

# **CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF TEACHERS' DEVIANCE IN PUBLIC BOYS' HIGH SCHOOLS IN KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN**

**Muhammad Ibrahim** 

PhD Scholar, Sarhad University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan

kpk300@gmail.com

**Mohammad Iqbal**

Sarhad University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan

## **Abstract**

*The present study examined the deviant teachers in Government Boys' High Schools. The population of the study included all the Teachers and principals, both in urban and rural areas. The simple random sampling technique was used for the selection of respondents. The data obtained were organized in tables and statistically analyzed by calculating the Percentage, Means, Standard Deviations (SD), Skewness, Pearson's Correlation. The inferences were drawn via independent Sample t-test Analysis. The study found that deviant behavior was there, in schools and made viable recommendations for improvement. It was recommended that Principals may be empowered to ensure the implementation of the rules and regulations in schools, and after three years a general transfer may be implemented.*

*Keywords: Deviance, Production Deviance, Property Deviance, and Personal Deviance*

## **INTRODUCTION**

The behavioral deviancy and misconduct of teachers in institutional settings and their possible adverse effects have attracted considerable attention of researchers and educationalists. The term deviant was used in the past in a number of ways. Once, the deviant behavior of teachers was described as unethical. Then it was termed as organizational misbehavior of teachers. Some researchers described it dysfunctional behavior, while others mentioned it as anti-social

behavior, organizational aggression and counterproductive behavior. Bennett and Robinson (1995:556) in their study, for the first time, named this trait of teachers as deviant behavior. It was considered worthwhile to study and analyze the behavior of deviant teachers in Government Boys' High Schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan. Deviant teachers adversely affect the school climate as well as smooth functioning of schools. According to Bennett and Robinson (1995:556) deviant behavior is caused by the voluntary behavior of teachers in which they resort to violate noteworthy authoritative standards and, in doing as such; undermine the wellbeing of an association, its individuals, or both. This idea was further elaborated by Chiu and Peng (2008:430), and Greenberg (2010 :12), when they called such behavior as Theft from an institution, misconduct, not coming to school on proper time, leaving school earlier, and misbehavior with principals and staff, come under the purview of deviant behavior. Appelbaum et al (2005:43) defined deviant behavior as infringement of professional ethics, rules, standards, codes, or standards, which give rules to ethically right conduct and truthfulness in particular circumstances.

Deviant teachers may change the environment of the institution through their deviant behavior. The deviant teacher does not usually oppose the staff and principal's decisions apparently but his/her behavior creates problems in the school. Deviant behavior in schools is generally misunderstood and not given proper attention by principals as they think that it may not result in other problems. The study, therefore, attempted to analyze deviant behavior of teachers and the mode of their working in the sampled schools.

### **Research Questions**

1. What are the different types and causes of deviant behavior of teachers in Government Boys' High Schools of the sampled three districts in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan?
2. What is the effect of this deviant behavior on school climate?
3. What remedial measures the study can suggest to improve the deviant behavior of teachers in Government Boys' High Schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan?

The scope of the study was delimited to Public Boys' High schools both in urban and rural areas in the three sampled districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

According to Iqbal (2012:114) teachers, more often, report discontentment and even those few dedicated to the profession feel unappreciated, overworked, and humiliated as professionals and educators. They are frustrated at the continuous non-teaching and non-professional

demands of public, students and their departmental officer. Adler and Adler (2009:13) suggested that individuals are considered deviant due to their attitudes or behaviors. People are described as deviant by others when they violate norms, values concerning to appearance or actions, suggest unaccepted religious faiths and beliefs, or involve in illegal acts. Besides, certain situations lead people to describe others as deviant, including disobediences and violations of norms, values and regulations of the institutions.

Bennett and Robinson (1995:556) explained that the behavior might be deviant when an “Institutional norms, policies, customs, rules and regulations are violated by an individual staff member or group of staff members that might make vulnerable the well-being of the institution or its teachers”. Deviant behavior is any behavior considered deviant by society, which might range from the minimum to the maximum. Bryant and Higgins (2010:249) stated that when teachers do not conduct according to the institutional norms, values, and do not put themselves according to the expectations of the school principal, they are depicted as deviants. Deviant behavior exists wherever teachers work collectively or in groups.

