

Employees' Perception and Determinants of Workplace Deviant Behaviour: An Empirical Study of the IT Sector

1. **Aishwerya**, Research Scholar, IMSAR, MDU Rohtak

2. **Prof. Satyawan Baroda**, IMSAR, MDU Rohtak

Abstract

In the fast-changing world of information technology, workplace deviant behaviour (WDB) has become an imperative organisational concern impacting employee well-being and organisational effectiveness. This study aims to explore employees' perceptions of deviant behaviours in the workplace and the organisational factors that affect them in the context of IT employees. The study was quantitative, and the data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire administered to 147 employees in the IT sector. Data were analysed using SPSS, including descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), correlation, and multiple regression. The analysis results confirmed the reliability and validity of the measurement scales, and the factors extracted accounted for 67.25% of the total variance. Several organisational factors were significantly correlated with one another in a correlation analysis. The regression analysis, however, revealed that none of the organisational factors included in the model significantly explained the respondents' deviant behaviour in the study. These results indicate that other organisational or individual factors need to be considered when explaining workplace deviant behaviour. The study builds on prior research on workplace deviance and offers practical advice for human resource managers to develop strategies to promote ethical workplace behaviour and improve the efficiency of the IT organisation.

Keywords: Workplace Deviant Behaviour, Employee Perception, IT Sector, Organizational Justice, Job Stress, Leadership Style, Employee Behaviour and SPSS.

1. Introduction

The workplace serves as a platform for a wide range of actions, each of which has a unique effect on people. These actions typically fit within the parameters of the company's standards (Javed et al., 2014). Workplace deviance is defined as voluntary behaviour that violates significant organisational norms and jeopardises the well-being of the organisation or its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Employee actions that harm the company and its legitimate interests are commonly referred to as deviant behaviours in the workplace (Di Stefano et al., 2019; Sackett, 2002). The idea of workplace deviance is not new, as evidenced by the literature; in fact, studies of deviant behaviour by employees date back to the middle of the 20th century, and because of its prevalence and related expenses, it has recently gained popularity as a research topic (Berry et al., 2007; Dilchert et al., 2007; Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007). One of the most widely accepted typologies in management literature is that developed by Robinson & Bennett (1995), who distinguished workplace deviance into two categories: organisational deviance and interpersonal deviance. In recent research, the same authors further developed the construct by proposing additional theoretical bases and reflective measures for future studies of workplace deviance. In recent research, the same authors further developed the construct by proposing additional theoretical bases and reflective measures for future studies of workplace deviance. Organisational experiences and work-related conditions significantly influence employees' perceptions of deviant behaviour in the workplace. An employee who believes they are being treated unfairly, receiving less support from the organisation, having more work to do, or feeling that management is less competent is more likely to engage in behaviours that go against the organisation's norms. (Spector & Fox, 2005) suggest that negative emotions are caused by workplace stressors, which in turn lead to increased counterproductive and deviant workplace behaviours. According to their stressor-emotion model, adverse working conditions have an indirect effect on workplace deviance through the employee's emotional response. Among the many antecedents, job stress has been a consistently strong predictor of workplace

