

**An Assessment of Relationship among Workplace Deviant Behaviours, Demographic Factors and Job Performance Dimensions in Retail Sector with Reference to Karnataka State**

**Dr. V. Chandrasekhar Rao**  
**Dr. Anandamma**  
**Dr. Madeswaran A**

**Abstract:** Indian retail industry is one of the fastest growing and is the preferred retail destination across the world. The country is among the biggest in the world in terms of per capita retail store availability. While contributing 10% of India's GDP, the sector employs nearly 8% of Indian workforce. India's retail sector is seeing exponential growth with expansion in tier 2, tier 3 cities along with major cities and metros. To continue with COGS in retail sector, organizations in retail sector must also look into the micro aspects that support the growth. One among such is workplace deviant behaviour of employees.

Managing the personnel effectively and efficiently is difficult and one of the essential success factors for any corporation. While managing the personnel, a manager must deal with factors influencing the performance and workplace behaviour to keep sustainability in the production and profits of organization. As deviant workplace behaviour play a significant role in determining the performance of employees, the importance to workplace behaviour has increased. Workplace Deviance defined as a planned, purposeful, and hateful attempt to disrupt an organization by causing problems in the workplace.

This paper provides review of the concept of workplace deviant behaviour in organised retail sector. The study examined the relationship of workplace deviant behaviour with employee performance and it also brings out the relationship of demographic profile, workplace issues with job performance in retail sector. The paper focuses on two different issues, demographic factors and workplace problems as one issue and deviant behaviour as the other issue which are impacting the job performance which is measured based on 5 broad dimensions like motivation, inter personal skills, integrity, discipline and deviance. Study focuses on the retail outlets of Karnataka state which has seen extremely fast growth in retail sector due to various technological and other factors. Data collected shows there is a negative impact of few deviant behaviours and positive effect of demographic factors on the job performance of the employees.

**Keywords:** Deviant Workplace Behavior, Job Performance, Retail Sector, COGS & GDP

**Introduction:**

India has a huge and ambitious middle-class of 750 lakh households. Surveys have ranked Indian consumers few among most confident in the world. The more confident they are on economy growth, personal finances, career growth, etc., the more they raise their consumption levels, buy non-essential products. Indian retail industry is one of the fastest growing and is the preferred retail destination across the world. The country is among the biggest in the world in terms of per capita retail store availability. While contributing 10% of India's GDP, the sector employs nearly 8% of Indian workforce. India's retail sector is seeing exponential growth with expansion in tier 2, tier 3 cities along with major cities and metros. Healthy economy, demographic profile, increase in disposable income, ever changing consumer tastes and preferences are few among many factors that are driving growth of organised retail market in India. The \$790-billion Indian retail sector till the economic slowdown due to pandemic was slated to double in size over the next five years. To enjoy the existing status and sustainability, the retail sector should look at micro level and one aspect is of deviant behaviour of employees which eat-away the profits of organizations.

Human behaviour is the display of every physical action and observable emotion related with individuals, as well as humans. The behaviour of humans will be within a range of being common, acceptable, unusual, and beyond the acceptable limits. Behaviour includes the way human act based on different influences such as genetics, social norms, core faith, and attitude and is experienced throughout an individual's entire lifetime. An attitude is an expression of favour or disfavor toward a person, place, thing, phenomena, or an event. Everyone has a different attitude towards different things, and it alters between everyone. Attitude has a lot to do with the mind which highly relates to human behavior. Positive attitudes are better than negative ones as negativity can bring on negative emotions that most of the time can be avoided. It is up to humans to make sure their attitudes positively reflect the behaviors they want to show. This can be done by assessing their attitudes and properly presenting them in society.

Passive, aggressive, assertive, passive-aggressive, and the alternative are the main types of human behavior. Passive behaviour is accepting or allowing what happens or what others do, without active

response or resistance where as aggressive behaviour is to feel powerful. Passive-aggressive style is all about harboring and bottling emotions when the person is usually full of anger, yet will mask it with a smile and somehow find a way to insult or create concern for the person, without directly being able to be identified and held accountable. An alternator is someone who constantly alternates between aggression and passiveness. Assertiveness is standing up for your personal rights - expressing thoughts, feelings, and beliefs in direct, honest and appropriate ways. It's about sticking up for yourself. A key point is assertive people always respect the thoughts, feelings and beliefs of other people as well as their own.

