovery, which refute them with end goal of review. It can, in any case, be said that there was (572) 95.3% accomplishment of survey organization.

## Instruments

**Detention Scale:** This scale involves three items including thing like "came to work late without assent" and respondents were made a demand to stick their responses on five demonstrates going from never common on how routinely they have done each on their present jobs. A Cronbach  $\alpha$  of .71 was obtained

showing it is suitable for this study.

**Nepotism Scale:** This scale included thirteen items. It was used to gauge how much employees see nearness of nepotism by an organization. Individuals were made a demand to demonstrate how much some of their partners get more noteworthy flexibility, get ready, affirmation and higher boosts in salary than is typical on their specialized topics, for instance, "some of my sidekicks get more versatility than is standard in my strength in work arranges". Declarations are evaluated on a size of five-point Likert scale stretching out from unequivocally agrees to determinedly disagree. In this survey, nepotism scale has a coefficient  $\alpha$  of .84.

**Truancy Scale:** This scale contains six items which were self-made including items like "delighted in a more drawn out relief than you were allowed to take" and respondents were made a demand to stick their responses on five points reaching out from never to normal on how much of time they have done each on their present businesses. A Cronbach  $\alpha$  of .80 was gotten and that shows that scale is proper for survey.

**Abnormality Scale<sup>13</sup>:** Deviance Scale was used to measure work deviation among employees. This scale contained twenty-eight items. Individuals were made a demand to exhibit how much they have possessed with such activities like "tackled an individual matter rather than working for your supervisor". Declarations are assessed on a size of five going from never to every

day. It was represented that this scale has internal steadfast nature of 0.81, and in this audit, it has inside trustworthiness of .79.

**Procedure:** Biographical data scale was used to assess demographic details of participants while nepotism, truancy, deviance and detention scales were administered on sample.

**Data analysis:** data obtained were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics analysis, Pearson product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Regression statistical tools.

## RESULTS

Table-1 demonstrates unwavering quality of considerable number of factors in review. Cronbach's alpha for deviance scale is .788, Truancy record is .801, nepotism is .840 and for detention, scale is .707, which meets base satisfactory suggested level. For Correlation, Pearson Correlation grid was utilized. It appears from Table 1 that an opposite relationship exists amongst deviance and Truancy (-.312) at a noteworthy level ( $p = .01$ ). deviance and nepotism demonstrated a concurrent relationship of .631 at critical level of .01, while a huge negative relationship was found amongst deviance and detention (-.264). Outcomes likewise showed noteworthy positive connections amongst Truancy and nepotism (.471), Truancy and detention (.339), and in addition detention and nepotism (.298).

**Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  and Correlations of Employee's deviance conduct, Truancy, Nepotism and Detention**

Variable	Mean	SD	Cronbach's $\alpha$	No. of items	1	2	3	4
Deviant Behaviour	76.114	9.071	0.788	28	1.00			
Truancy	15.003	6.109	0.801	6	-.312**	1.00		
Nepotism	33.207	11.273	0.84	13	.631**	.471**	1.00	
Detention	9.465	4.64	0.707	3	-.264**	.339**	.298*	1.00

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  and Correlations of Employee's deviance conduct, Truancy, Nepotism and Detention N=150; \*\* Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); \* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed);

Results in Table 2 showed that with all marker elements (Detention, Nepotism and Truancy) in backslide indicate together expected deviance conduct ( $R = .441$ ;  $R^2 = .194$ ; Adj.  $R^2 = .194$ ;  $F(3, 574) = 33.478$ ;  $p < .05$ ). This showed that all predictor variables accounted for 19.4% of variance in employees' deviant

conduct. Null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant joint contribution of detention, nepotism and truancy on employees' deviant conduct was rejected by this finding. This implies that there is a significant joint contribution of detention, nepotism and truancy on employees' deviant conduct.