deviant behaviour. Work overload, role ambiguity, role conflict and emotional exhaustion are associated with workers showing withdrawal behaviours, lower productivity, interpersonal conflict and organizational misconduct. The rapid pace of technological evolution, along with the pressure of deadlines, long hours, and performance expectations, contributes to employees' stress in the IT industry, making workplace deviance a critical organisational concern. Recent reviews still confirm work stress as one of the major organisational factors that fosters workplace deviance in all industries. The concept of organisational justice has also been the subject of much study in the field of workplace deviance. Organisational justice is the employees' perception of the fairness of the procedures, resource allocation and interpersonal treatment within the organisation. According to Jerald Greenberg (1990), perceived injustice may drive workers to engage in deviant workplace behaviours. Likewise, Jason A. Colquitt et al. (2001) showed that distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice have a significant impact on employee attitudes and behaviours. When employees perceive their work as fair, they tend to be more committed and less likely to engage in deviant behaviours. Another factor that influences deviant behaviour in the workplace is leadership style. Transformational and ethical leaders can foster trust, organisational commitment and employee engagement, whereas abusive or authoritarian leadership can lead to frustration, resentment and retaliatory behaviours. Bennett J. Tepper (2000) discovered that abusive supervision had a significant effect on employees' deviant workplace behaviors. Leaders who effectively communicate, support and treat employees with respect foster positive work cultures that deter organisational wrongdoing. Other workplace factors affect employees' behavioural reactions, such as interpersonal relationships and supervisory support. Positive relationships between colleagues contribute to team working, co-operation and psychological safety; while negative relationships can lead to aggression, knowledge hiding and retaliatory behaviour. When employees are provided with supervisory support to deal with stress in the workplace, this support increases job satisfaction and organizational commitment and decreases deviant behaviour. Systematic reviews of the recent literature also argue that organisational culture, interpersonal climate and leadership are collectively related to workplace deviance in organisational settings. Organisational commitment has also been identified as an important antecedent of workplace deviance. Employees with greater affective commitment to their organisation are less likely to engage in negative behaviours towards it because they share its values and goals. Employees who are less committed, on the other hand, are more likely to engage in organizational deviance such as absenteeism, withdrawal, reduced effort, and other behaviors. The results of this study show that organisational policies are related to employee commitment to the organisation and that strengthening this relationship can reduce workplace deviance.

These knowledge-intensive, constantly innovating, digitalising, hybrid-working and highly competitive organisational conditions make the IT sector a special field when it comes to studying deviant behaviours in the workplace. Staff often have challenging workloads, uncertainty around technology, role ambiguity, and high client expectations. These conditions make the roles of organisational justice, leadership effectiveness, interpersonal relationships, and supervisory support more vital to employee behaviour in the workplace. The studies that have been reviewed in this mini-literature review point to the need to view workplace deviance as the result of a complex mix of organisational, interpersonal, and individual factors rather than as personal factors. A large body of literature has examined workplace deviant behaviour, yet key gaps remain in the research. While many existing studies have focused on one or two of these organisational factors, only a few studies have studied multiple organisational factors simultaneously in the Indian IT sector. Furthermore, little empirical research exists on the perceptions of employees of deviant behaviour in knowledge-intensive organisations. Thus, the current study aims to fill this gap by examining employees' perceptions of deviant behaviour in the workplace and the impact of job stress, organisational justice, leadership style, organisational commitment, interpersonal factors, and supervisory factors on such behaviour among employees in the Indian IT sector.

1.2 Research Gap

Deviant behaviour at work has been extensively researched, but there are still a lot of unanswered questions. The majority of previous research has concentrated on distinct antecedents or organisational outcomes, paying little attention to how employees' perceptions directly affect their performance. Additionally, despite the Indian IT sector's distinctive work environment, which is marked by high job demands, technological advancement, and hybrid work practices, there is a dearth of empirical data. Additionally, a few organisational and individual determinants have been combined into a single framework in prior research. In order to close these gaps, this study looks at how employees in the Indian IT industry perceive and determine workplace deviant behavior, as well as how these factors affect employee performance.

1.3 Research Objectives

1. To study the perception of employees with respect to workplace deviant behaviour.
2. To examine the factors affecting Workplace deviant behaviour among employees in the IT Sector

Addressing the research questions raised in this study is essential, as it examines perceptions and determinants of workplace deviant behaviour in the IT Sector. The remaining sections are as follows: Section 2 describes the study's methodology; Section 3 presents the review of findings; Section 4 provides the conclusion; Section 5 presents the practical implications; Section 6 presents the managerial implications; and Section 7 addresses the limitations and scope for further research.

1.4. Hypothesis Development

H1a: Job stress has a significant effect on workplace deviant Behaviour.

H1b: Organisational Justice has a significant effect on workplace deviant behaviour

H1c: Leadership Style has a significant effect on workplace Deviant behaviour.

H1d: Organisational Climate change has a significant effect on workplace deviant Behavior

H1e: Interpersonal Factors have a significant effect on workplace deviant Behaviour.

H1f: Social factors have a significant effect on workplace deviant behavior

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study was of a quantitative, descriptive and cross-sectional nature. This study was conducted with a quantitative descriptive and cross sectional research design to study the perception of the employees and determinants of deviant behavior of their work and the impact of these on employee performance. The descriptive design enabled systematic collection of data and interpretation of relationships between the study variables, whereas the cross sectional design enabled data to be gathered at one particular time.