Viewing deviance as a violation of social norms, sociologists have characterized it as “any thought, feeling, or action that members of a social group judge to be a violation of their values or rules or group conduct, that violates definitions of appropriate and inappropriate conduct shared by the members of a social system including a formally enacted rule which members of society are conventionally guided”. Deviance is also characterized as “the departure of certain types of behavior from the norms of a particular society at a particular time and violation of certain types of group norms where behavior is in a disapproved direction and of sufficient degree to exceed the tolerance limit of the community”. Deviance can be relative to place and time as the one that is considered deviant in one social context may be non-deviant in another. Employees in organizations is a person who contributes labor and expertise to an endeavor of an employer through performing specific duties which are packaged into a job. Employees generally articulate varied behaviours which impact differently to individuals and the organization. These behaviors should be in line with the norms of organization in order to be considered as positive and If the work behavior is not in compliance with expected norms, they affect the organization causing financial and physical damage to the organisation. Direct negative behaviour may result into theft, sabotage, and destruction of things and indirectly, it may lead to decrease in productivity, loss of reputation and other related issues.

Considering the growth in retail sector in Karnataka state due to its varied advantages, study is taken in the major cities of Karnataka.

### **Literature Review**

- Azlina Binti Yassin (2011) conducted a study on Deviant behaviour at workplace with the purpose of investigating the relationship between the 4 variables of workplace deviant behaviour in manufacturing industry. The objectives of the study were to investigate the relationship of ethical climate, job satisfaction, personal attributes & personal attitudes with workplace deviant behaviour; to examine what is the most influence factor (i.e. ethical climate, job satisfaction, job satisfaction and factors) on workplace deviant behaviour. Data suggested a significant negative relationship among job satisfaction, ethical climate and self-esteem with workplace deviant behaviour and job satisfaction is the most influential independent variable on workplace deviant behaviour.
- Dr. Muhammad Nadeem Anwar et al (2011) conducted research on Gender differences in Workplace Deviant Behaviour of University Teachers and Modification Techniques. This study was conducted to test whether there is any difference in organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance behaviour, deviance behaviour of male-female university teachers. 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.
- Stefan Thau and et al (2008) conducted research on how management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. As Ambrose and her colleagues point out (Ambrose et al., 2002), it may be that the recipient of the harmful behaviour may diverge from the target of the harm due to displaced aggression (e.g., an abused subordinate may passively retaliate by failing to complete his share of the workload, but his coworkers are the ones who bear the brunt of the deviance, not the supervisor or the organization).
- Reeshad S. Dalal (2005), in the article A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior writes that job performance is crux of the industrial-organisational psychology and it is criterion. In this researcher has used meta analysis to know the strength of the relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. On the basis of construct definitions, it can be known that people who engage in Organisational Citizenship Behavior will not tend involve in Counterproductive Work Behavior. And those who tend to involve in Organisational Citizenship Behavior would be more performance oriented.

- Patrick D. Dunlop and Kibeom Lee (2004) have performed research on Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. The influences of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and workplace deviant behaviour (WDB) on business unit performance were investigated using data from branches of a fast food organization. It was found that WDB was negatively and significantly associated with business unit performance measured both subjectively and objectively. OCB, however, failed to contribute to the prediction of business unit performance beyond the level that was achieved by WDB.
- Paul R. Sackett (2002) in the article The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance examines three large data sets that shed light on the interrelationships among task performance, citizenship behavior, and counterproductive behavior. Relationships between task performance and counterproductive behavior vary quite widely across studies, with very low relationships found when task performance is operationalized as task proficiency: what the employee can do. Much stronger relationships are found when both facets of performance are obtained by the same measurement method (e.g. supervisor ratings) and when task performance is operationalized as typical task performance: what the employee will do.
- Suzy Fox and Paul E. Spector and Don Miles (2001) did research on Counterproductive Work behaviour (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions. The study investigated relations among job stressors, perceived justice, negative emotional reactions to work, counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), autonomy, and affective traits. The results of the study were in consistent with a theoretical job stress framework in which organizational constraints, interpersonal conflict, and perceived injustice are job stressors, CWB is a behavioural strain response, and negative emotion mediates the stressor-strain relationship. In the study, they found that very weak support was found for the moderating role of affective disposition (trait anger and trait anxiety), and no support was found for the expected moderating role of autonomy in the stressor-CWB relationship.
- Melissa L. Gruys (1999) has conducted research on the dimensionality of deviant employee behaviour in the workplace. The study has indicated eleven categories of deviant behaviour: 1) Theft and Related behaviour, 2) Destruction of Property, 3) Misuse of Information, 4) Misuse of Time and Resources, 5) Unsafe behaviour, 6) Poor Attendance, 7) Poor Quality Work, 8) Alcohol Use, 9) Drug Use, 10) Inappropriate Verbal Actions, and 11) Inappropriate Physical Actions. Data suggests that deviant behaviour categories vary on two dimensions: a personal versus impersonal dimension and a task-related versus not task related dimension.
- Robinson, Sandra L; Bennett, Rebecca J (1995), in their study A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional Scaling Study developed a typology of workplace behaviors considered deviant. It is brought out that deviance vary on two dimensions: minor versus serious, interpersonal versus organizational. Workplace deviance of employee appears to fall into four categories called production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression. They tried to validate Wheeler's model and Hollinger and Clark's typologies. Significant contribution of these authors is identifying underlying dimensions of deviance and how these are related to each other