**Table 2. Model summary of the regression analysis for the combined influence of Truancy, Nepotism and Detention to the prediction of employees' deviance conduct**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj.R <sup>2</sup>	SE	Change Statistics	F change	df1	df2	Sig.F change
Predictor variables	0.441	0.194	0.194	13.061	R <sup>2</sup> change	33.478	3	574	0.021
					0.194				

- a) Predictors: (constant), Truancy, Nepotism and Detention;
- b) Dependent variable: Employee's Deviant conduct

Results in Table 3 revealed nature of causation of marker variable on worldview variable. Most serious pointer of employees' deviance direct among marker variables of audit is nepotism ( $\beta = .472$ ;  $t = 9.115$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Truancy is accompanying intense variable ( $\beta = .298$ ;  $t = 4.307$ ;  $p < .05$ ), and lastly by detention ( $\beta = -.231$ ;  $t = 3.001$ ;  $p < .05$ ) in prediction of employees' deviant conduct.

hypothesis of no relative contribution of detention, nepotism and truancy on employees' deviant conduct was rejected by this finding. This implies that there is a significant relative contribution of detention, nepotism and truancy on employees' deviant conduct, while nepotism was found to be most potent predictor among three.

**Table 3. Beta coefficients and t ratio for relative contributions of Truancy, Nepotism and Detention to the prediction of employees' deviance conduct**

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-ratio	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta ( $\beta$ )		
Constant	3.409	0.615		8.86	0.00
Truancy	0.226	0.135	0.298	4.31	0.01
Nepotism	0.418	0.038	0.472	9.11	0.00
Detention	-0.167	0.027	-0.231	-3.00	0.00

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed);

- a) Dependent variable: Employee's Deviant conduct

Results in Table 4 exhibited that with all pointer components (Detention, Nepotism, and Truancy) entered into backsliding show promptly; there was an enormous conjecture of decline lead among male and female employees in organization. For male employees ( $R = .307$ ;  $R^2 = .094$ ;  $Adj R^2 = .088$ ;  $F(4,248) =$

$19.907$ ;  $p < .05$ ), while for female employees, values are ( $R = .511$ ;  $R^2 = .261$ ;  $Adj R^2 = .247$ ;  $F(4,322) = 8.543$ ;  $p < .05$ ). This implies that there was combined contribution of detention, nepotism and truancy to prediction of deviant conduct among both male and female employees.

**Table 4. Model Summary of the multiple regression analysis of the moderating effect of gender on the influence of Truancy, Nepotism and Detention to the prediction of employees' deviance conduct**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj.R <sup>2</sup>	SE	Change Statistics	F change	df1	df2	Sig.F change
Predictor variables					R <sup>2</sup> change	19.907	4	248	0.013
Male	0.307	0.094	0.088	10.771	0.388				
Female	0.511	0.261	0.247	18.002	0.247	8.543	4	322	0.00

- a) Predictors: (constant), Truancy, Nepotism and Detention;
- b) Dependent variable: Employee's Deviant conduct

## DISCUSSION

**Hypothesis-1** anticipated no huge joint commitment of Truancy, nepotism, and detention on representatives' deviance conduct. Results demonstrated that all indicator factors represented 19.4% of difference in employees deviance conduct. This result certifies past discoveries<sup>14,15</sup> that employees take part in Deviant practices while other<sup>16</sup> affirmed that it is more apparent in lower class representatives since they confer greater part of their free circumstances at getting back at whoever that irritates them. Likewise, a review<sup>17</sup> present that hierarchical trouble making happens among employees of service organizations.

**Hypothesis-2** uncovered a noteworthy expectation of Deviant conduct among male and female employees in world. This infers there was consolidated commitment of Truancy, nepotism, and detention to expectation of deviance conduct among both male and female employees in community. Finding of a review<sup>18</sup> makes an announcement that between 35% and 78% of all employees have occupied with one type of deviant conduct or other. In two distinct reviews<sup>19,20</sup>, it was watched that all people in working environments have inclination of taking part in dangerous practices.