Knights and Kennedy (2005:69) identified that decrease in teachers commitment might result in deviant behavior. Lawrence and Robinson (2007:379) suggested that if teacher perceives that he is not receiving proper attention or not respected in the institution, he would not respond positively in fulfilling his responsibilities. He would show deviant behavior in the school. Thau and Mitchell (2010:1009) reported that if teacher feels that he is not treated fairly, and norms and rules of the institution are not respected, he shows deviance in the institution. Appelbaum et al (2005:53) stated that keeping the psychological needs of the teachers, developing wellbeing in the institution and promoting an ethical climate hinders deviant behaviors in the school. Rossouw and Van Vuuren (2010:21) stated, “Deviant behavior is used as a combined term for what is described by different investigators as deviance”. Cowen and Marcel (2011:525) documented that deviance not only has harmful effects on the institution but also for the teachers who indulge in such deviant behavior. The significance of deviant behavior is critical because it can adversely affect the institution in terms of its decision-making, teacher’s efficiency, and students’ achievements. Robinson and Greenberg (1998:3) stated, “There is currently no generally accepted definition or terminology regarding teacher deviance”.

### **Typology of Deviance**

Bennett and Robinson (1995:568) stated that the above mentioned divisions and systems don't represent deviant acts of an Inter Personal nature, for example, physical animosity and lewd behavior and just acts against organizations. Deviant behavior ought to likewise comprise of

social viewpoints to the institution-aimed forms of deviance. This division comprises of the following two dimensions:

## Inter Personal versus Institutional Deviance

### *Inter Personal Deviance*

Henle (2005:247) described Inter Personal Deviance behaviors as belittling others, playing pranks on others, acting rudely, arguing, and physical aggression. Inter Personal Deviance comprises those behaviors, which are damaging to other individuals within the institution such as aggression, bullying, harassment, incivility etc.

### *Institutional Deviance*

Anwar et al (2011:193) stated that institutional deviance is a grouping of behaviors between the individual and the institution that includes such things as Sabotage, Theft, lateness, or putting little effort into teaching.

## Minor vs. Serious

The second dimension of Bennett and Robinson (1995:568) typology described the severity of deviance ranging from minor to serious. The conclusions of their results produced a two-dimensional chart, which classifies deviant behavior into four quadrants labeled: first Production Deviance, second Property Deviance, third Political deviance and fourth is Personal Deviance. Figure 1 demonstrates the classification of the two-dimensional deviant behavior.

Figure 1: Typology of Deviant Workplace Behavior



Source: Robinson and Bennett, 1995 (Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviour)

Everton et al (2007:4) described that the four quadrants of the above chart proposed that practices are different from one quadrant to those in an alternate. Negligible events of incivility may prompt forceful conduct and in the end nonattendance can be the result.

### ***Production Deviance***

Bennett and Robinson (1995:569) defined Production Deviance as behaviors that violate the formally endorsed standards portraying the insignificant quality and amount of work to be performed. Advancing late to class, leaving ahead of schedule without authorization, taking intemperate and more breaks, and absenteeism from school without any reasonable reason, are different forms of Production Deviance. Kidwell and Martin (2008:213) explained that teaching slowly and withholding exertion outlines the rate where a teacher gives not as much as full exertion in teaching and other job-related tasks.

### ***Property Deviance***

Bennett and Robinson (1995:569) defined Property Deviance as those occasions where workers gain or harm the unmistakable Property or resources of the work organization without power. Everton et al (2007:4) noted that Property Deviance damages the institutions and is quite rigorous. Destroying school desks and chairs, misusing institutional confidential information, and fraudulent in records, are manifestations of Property Deviance.

### ***Political Deviance***

Bennett and Robinson (1995:569) defined political deviance as the behavior of engagement in social connection that puts different people at an individual or political drawback. Institutional incivility, tattling about partners, demonstrating favoritism and opposing colleagues and principal, non-constructively, are types of political deviance. Sarwar et al (2010:100) stated that political interference in schools and political transfers promote negative attitude among teachers. Appelbaum et al (2005:52) suggested that obstruction and verbal aggression usually take place in the schools.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Population of the Study**

The population of this study consisted of principals and teachers of Government high school for boys of the provincial Government in rural and urban areas in three districts; Charsadda, Mardan and Peshawar of this province. There are 55 schools located in urban areas and 164 are located in rural areas of three sampled districts.

The present study is an attempt to highlight the existing conditions and prevalent practices of the teachers in Government schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The Simple Random Sampling Technique was used to draw 20 percent schools as stated by Gay and Airasian (2000:134). The numbers of schools included in the sample, 45 schools were selected by taking 20 percent of the population of schools (the target population). Information about the existing conditions, regular practices, and conduct of teachers were collected through Opinionnaires and analyzed. Standards were identified through intensive and extensive study of the relevant literature so that existing-conditions in the sampled population could be compared with these standards analytically.