**Research Methodology:** Social science research is a systematic method of exploring, analyzing and conceptualizing human life in order to extend, correct or verifies knowledge of human behavior and social life.

### **Objectives of the Study**

- To determine whether employee demographic factors, workplace related issues have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance
- To evaluate whether deviant employee behaviour and employee performance are related to each other

**Research Design:** Exploratory and descriptive research methods are used to carry out the research.

### **Data Collection**

**Primary data:** Primary data was collected through structured questionnaire from the front line employees and their supervisors/managers working in organized retail outlets through structured questionnaire containing Likert's 5 rating questions. Questionnaires are framed to get the opinion on categorical variables in the form of both independent and dependent variables.

**Secondary data:** Secondary data was collected from books, various research journals and publications.

**Sampling method:** Retail outlets are classified into Large, Medium and Small strata and then convenience sampling technique is adopted.

**Sample Size:** The population comprises of employees working in organized retail outlets in Bangalore and other B-towns from Karnataka. Sample size of 250 employees, 50 supervisors/ managers is considered.

**Hypotheses framed for the study:**

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship among demographic factors and workplace related issues with employee performance

**Sub-hypotheses** are framed for each demographic factors and work related issues.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is significant relationship between deviant behavior and employee performance

**Statistical Tools and Measures Applied in the Study:**

- To determine whether employee demographic factors, workplace related issues have a statistically significant relationship with employee performance, T and ANOVA tests are used on each demographic variables and work-related issues.
- To evaluate whether deviant employee behaviour and employee performance are related to each other, correlation analysis was done.
- Data reliability is tested through Cronbach alpha.

**Results and Discussion:** Primary data collected through questionnaires has been examined through factor analysis to arrive at establishing the job performance dimensions and hence their mean values. Factor analysis, KMO test and other analysis are not shown here and analysis is extracted directly from calculations.

**Table 1:** Reliability Analysis

constructs	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
fac1	.836	5
fac2	.789	6
fac3	.616	3
fac4	.650	2
Fac5		

The above Table1, showed the result of reliability test, Cronbach alpha for each constructs is more than .6, which is good. The test result ensured the consistency of the instrument and data is reliable.

The below table 2 shows the factors F1 to F5 arrived from factor analysis have the following frequencies (Likert scale):

**Table 2**

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev
F1- Interpersonal skills	51	1.60	5.00	3.89	0.68
F2- Integrity	51	2.50	5.00	4.27	0.51
F3- Discipline	51	2.00	5.00	3.87	0.58
F4- Motivation	51	1.00	5.00	4.08	0.61
F5- Deviance	51		5.00		

An analysis of the above table brings out that the overall mean score of Interpersonal Skills was found to be 5.00. 4.27 for Integrity, 3.87 for Discipline, and 4.08 for motivation.