2.2 Sampling

The respondents were chosen through convenience sampling which is a pragmatic and available sampling method. Staff volunteers completed the survey if they were willing to and able to. In organizational and behavioral research, where it can be difficult to obtain a complete sampling frame, this non-probability sampling technique is frequently employed.

2.3 Sample Size

A total of 147 IT workers' responses were analyzed. This sample size was considered adequate for the purpose of conducting statistical analysis including correlation, regression and structural equation modeling. The respondents represented diverse demographic group and thus the results were more reliable and applicable to the Indian IT industry.

Data collection methods and instruments were used to gather relevant data.

Data was collected using a structured questionnaire comprising of two parts. The first section gathered demographic information from respondents while the second section included statements regarding workplace deviant behavior, its antecedents and performance. The questionnaire was designed based on the validated scales of previous study to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the content.

2.5 Measurement Scale

Each study variable was measured on a fivepoint Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree. This scale was used to allow respondents to express their agreement with each statement. Because of its ease of use, dependability, and appropriateness for quantitative statistical analysis, the Likert scale is widely used in behavioral research.

2.6 Reliability

The internal consistency of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. A coefficient score of 0.7 or higher was deemed acceptable as it meant the measurement items measured the constructs intended. The instrument was subjected to reliability analysis to ensure that it consistently and reliably yields the same results in statistical analysis for subsequent analysis.

2.8 Statistical Tools

IBM SPSS was used to analyse the data. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the characteristics of the respondents, while reliability, correlation and regression analyses were used to explore the relationships between the variables.

3. Result

5.1 Reliability

Table 1: Reliability Analysis of the study variable using Cronbach's Alpha

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Job Stress	0.706
Organizational Justice	0.859
Leadership Style	0.877
Organisational Climate Change	0.691
Individual Factor	0.871
Social Factor	0.756
Task Performance	0.808
Adaptive Performance	0.739
Contextual Performance	0.782
Overall, Job Effectiveness	0.798
Workplace Deviant Behaviour	0.913

Source:

All study variables show acceptable to excellent internal consistency, according to the reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha. While Organizational Climate Change (0.691) is deemed appropriate for exploratory research, the Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0.691 to 0.913, surpassing the suggested threshold of 0.70 for the majority of constructs. Excellent reliability is demonstrated by Workplace Deviant Behavior (0.913), which is followed by Leadership Style (0.877), Individual Factor (0.871), and Organizational Justice (0.859). Reliability is also satisfactory for other constructs, such as Task Performance (0.808), Overall Job Effectiveness (0.798), Contextual Performance (0.782), Social Factor (0.756), Adaptive Performance (0.739), and Job Stress (0.706). Overall, the results demonstrate the measurement scales' dependability and suitability for further statistical analysis.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the study variables

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
W2B4	147	4	1	5	3.59	.882	.779	-.596	.200	.366	.397
W2B5	147	4	1	5	3.59	.875	.765	-.700	.200	.173	.397
W2B6	147	4	1	5	3.50	.847	.717	-.401	.200	-.252	.397
W2N61	147	4	1	5	3.63	.930	.864	-.499	.200	-.153	.397
W2B7	147	4	1	5	3.41	1.033	1.066	-.450	.200	-.564	.397
W2B9	147	4	1	5	3.62	.814	.662	-.740	.200	.702	.397
W2B11	147	4	1	5	3.52	.917	.840	-.531	.200	-.258	.397
W2B13	147	4	1	5	3.48	.924	.854	-.794	.200	.056	.397
W2B14	147	4	1	5	3.34	.933	.870	-.320	.200	-.264	.397
W2B15	147	4	1	5	3.71	.945	.893	-.665	.200	.410	.397
W2B16	147	4	1	5	3.65	.842	.710	-.645	.200	.499	.397
W2B18	147	4	1	5	3.56	.853	.727	-.507	.200	.195	.397
Valid N (listwise)	147										

Source: Computed by researcher by using IBM SPSS

Descriptive statistics were calculated to investigate the central tendency and distribution of items for workplace deviant behaviours. The data were collected from 147 employees. The mean scores for the workplace deviant behaviour items ranged from 3.34 to 3.71, reflecting a moderate to relatively high level of agreement of the respondents with the statements measuring workplace deviant behaviour. The highest mean score ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.945$) was observed for W2B15, which indicates that the respondents' perception of this aspect of workplace deviant behaviour is higher than the other items. In contrast, the mean score of W2B14 was the lowest ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.933$) which showed relatively low agreement.