**Hypothesis-3** anticipated that there is no noteworthy relative commitment of Truancy, nepotism, and detention on employees Deviant conduct. Finding uncovers noteworthy relative commitment of Truancy, nepotism, and detainment on employee's deviance conduct, while nepotism was observed to be strongest indicator among three. In light of this view, it is apparent that an employee who is disappointed may take part in some deviance conduct like not appearing for work with a specific end goal to turn tables on association. Likewise, it<sup>21</sup> was considered nonappearance to be a sign of lethal workplace while it<sup>22</sup> presents that nonappearance is a gently workplace deviance and a potential wellspring of work environment strife.

**Hypothesis-4** expressed that there is no critical direct connection between Truancy, nepotism and detention and deviance conduct among representatives. Result of this finding uncovered a noteworthy direct relationship among factors either emphatically or contrarily. A back-wards relationship exist between deviance conduct, Truancy (-.312), and detention (-.264). outcomes on immediate connection between Truancy, detainment and Deviant conduct is par with past discoveries that emotions and demonstration of

Truancy and detainment prompt counterproductive work practices it could be said that they cause inactivity<sup>23</sup>, low levels of duty<sup>24</sup>, and an absence of exertion. Likewise, another researcher<sup>25</sup> has demonstrated that detention adversely influences achievement of each association.

Deviant conduct and nepotism demonstrated a united relationship. Additionally, a noteworthy positive relationship was found amongst Truancy and nepotism, Truancy and detention. This outcome is in accordance<sup>26</sup> with that presumed that avoidance makes people feel awful about them, and rejected people revealed sentiments of uselessness and ineptitude.

## CONCLUSIONS

Disclosures from this study have basic implications for employee's organization and appraisal. This is in light of fact that, an inclination is counterproductive and could incite bring down employees resolve and could be de-pushing too hard working employees especially when they feel their tireless work is not adjusted. Manager should not reinforce any illustrative in any case, and compensate persevering work in perspective of job performance. There should be awesome and target gadgets and criteria for evaluation and appraisal that is direct and fathomed by all. This will go far in diminishing employee's anomaly. Truancy which is seen as "tenderly monstrosity" work lead should be checked and controlled since it can incite more certifiable conflicts. To fulfill this, truancy technique should be set up by relationship to check and control employee willful nonappearances.

**Ethical Clearance:** Not required

**Source of Funding:** Self

**Conflict of Interest:** Nil

## REFERENCES

1. Borlin, B & Heatherly, L. *Predictors of employee deviance: the relationship between bad attitudes and bad behaviour*, 15 (3) ed.: Journal of Business & Psychology; 2001.
2. Robinson, S & Bennett, R. *A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study*, 38 ed. : Academy of Management Journal; 1995.
3. Appelbaun, S. H.; Iaconi, G. D.; & Matouset, A. *Positive & negative workplace deviant behaviors:*