Similarly, mean values of independent variables, demographic variables, workplace issues and deviant behaviours were calculated. Through review of literature, author has identified 51 employee

behavioural variables and were administered to retail outlet employees in the form of questionnaires to seek the opinion. These 51 variables categorized into 10 broad variables and the analysis of the data is done to calculate frequencies:

**Table 3: Deviant behaviour frequencies**

	N	Min	Max	Mean	S. D
Theft & Related Behaviour	250	1.00	4.00	1.22	0.48
Destruction of property	250	1.00	4.00	1.14	0.48
Misuse of Information	250	1.00	4.20	1.17	0.43
Misuse of Time & Resources	250	1.00	4.00	1.25	0.34
Unsafe Behaviour	250	1.00	4.00	1.15	0.47
Poor Attendance	250	1.00	4.00	1.39	0.44
Poor Quality Work	250	1.00	4.00	1.13	0.39
Alcohol Use	250	1.00	4.00	1.04	0.27
Drug Use	250	1.00	4.00	1.03	0.26
Inappropriate Verbal Actions	250	1.00	4.00	1.20	0.34

The mean values of the deviant behaviour based on Likert scale used on the surveyed data ranged from 1.03 to 1.39 which are at lower end in agreeing with the questions on existence of deviant behaviours. Poor attendance has turned out to be biggest deviant behaviour with 1.39 mean and drug use as the lowest impacting deviant behaviour with mean of 1.03.

**Analysis of the significant relation among the demographic variables, workplace issues with job performing dimensions:**

**Sub-Hypotheses:**

**Table 4: Hypothesis Based on Gender**

**H<sub>01.1</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Gender and Employee Performance

	v1.Gender	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	t value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	Female	64	3.84	0.70	0.09	-.636	.525
	Male	186	3.90	0.67	0.05	-.624	
F2- Integrity	Female	64	4.31	0.50	0.06	.736	.463
	Male	186	4.25	0.52	0.04	.748	
F3- Discipline	Female	64	3.84	0.63	0.08	-.532	.595
	Male	186	3.88	0.56	0.04	-.503	
F4- Motivation	Female	64	4.14	0.61	0.08	.954	.341
	Male	186	4.06	0.61	0.04	.956	
F5- Deviance	Female	64	2.97	0.97	0.12	.393	.695
	Male	186	2.91	1.08	0.08	.416	

In the above 't' analysis (table 4), all the significant values for job performance dimensions are more than 0.05 leading to not rejecting the null hypothesis and indicates that there is no significant relationship between gender and employee performance.



**Table 5: Hypothesis based on Age**

**H01.2:** There is no significant relationship between age and Employee Performance

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	t value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	<25	166	3.86	0.66	0.05	-0.96	.337
	> 26 yrs	84	3.95	0.72	0.08		
F2- Integrity	<25	166	4.21	0.53	0.04	-2.31	.021*
	> 26 yrs	84	4.37	0.46	0.05		
F3- Discipline	<25	166	3.88	0.63	0.05	0.44	.660
	> 26 yrs	84	3.85	0.46	0.05		
F4- Motivation	<25	166	4.07	0.62	0.05	-0.21	.835
	> 26 yrs	84	4.09	0.59	0.06		
F5- Deviance	<25	166	2.86	1.13	0.09	-1.26	.210
	> 26 yrs	84	3.04	0.88	0.10		

In the above 't' analysis (table 5), integrity has significant value less than 0.05 whereas other dimensions are with more than 0.05. Hence null hypothesis is rejected only for 'Integrity' & is not rejected for other dimensions. It indicates that there is a relationship between age and integrity. 'Age' does not have any significant relationship with other dimensions of the study.

**Table 6: Hypothesis based on Marital Status**

**H01.3:** There is no significant relationship between marital status and Employee Performance

	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	T value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	Single	190	3.89	0.65	0.05	0.22	.822
	Married	60	3.87	0.76	0.10		
F2- Integrity	Single	190	4.27	0.51	0.04	0.43	.665
	Married	60	4.24	0.53	0.07		
F3- Discipline	Single	190	3.88	0.59	0.04	0.42	.675
	Married	60	3.84	0.55	0.07		
F4- Motivation	Single	190	4.06	0.64	0.05	-1.05	.294
	Married	60	4.15	0.50	0.06		
F5- Deviance	Single	190	2.93	1.08	0.08	0.20	.840
	Married	60	2.90	0.98	0.13		

To establish significant difference between various dimensions, T test (table 6) is conducted. It is found that all the significant values are more than 0.05 and hence null hypothesis is not rejected. It signifies that there is not significant relationship between marital status and job performance.