Standard deviations for the items in the workplace deviant behavior ranged from 0.814 to 1.033, indicating moderate variability in respondents' opinions for the items. This indicated that although the participants generally had the same perceptions, there was some variation of responses.

The skewness values of the items ranged from -0.794 to -0.320 , with a slight negative skewness across all items. This indicates that the answers were more tightly clustered on the higher end of the Likert scale, meaning that more respondents answered "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" than the other responses. The Kurtosis values ranged from -0.564 to 0.702 , within the commonly accepted ± 2 range, indicating that the data did not deviate significantly from a normal distribution. Hence, it can be assumed that the workplace deviant behaviour items are approximately normally distributed, validating the use of parametric statistical techniques.

5.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 3: Result of KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.777
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2310.076
	df	496
	Sig.	.000

Source: Computes by the researcher using IBM SPSS

The suitability of data was examined by using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity before running the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The KMO value was 0.777, higher than the 0.60 recommended for good sampling adequacy for factor analysis. In addition, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2310.076$, $df = 496$, $p < 0.001$), which indicated a correlation matrix that was not an identity matrix and a correlation coefficient between the variables greater than 0. Also, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2310.076$, $df = 496$, $p < 0.001$) which indicated that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix and that the variables were correlated. The data were thus taken as appropriate for Exploratory Factor Analysis.

Table 4: Communalities of the study

	Initial	Extraction
JS1	1.000	.728
JS2	1.000	.661
JS3	1.000	.678
OJ1	1.000	.739
OJ2	1.000	.803
OJ3	1.000	.758
LS1	1.000	.834
LS2	1.000	.814
LS3	1.000	.771
OCC1	1.000	.491
OCC2	1.000	.644
OCC3	1.000	.700
OCC4	1.000	.522
IF1	1.000	.738
IF2	1.000	.693
IF3	1.000	.798
IF4	1.000	.658
SF1	1.000	.823
SF2	1.000	.798
SF3	1.000	.775
TP2	1.000	.650
TP3	1.000	.548
TP4	1.000	.623
AP1	1.000	.555
AP2	1.000	.593
CP1	1.000	.588
CP2	1.000	.599
CP3	1.000	.592
CP4	1.000	.621
OJE2	1.000	.570
OJE3	1.000	.543
OJE4	1.000	.610

Source: Author's own calculation

The communalities for each variable were analyzed to see the percentage of variance accounted for by the factors. The extraction values ranged from 0.491–0.834 which showed that most variables were fairly well represented in the factor solution. The factors extracted explained a significant amount of variance in the observed variables as indicated by most of the communalities being greater than 0.50. One item (OCC1) had a communality of .491 but was retained for further analysis because the value was slightly below the recommended threshold of .5 and was supported by factor loadings on the rotated factors.

Table 5: Total Variance Explained by the Extracted factors

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.567	20.523	20.523	6.567	20.523	20.523	6.510	20.345	20.345
2	4.845	15.140	35.664	4.845	15.140	35.664	3.033	9.478	29.822
3	2.761	8.627	44.290	2.761	8.627	44.290	2.575	8.048	37.870
4	1.865	5.828	50.118	1.865	5.828	50.118	2.487	7.773	45.643
5	1.771	5.535	55.654	1.771	5.535	55.654	2.114	6.606	52.249
6	1.413	4.415	60.069	1.413	4.415	60.069	1.972	6.161	58.410
7	1.260	3.936	64.006	1.260	3.936	64.006	1.702	5.318	63.728
8	1.037	3.240	67.245	1.037	3.240	67.245	1.125	3.517	67.245
9	.955	2.984	70.229						
10	.835	2.608	72.838						
11	.784	2.451	75.288						