### **Tools and Sources of Data Collection**

The primary source of data collection were Opinionnaires, and study of relevant documents. Two Opinionnaires were developed one each for principals and teachers. In the collection of data collecting phase a number of 614 Opinionnaires were administered in teachers and 45 Opinionnaires were administered in principals, out of which 609 with percentage of 99.18% Opinionnaires from teachers and 44 with a percentage 97.77% from principals were received back. Overall response rate for the study is 98.90%, which is very good and acceptable.

## **ANALYSIS & FINDINGS**

### **Counter Work Behavior Items**

Counter work behavior scale was developed by Spector et al (2006:446) which was adopted here. This scale is consisted of 52 items, which is further, divided into sub-scales.

### **Counter Work Behavior –Organization (CWB-O)**

The Counter work behavior –organization (CWB-O); which is further divided into subscales Sabotage, consisted on three items, Withdrawal is consisted of four items, Production Deviance is consisted of four items, and Theft is consisted of 11 items.

### **Counter Work Behavior –Person (CWB-P)**

The Counter Work Behavior –Person (CWB-P) and is further consisted of Abuse, which is consisted of 23 items; Personal Deviance is consisted on three items, while Property Deviance is consisted of four items. The findings of the investigation directed on each of the subscales will now be talked about and correlated with others sub-scales.

### Counter Work Behavior –Organization (CWB-O)

The overall values of the sum of sub scales of Sabotage, Withdrawal, Production Deviance, and Theft of Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O) are given in table 1.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Skewness Values of Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O) Principals' Response about Teachers (N=44)

Item	Minimum	Maximum	Means	SD	Skewness
Sabotage	03.00	17.00	08.5227	04.37482	0.9215
Withdrawal	08.00	26.00	15.0000	04.35623	0.7478
Production Deviance	04.00	24.00	14.0682	05.30641	-0.5574
Theft	18.00	62.00	37.1818	10.49977	0.4873

### Counter Work Behavior –Person (CWB-P)

The overall values of the sum of sub scales of Abuse, Personal Deviance and Property Deviance of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P) are given in table 2.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Skewness Values of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P) of Teachers' Self Response (N=609)

Item	Minimum	Maximum	Means	SD	Skewness
Abuse	56.00	114.00	84.0525	10.10311	0.5858
Personal Deviance	03.00	21.00	10.6190	04.03635	1.7777
Property Deviance	04.00	27.00	15.2200	04.13436	0.0000

The overall values of the sum of sub scales of Abuse, Personal Deviance and Property Deviance of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P) are given in table 3.

Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Skewness Values of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P) Principals' Response about Teachers (N = 44)

Item	Minimum	Maximum	Means	SD	Skewness
Abuse	38.00	121.00	74.8864	21.07375	-0.7450
Personal Deviance	03.00	17.00	09.7727	04.28553	0.2408
Property Deviance	04.00	27.00	15.7727	05.92536	0.2212

### t-test of Scales and Subscales of Teachers' Deviance , (of Teachers Self-Response) and Principals' Response about Teachers

In independent samples, t-test assesses the difference between the means of two independent or unrelated groups. The t-test examines that whether the mean value of the test variable of

teachers (self-Report) disagrees significantly from the mean value of the test variable of principal's response about teachers.

In order to meet the objective of the study for each of the sub-scales and their effect on teachers deviance in schools, independent samples t-test were conducted. Descriptive statistics for each of the sub scales and the consequences of the t-tests were displayed in table 4.

Table 4: t-tests of Scales and Subscales of Teacher Deviance of Teachers Self Response and Principals Response about Teachers

Paired samples	Sub scales	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	p
Pair 1	Sabotage (Teachers)	09.958	02.82551	0.11450	86.981	608	.000
	Sabotage (Principals)	08.522	04.37482	0.65953	12.922	43	.000
Pair 2	Withdrawal (Teachers)	14.023	04.22626	0.17126	81.883	608	.000
	Withdrawal (Principals)	15.000	04.35623	0.65673	22.841	43	.000
Pair 3	Production Deviance (Teachers)	13.955	04.25615	0.17247	80.917	608	.000
	Production Deviance (Principals)	14.068	05.30641	0.79997	17.586	43	.000
Pair 4	Theft (Teachers)	36.257	06.68518	0.27090	133.843	608	.000
	Theft (Principals)	37.181	10.49977	1.58290	23.490	43	.000
Pair 5	Abuse (Teachers)	84.052	10.10311	0.40940	205.307	608	.000
	Abuse (Principals)	74.886	21.07375	3.17699	23.571	43	.000
Pair 6	Personal Deviance (Teachers)	10.619	04.03635	0.16356	64.924	608	.000
	Personal Deviance (Principals)	09.772	04.28553	0.64607	15.126	43	.000
Pair 7	Property Deviance (Teachers)	15.220	04.13436	0.16753	90.848	608	.000
	Property Deviance (Principals)	15.772	05.92536	0.89328	17.657	43	.000