**Table 7: Hypothesis based on Overtime work**

**H<sub>01.4</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between overtime work and Employee Performance

	Over time work	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	t value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	No	192	3.82	0.68	0.05	-3.00	.003*
	Yes	58	4.12	0.62	0.08		
F2- Integrity	No	192	4.28	0.51	0.04	0.58	.566
	Yes	58	4.23	0.53	0.07		
F3- Discipline	No	192	3.84	0.54	0.04	-1.57	.117
	Yes	58	3.98	0.71	0.09		
F4- Motivation	No	192	4.07	0.55	0.04	-0.49	.628
	Yes	58	4.11	0.77	0.10		
F5- Deviance	No	192	2.99	0.97	0.07	1.80	.073
	Yes	58	2.71	1.27	0.17		

T test (table 7) is conducted to establish significant difference between dimensions. The Significant difference was found only for the dimension F1- Interpersonal skills and there was no significant difference between any other dimensions. Hence we reject null hypothesis for the dimension 'interpersonal skills' indicating there is a relationship between interpersonal skills and overtime work. The other dimensions do not have significant relationship with interpersonal skills as significant value is greater than 0.05

**Table 8: Hypothesis based on Supervision in work**

**H<sub>01.5</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between 'supervision in work' and 'Employee Performance'.

	Supervision in work	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	t value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	No	184	3.89	0.70	0.05	0.20	.840
	Yes	66	3.87	0.62	0.08		
F2- Integrity	No	184	4.33	0.49	0.04	3.12	.002*
	Yes	66	4.10	0.53	0.07		
F3- Discipline	No	184	3.84	0.53	0.04	-1.59	.112
	Yes	66	3.97	0.70	0.09		
F4- Motivation	No	184	4.10	0.56	0.04	1.10	.274
	Yes	66	4.01	0.73	0.09		
F5- Deviance	No	184	2.90	0.96	0.07	-0.48	.633
	Yes	66	2.98	1.29	0.16		

T test (table 8) is conducted to analyze and establish significant difference between various dimensions. The significant difference was found only in the dimension F2- Integrity. There was no significant difference found between any other dimensions. Hence null hypothesis is rejected for F1- integrity and is not rejected for other dimensions.

**Table 9: Hypothesis based on stress in job**

**H01.6:** There is no significant relationship between ‘stress in job’ & ‘Employee Performance’.

	Stress in your job	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	T value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	No	205	3.86	0.70	0.05	-1.14	.257
	Yes	45	3.99	0.57	0.08		
F2- Integrity	No	205	4.27	0.51	0.04	0.43	.669
	Yes	45	4.24	0.50	0.08		
F3- Discipline	No	205	3.86	0.55	0.04	-0.50	.620
	Yes	45	3.91	0.71	0.11		
F4- Motivation	No	205	4.08	0.56	0.04	0.27	.785
	Yes	45	4.06	0.79	0.12		
F5- Deviance	No	205	2.95	1.04	0.07	0.87	.384
	Yes	45	2.80	1.14	0.17		

T test (table 9) is conducted to establish significant difference between job performance factors and stress but no significant relation was found between performance dimensions and stress in job. This is evident from the significant values which are all more than 0.05 indicating we are not rejecting the null hypothesis.

**Table10: Hypothesis based on friction in previous job**

**H01.7:** There is no significant relationship between ‘friction previous job’ & ‘Employee Performance’.

	Friction	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean	t value	sig value
F1- Interpersonal skills	No	227	3.91	0.68	0.04	1.62	.106
	Yes	23	3.67	0.65	0.14		
F2- Integrity	No	227	4.31	0.50	0.03	4.10	.00*
	Yes	23	3.86	0.50	0.10		
F3- Discipline	No	227	3.89	0.58	0.04	1.40	.162
	Yes	23	3.71	0.56	0.12		
F4- Motivation	No	227	4.11	0.60	0.04	2.47	.014*
	Yes	23	3.78	0.67	0.14		
F5- Deviance	No	227	2.96	1.06	0.07	1.72	.087
	Yes	23	2.57	0.98	0.20		

T test (table 10) is conducted to establish significant relationship between friction in previous job and various job performance dimensions. The significant relationship was found only in the dimensions F2- Integrity & F4- Motivation and it is evident through the significant values .00 and 0.014 for them. It is found that there was no significance difference found between any other dimensions through their significant values. Hence, we are not rejecting null hypothesis for integrity and motivation where as for other dimensions we are rejecting the null.