12	.749	2.340	77.628					
13	.658	2.057	79.685					
14	.587	1.835	81.520					
15	.550	1.718	83.238					
16	.541	1.692	84.930					
17	.508	1.587	86.517					
18	.483	1.509	88.026					
19	.428	1.336	89.362					
20	.417	1.302	90.664					
21	.381	1.192	91.856					
22	.369	1.152	93.008					
23	.343	1.071	94.079					
24	.312	.976	95.055					
25	.281	.879	95.934					
26	.254	.794	96.728					
27	.253	.791	97.519					
28	.199	.622	98.142					
29	.196	.612	98.754					
30	.159	.498	99.252					
31	.122	.382	99.634					
32	.117	.366	100.000					

Source: Author own calculation

The results of the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) revealed that eight factors were extracted based on the Kaiser criterion (Eigenvalue > 1). The eigenvalues of the extracted factors were from 6.567 for the first factor to 1.037 for the eighth factor. The first factor accounted for 20.523% of the total variance; the second, 15.140%; the third, 8.627%; the fourth, 5.828%; the fifth, 5.535%; the sixth, 4.415%; the seventh, 3.936%; and the eighth, 3.240%. The total variance accounted for by these eight factors is 67.245% which is above 60%, the generally accepted value for social science research. As a result, the factor structure extracted is a good representation of the underlying dimensions of the constructs measured, and has satisfactory construct validity.

Table 6: Rotated Component Matrix^a through Exploratory Factor Analysis

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
TP2	.764							
OJE4	.755							
CP4	.746							
CP3	.743							
CP1	.739							
OJE2	.737							
CP2	.727							
AP2	.725							
TP4	.723							
TP3	.715							
AP1	.708							
OJE3	.708							
IF3		.869						

IF1	.811						
IF2	.786						
IF4	.781						
LS1		.894					
LS2		.846					
LS3		.811					
OJ2			.870				
OJ1			.832				
OJ3			.823				
OCC3				.771			
OCC2				.749			
OCC4				.552			
OCC1				.530			
JS1					.805		
JS3					.785		
JS2					.732		
SF1						.877	
SF2						.858	
SF3							.844

Source: Author's own calculation using IBM SPSS

After applying Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation, eight factors were obtained in the Rotated Component Matrix. Factor loadings of all retained items were found to be above the minimum recommended value of 0.50, with the variables that were observed being highly related to their underlying constructs. The factor solution stabilized after 6 rotations indicating that the rotation process was stable and yielded a clear, interpretable factor solution.

The first factor included items TP2, TP3, TP4, AP1, AP2, CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, OJE2, OJE3, and OJE4 with the factor loadings varying between 0.708 and 0.764. The high loadings suggest that these items form a general underlying construct. The content of these items may mean that this factor can be understood as being related to the construct being measured. The second factor was comprised of IF1, IF2, IF3 and IF4, which had factor loading between 0.781 to 0.869. High loadings suggest that these items are good indicators of the same latent construct.

The third factor was LS1, LS2, and LS3, with factor loading ranging from 0.811 to 0.894, showing that the items concerned with leadership have a good structure and reliability.

The fourth factor consisted of OJ1, OJ2, and OJ3 with factor loadings ranging between 0.823 and 0.870. The results suggest that all items in the Organizational Justice scale share a strong common factor that is "Organizational Justice."

The fifth factor consisted of OCC1, OCC2, OCC3, and OCC4, which had factor loadings between 0.530 and 0.771. The lowest loading was for the item OCC1 (0.530), which was above the minimum acceptable level of 0.50, and was therefore included in the analysis.

The sixth factor was represented by JS1, JS2 and JS3 and had factor loadings in the range of 0.732 to 0.805. The results show that the Job Stress items have high loading on one factor. The seventh factor was labeled as SF1 and SF2 with factor loadings of 0.877 and 0.858, respectively. High loadings are a good sign of the underlying construct's strength.

The eighth factor was loaded with SF3 (0.844). The loading is statistically high, but if a factor is represented by a single item, then it is not generally recommended that it be used in factor analysis. This means that the SF construct needs to be looked at carefully. An alternative explanation may be that other SF items have loaded

differently or the factor structure should be reconsidered based on the scree plot, the theoretical basis and, if applicable, reanalyze the data.

The rotated component matrix is generally understandable, and the loadings for all items retained on the factor exceeded the minimum of 0.50, and none of the items had large cross-loadings. This shows good construct validity and justifies the acceptance of the extracted factors for further analysis like correlation and regression.