- causes, impact and Solutions. 7(5) ed.: Corporate Governance; 2007.
4. Mayer, Thau, Workman, Djike & Creme. *Leadership mistreatment, employee hostility and deviant behaviors: integrating self-uncertainty & thwarted needs perspectives on deviance*, 117(1) ed. : Journal of Organizational & Human Decision Process; 2011.
  5. Fagbohunge, B. O.; Akinbode, G. A.; & Ayodeji, F. S. *Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviors: An empirical analysis in Nigeria*, 7(5) ed.: International Journal of Business & Management; 2012.
  6. Malisetty S. *A case study in IT Industry*, 9(14) ed. Indian Journal of Science and Technology: DOI: 10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i14/87684.; 2016.
  7. Fodlucck, K. M.. *Management principles: the theory of management, work environments that negate counterproductive behaviors and foster organizational culture: Research based recommendations for managers*, 10(1) ed.: Psychologist Managerial Journal; 2007.
  8. Arnold, A. *Types of favoritism in the workplace. Small Business*. [www.findarticle.com](http://www.findarticle.com) (accessed August 14, 2013, 4.50p.m).
  9. Ramachander, A. *Dealing with favoritism in the workplace*. <http://www.dealing-favoritism-workplace.html> (accessed Oct. 24, 2013, 1.21pm).
  10. Byras, L. L. & Rue, L. W. *Human resources management*. Boston, MA: Macgraw-Hill; 2000.
  11. Cuma, M. A.. *Avoiding favoritism in the workplace*. [posts/entry/avoiding-favoritism-in-the-workplace-html](http://posts/entry/avoiding-favoritism-in-the-workplace-html) (accessed Oct. 24, 2013, 1.30pm).
  12. Hanebuth, Dirk. *Background of absenteeism*, K. Heinitz ed. Peter Lang: Frankfurt: Psychology in Organizations - Issues from an applied area; 2008.
  13. Bennett, R. J & Robinson, S. L. *The past, present and future of workplace deviance research*, J. Greenberg ed.: Organizational behaviour: the state of the science; 2003.
  14. Chirasha, V & Mahapa, M. *An analysis of the causes and impact of deviant behavior in the workplace. The case of secretaries in state universities*, 3(5) ed.: Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS); 2012.
  15. Moti, U. G. *Employee Misbehavior and management among academic and nonacademic staff of the University of Abuja, Nigeria*. [http://www.academia.edu/1138253/employee\\_misbehaviour\\_and\\_management\\_among\\_academic\\_and\\_non](http://www.academia.edu/1138253/employee_misbehaviour_and_management_among_academic_and_non) (accessed July 10, 2014, 1pm).
  16. Mazni, A. & Roziah, M. R.. *owards developing a theoretical model on the determinants of workplace deviance among support personnel in the Malaysian public service organizations*. [www.ufhrd.co.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/S9Alias070RP.doc](http://www.ufhrd.co.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/S9Alias070RP.doc) (accessed Nov. 26, 2013, 10.15 am.).
  17. Kalejaiye, P. O & Adeyemi, B. F. . *Job tenure, job status and employees' attitude to work: a study of selected non-academic staff of Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria*, 1(2) ed.: Journal of Business Management and Administration; 2013.
  18. Fagbohunge, B. O.; Akinbode, G. A.; & Ayodeji, F. S. *Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria*, 7(5) ed. : International Journal of Business & Management; 2012.
  19. Griffin, R. W. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M.. *The dark side of organizational behavior*. New York: Wiley; 2004.
  20. Chirasha, V & Mahapa, M. *An analysis of the causes and impact of deviant behavior in the workplace. The case of secretaries in state universities*, 3(5) ed.: Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS); 2012.
  21. Saez, A. *The effect of absenteeism and tardiness on work*. Demand media. <http://www.yourbusiness.ascentral.com/effect-absenteeism-tardiness-work-4991> (accessed August 6, 2014, 11.50am).
  22. Thomas, D. N. *Narcissism: Behind the Mask: In Absenteeism (Ed.)*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Absenteeism> (accessed August 6, 2014, 11.50am).
  23. Martinko, M.J., Gundlach, M.J., and Douglas, S.C. *Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behavior: A causal reasoning perspective*, 10(1/2) ed.: International Journal of Selection and Assessment; 2002.
  24. Fox, S.; Spector, P.E.; Goh, A.; Bruursema, K.; & Kessler, S.R. *The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior*. 85 ed.: Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology; 2012.
  25. Gervasini, K. *Workplace tardiness affects staff morale and business operations*. [www.jkentstaffing.com](http://www.jkentstaffing.com) (accessed June 10, 2014, 12:52pm).
  26. Gerber, J. & Wheeler, L.. *On being rejected: A meta-analysis of experimental research on rejection*, 4 ed. : Perspectives on Psychological Science; 2009.