**Table 11: Hypothesis based on Education**

**H<sub>01.8</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between ‘education’ & ‘Employee Performance’

		N	Mean	Std. Dev	F	Sig.
F1- Interpersonal skills	Degree	74	4.11	0.70	15.17	.000*
	Diploma	35	4.21	0.53		
	till PUC	141	3.69	0.64		
F2- Integrity	Degree	74	4.32	0.56	7.67	.001*
	Diploma	35	4.52	0.42		
	till PUC	141	4.17	0.48		
F3- Discipline	Degree	74	4.00	0.59	4.35	.014*
	Diploma	35	3.99	0.57		
	till PUC	141	3.78	0.56		
F4- Motivation	Degree	74	4.07	0.70	0.64	.526
	Diploma	35	4.19	0.44		
	till PUC	141	4.06	0.59		
F5- Deviance	Degree	74	2.95	1.10	0.07	.932
	Diploma	35	2.87	1.03		
	till PUC	141	2.92	1.04		

The analysis of the above (table11) using ANOVA brings out that interpersonal skills, integrity, discipline are showing significant relation with ‘education’. This is evident as significant values of these three are less than 0.05. Hence null hypothesis is rejected for F1-inter personal skills, F2-integrity and F3-discipline and null hypothesis is not rejected for other two dimensions F4-motivation, F5-Deviance.

**Table 12: Hypothesis based on experience**

**H<sub>01.9</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between ‘experience’ & ‘Employee Performance’.

		N	Mean	Std. Dev	F	Sig.
F1- Interpersonal skills	<2 years	153	3.88	0.68	0.09	.915
	2-5 years	76	3.91	0.68		
	5-10 years	21	3.86	0.69		
F2- Integrity	<2 years	153	4.25	0.54	1.11	.332
	2-5 years	76	4.33	0.44		
	5-10 years	21	4.16	0.51		
F3- Discipline	<2 years	153	3.86	0.62	0.23	.796
	2-5 years	76	3.87	0.50		
	5-10 years	21	3.95	0.59		
F4- Motivation	<2 years	153	4.03	0.64	1.39	.251
	2-5 years	76	4.14	0.53		
	5-10 years	21	4.21	0.58		
F5- Deviance	<2 years	153	2.90	1.07	0.87	.419
	2-5 years	76	2.89	1.04		
	5-10 years	21	3.21	0.98		

In the above ANOVA analysis (table12), test establishes significant difference between experience level in job and various performance dimensions. There was no significant difference found between these two as all significant values related to all dimensions are more than 0.05. It signifies that there is no significant relation of experience on job performance. Hence null hypothesis is not rejected.

**H02:** There is no significant relationship between marital status and Employee Performance

**Table 13: Correlation Analysis**

		Interperson al skills	Integrit y	Disciplin e	Motivation	Deviance
Theft & Related Behavior	Pearson Correlation	.130	.047	0.15	0.03	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.040*	.463	0.01*	0.59	.862
Destruction of property	Pearson Correlation	.034	.017	0.10	-0.03	-.120
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.594	.785	0.10	0.58	.057
Misuse of Information	Pearson Correlation	.030	.012	0.10	0.03	-.150
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.641	.845	0.11	0.66	.018
Misuse of Time & Resources	Pearson Correlation	.052	.053	0.14	0.06	-.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.412	.404	0.03*	0.37	.213
Poor Attendance	Pearson Correlation	-.063	-.027	-0.02	0.00	-.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.323	.675	0.77	0.96	.135
Poor Quality Work	Pearson Correlation	-.037	-.084	0.12	0.00	-.114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.563	.184	0.049*	0.96	.071
Alcohol Use	Pearson Correlation	-.063	-.055	0.09	-0.02	-.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.322	.383	0.15	0.79	.098
Drug Use	Pearson Correlation	-.128	-.134	0.01	-0.06	-.118
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043*	.034*	0.83	0.35	.063
Inappropriate Verbal Actions	Pearson Correlation	-.110	-.095	-0.03	-0.01	-.094
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.084	.135	0.59	0.84	.139
Inappropriate Physical Actions	Pearson Correlation	.025	-.021	0.04	0.04	-.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.693	.738	0.52	0.57	.495
	N	250	250	250	250	250