3.4 Correlation

Table 7: Correlations Matix of the study

		JS	OJ	LS	OCC	IF	SF	TP	AP	CP	OJE
JS	Pearson Correlation	1	.155	.258**	.113	.002	.158	-.013	-.064	-.079	-.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.062	.002	.174	.985	.056	.879	.444	.346	.622
	N	147	147	147	147	147	147	146	146	146	146
OJ	Pearson Correlation	.155	1	.358**	.284**	.225**	.054	-.031	-.010	-.084	.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.062		.000	.000	.006	.514	.715	.901	.316	.739
	N	147	147	147	147	147	147	146	146	146	146
LS	Pearson Correlation	.258**	.358**	1	.307**	.160	.059	.026	.038	.038	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000		.000	.053	.477	.759	.653	.652	.895
	N	147	147	147	147	147	147	146	146	146	146
OCC	Pearson Correlation	.113	.284**	.307**	1	.472**	.132	-.047	-.076	.062	.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.174	.000	.000		.000	.111	.575	.362	.456	.821
	N	147	147	147	147	147	147	146	146	146	146
IF	Pearson Correlation	.002	.225**	.160	.472**	1	.265**	-.003	-.151	-.036	-.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.985	.006	.053	.000		.001	.970	.070	.667	.843
	N	147	147	147	147	147	147	146	146	146	146
SF	Pearson Correlation	.158	.054	.059	.132	.265**	1	.080	-.010	-.005	.087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.056	.514	.477	.111	.001		.335	.900	.950	.293
	N	147	147	147	147	147	148	147	147	147	147
TP	Pearson Correlation	-.013	-.031	.026	-.047	-.003	.080	1	.658**	.668**	.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.879	.715	.759	.575	.970	.335		.000	.000	.000
	N	146	146	146	146	146	147	147	147	147	147
AP	Pearson Correlation	-.064	-.010	.038	-.076	-.151	-.010	.658**	1	.636**	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.444	.901	.653	.362	.070	.900	.000		.000	.000
	N	146	146	146	146	146	147	147	147	147	147
CP	Pearson Correlation	-.079	-.084	.038	.062	-.036	-.005	.668**	.636**	1	.688**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.346	.316	.652	.456	.667	.950	.000	.000		.000
	N	146	146	146	146	146	147	147	147	147	147
OJE	Pearson Correlation	-.041	.028	-.011	.019	-.017	.087	.657**	.623**	.688**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.622	.739	.895	.821	.843	.293	.000	.000	.000	
	N	146	146	146	146	146	147	147	147	147	147

Source: Author's own calculation using IBM SPSS

These findings showed several statistically significant positive relationships among the independent variables. Job Stress ($r = 0.258$, $p < 0.01$) showed a positive and significant correlation with Leadership Style, indicating a moderate relationship. There were also significant positive correlations between Organisational Justice and Leadership Style ($r = 0.358$, $p < 0.01$), Organisational Commitment/Culture ($r = 0.284$, $p < 0.01$) and

Interpersonal Factors ($r = 0.225$, $p < 0.01$). In addition, Organisational Commitment/Culture showed a moderate positive correlation with Interpersonal Factors ($r = 0.472$, $p < 0.01$), indicating a positive relationship between the two.

Performance was positively correlated with all performance-related variables. Task Performance had strong positive correlations with Adaptive Performance ($r = 0.658$, $p < 0.01$), Contextual Performance ($r = 0.668$, $p < 0.01$), and Organisational Justice Environment ($r = 0.657$, $p < 0.01$). Likewise, Adaptive Performance was correlated with Contextual Performance ($r = 0.636$, $p < 0.01$) and Organisational Justice Environment ($r = 0.623$, $p < 0.01$). Additionally, there was a strong positive correlation between Contextual Performance and Organisational Justice Environment ($r = 0.688$, $p < 0.01$). The results suggest that the three facets of the job performance are tightly correlated with each other.