### Findings, Suggestions and Conclusions

Mean scores of Deviant behaviors, job performance dimensions, demographic factors along with workplace issues in the retail sector found on the basis of primary data collected. Job performance indicators are brought under broad category of 5 dimensions through factor analysis. The following findings were evolved through the study:

- Cronbach alpha (Table 1) the reliability test ensured the consistency & Reliability.
- t analysis (table 4) shows no significant relationship between Dimensions of employee performance and 'Gender'. Similar results were found with 'Marital status' (table 6), & 'stress in job' (table 9). Table 5 shows the significant relationship between Integrity & Age and similar result is seen in table 8 between integrity & supervision in work, while in table 7 significant relationship is shown between interpersonal skills and over time work. t test (table 10) establishes significant relationship between employment dimensions 'Integrity' & 'Motivation' and friction in previous job
- ANOVA (table 11) brings out significant relation of interpersonal skills, integrity, discipline with 'education', while it does not show any relation of dimensions with work experience (table 12).

- Correlation analysis (table 13) shows 'Theft & Related Behavior' has a positive correlation with 'interpersonal skills & Discipline', similarly 'Misuse of Time & Resources' & 'Poor Quality Work' with 'Discipline'. Drug use has negative correlation with 'Interpersonal skills & Integrity'.

### **Conclusion**

Research studies on behavioral aspects of employees in an organization show that, the deviant behaviour in workplace breach the established norms, policies and rules framed in organization and causes significant loss to the organization as well as its stakeholders either directly or indirectly. The study by the authors tries to examine this phenomenon in retail sector which is the fastest growing sector in India. This study tried to identify the significant relationship between so called deviant behaviour and job performance dimensions. Parallely, the driving forces like demographic factors and workplace issues were also checked for significant relationship with job performance.

Amongst the deviant behaviors considered, very few are showing a significant relationship with job performance dimensions. Correlation analysis carried out for each deviant behavior dimension with job performance indicators proved that significant relationship does not exist between various deviant behavior dimensions and job performance indicators. Therefore, it is wrong to assume that if deviant behavior exist in employee, job performance would be poor in retail sector. Research also has shown through 't' analysis that there is no relationship between Gender, Marital Status and Deviant behaviors. Study reveals that these demographic factors have no influence on deviant behaviors except age on Theft and Related Behavior as a retaliation. There is a negative relationship between Supervision in work and Misuse of Information and Unsafe Behavior. Friction in the previous job is related to deviant behaviors. Education has relationship with Misuse of Time & Resources. Study concludes that apart from gender and marital status, all other demographic factors have relationship with some or the other form of deviance.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Azlina Binti Yassin (2011), 'Deviant behaviour at workplace', Thesis submitted to Universiti Utara Malaysia, June 2011
2. Dr. Muhammad Nadeem Anwar, Dr Muhammad Sarwar, Dr. Riffat-un-Nisa Awan, Muhammad Irfan Arif, Gender differences in Workplace Deviant Behaviour of University Teachers and Modification Techniques. International Education Studies, Vol. 4, No. 1; February 2011, Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education ([www.ccsenet.org/ies](http://www.ccsenet.org/ies))
3. Stefan Thau, Rebecca J. Bennett, Marie S. Mitchell, and Mary Beth Marrs(2008), How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective, Management Department Faculty Publications, published online July 16, 2008.
4. Reeshad S. Dalal (2005), A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior, Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 90, No. 6, 1241–1255
5. Patrick D. Dunlop and Kibeom Lee (2004), Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel, Journal of Organizational Behaviour, published online in Wiley InterScience.  
[www.interscience.wiley.com](http://www.interscience.wiley.com)
6. Gruys, Melissa & Sackett, Paul. (2003). Investigating the Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior. International Journal of Selection and Assessment. 11. 30 - 42. 10.1111/1468-2389.00224.
7. Paul R. Sackett (2002), The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance, International Journal of Selection and Assessment, Volume 10 numbers 1/2 March/June 2002
8. Suzy Fox and Paul E. Spector and Don Miles(2001), Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions, Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 59, pp no.291–309
9. Sandra L. Robinson; Rebecca J. Bennett (1995), A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study, The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 38, No. 2. (Apr., 1995), pp. 555-572.