However, no significant relationships were found between Job Stress and the other performance-related variables (Task Performance, Adaptive Performance, Contextual Performance, and Organisational Justice Environment) as the correlation coefficients were low and the corresponding p-values were above 0.05. Similarly, there were no significant correlations between Supervisory Factors and the performance dimensions. The general pattern from the correlation analysis suggests significant relationships among the organisational and performance factors. Correlation coefficients among all observed variables were not greater than 0.80, indicating no multicollinearity, which is not a problem for the subsequent multiple regression analysis.

4. Conclusion

The study findings indicate that deviant behaviour in India's IT industry is the result of several individual and organisational factors. The instrument's reliability and validity were strong, indicating that the measurement model was valid and reliable. The exploratory Factor Analysis yielded a good factor structure, and the correlation analysis showed reasonable correlations among the organisational justice, leadership style, organisational climate and individual factors. The correlations between the various aspects of employee performance also reveal that workplace performance has multiple dimensions and is interconnected.

5. Practical implications

The results of this study provide valuable practical information for IT organisations seeking to minimise deviant behaviour within their workplaces and improve organisational effectiveness. The study suggests that organisations focus on easing job stress by streamlining workloads and offering employee wellness programs and stress management initiatives. The implementation of transparent decision-making, fair performance measurement and reward systems can increase employee trust and reduce deviant behaviours, thereby promoting organisational justice. Ethical, supportive and transformational leadership should be encouraged and developed through leadership development programs as a way to foster a positive work environment. It's also important to promote healthy interrelationships among employees by encouraging communication, cooperation, and conflict resolution. Furthermore, by recognizing workers, providing promotion opportunities and fostering a supportive HR environment, workplace deviance can be reduced by increasing organisational commitment. The results provide helpful guidance for HR managers, organisational leaders, and policy makers in creating evidence based strategies that will encourage staff wellbeing, encourage positive behaviours within the workplace and, ultimately improve productivity and organisational performance in the competitive IT industry.

6. Managerial implications

The outcomes of this investigation can be useful to managers in the IT field. Managers should be proactive in identifying and eliminating the causes of deviant behaviour by fostering a fair, supportive, and inclusive environment. Employing clear performance assessments, reducing excessive job stress, and fostering ethical leadership can enhance employee trust and commitment. Managers should also foster open communication, collaboration and quick resolution of conflicts to improve people skills. Support from employees, through feedback, counselling and training programs, can help identify behavioural issues early and minimise

behaviour that impacts the workplace. These initiatives have the potential to boost employee morale, productivity, and the organisation's overall performance.

7. Limitations

The following are some of the limitations of this study that should be taken into consideration when analysing the findings. The study was initially restricted to the IT sector, which may limit the generalizability of its results. Second, data were collected through a cross-sectional survey, meaning the data only reflect respondents' perceptions at one point in time and do not yield any cause-and-effect relationships. Third, the study was based on self-reported data, which can be subject to common method and social desirability biases. Fourth, the sample size was limited to the selected respondents and may not be representative of the larger IT population. Finally, the study only considered some selected organisational factors that affect deviant behaviour in the workplace; organisational culture, personality factors, and even emotional intelligence were not covered and may be included in future studies.

Reference

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85(No. 3), 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 410–424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410>
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Mueller, J. S. (2007). Does perceived unfairness exacerbate or mitigate interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors related to envy? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 666–680. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.666>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Cooper, C., & Dewe, P. (2008). Well-being—Absenteeism, presenteeism, costs and challenges. *Occupational Medicine*, 58(8), 522–524. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqn124>
- D, Z. (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*. 75.
- Di Stefano, G., Scrima, F., & Parry, E. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(17), 2482–2503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1326393>
- Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., Davis, R. D., & Rostow, C. D. (2007). Cognitive ability predicts objectively measured counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 616–627. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.616>
- Di Stefano, G., Scrima, F., & Parry, E. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(17), 2482–2503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1326393>
- Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., Davis, R. D., & Rostow, C. D. (2007). Cognitive ability predicts objectively measured counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 616–627. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.616>
- Javed, R., Amjad, M., Faeer-Ul-Ummi, U. Y., & Bukhari, R. (2014). *INVESTIGATING FACTORS AFFECTING EMPLOYEE WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR*. 9(3).
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A TYPOLOGY OF DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIORS: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING STUDY. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256693>

- Sackett, P. R. (2002). The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1–2), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00189>
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets*. (pp. 151–174). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10893-007>