In each of the above sub scale the value of ( $p < 0.001$ ) in all cases, there exists a significant effect in each of the above sub-scale. From table 4, it is obvious that all things considered teachers' (self response) depict their own particular character values to be stronger than their principals' point of view. Teachers self-report measures are on average higher than the principals' response about teachers.

The mean of the teachers' (self response) Sabotage (Teachers) is 9.958 whereas the mean of their principals' Sabotage (Principals) is 8.522, Abuse (Teachers) is 84.052 whereas the mean of their principals' Abuse (Principals) is 74.886, and Personal Deviance (Teachers) is 10.619 whereas the mean of their principals' Personal Deviance (Principals) is 9.772.

The opposite, however, is true for the teachers' deviance in school. On average the teachers see themselves as (self) as more averse to have vulnerable to include in deviance in school, while the principals discern their subordinates to have a stronger propensity to show deviance in school (the method for the teachers self-report are lower than the means for their

principals). Case in point, the mean of Withdrawal (Teachers) is 14.023 whereas the mean of their principals' Withdrawal (Principals) is 15.000, Production Deviance (Teachers) is 13.955 whereas the mean of their principals' Production Deviance (Principals) is 14.068, Theft (Teachers) is 36.257 whereas the mean of their principals' Theft (Principals) is 37.181, Property Deviance (Teachers) is 15.220 whereas the mean of their principals' Property Deviance (Principals) is 15.772, for their subordinates.

### **Counter Work Behavior items**

Counter Work Behavior items are consists of two sub-scales.

#### ***Counter Work Behavior –Organization (CWB-O)***

Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O) is further divided into,

1. The Sabotage (teachers) consisted of three items. All the three items are positively skewed and the respondents do not agree with these items. The Sabotage (principals) consisted of three items. All the three items are positively skewed and the respondents do not agree with these items.
2. The Withdrawal (teachers) consisted of four items. Two items are negatively skewed, indicating that the respondents are agreed, while two items are positively skewed, describing that the respondents do not agree with these items. The Withdrawal (principals) consisted of four items. Three items are negatively skewed, indicating that the respondents are agreed, while one item is positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items.
3. The Production Deviance (teachers) consisted of four items. Three items are negatively skewed, indicating that the respondents are agreed, while one item is positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items. The Production Deviance (principals) consisted of four items. Three items are negatively skewed, indicating that the respondents are agreed, while one item is positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items.
4. The Theft (teachers) consisted of 11 items. All the items are positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents are not agreed with these items. The Theft (principals) consisted of 11 items. Two items are negatively skewed, indicating that the respondents are agreed, while nine items are positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items.

**Counter Work Behavior –Person (CWB-P)**

Counter work behavior –person (CWB-P) is further divided into,

1. The Abuse (teachers) consisted of 23 items. Eight items are negatively skewed, suggesting that the respondents are agreed with these items, while the remaining 15 items positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items. The Abuse (principals) consisted of 23 items. All the items are positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items.
2. The Personal Deviance (teachers) consisted of three items. All the items are positively skewed, indicating that the respondents do not agree with these items. The Personal Deviance (principals) consisted of three items. All the items are positively skewed, indicating that the respondents do not agree with these items.
3. The Property Deviance (teachers) consisted of four items. One item is negatively skewed, suggesting that the respondents are agreed with this item, while the remaining three items are positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items. The Property Deviance (principals) consisted of four items. Two items are negatively skewed, suggesting that the respondents are agreed with these items, while the remaining two items positively skewed, suggesting that the respondents do not agree with these items.

**Correlations between Teachers' Deviances and Character Strength Factors****Correlations between Teacher Deviances in Government Boys' High School (Teachers Self-Response)**

The analysis of the collected data revealed significant correlation between Counter Work Behavior items (CWB) Counter Work Behavior Items-Organization (CWB-O) and Counter Work Behavior Items-Person (CWB-P). The relationship was verified through various statistical measures including bivariate correlation method, t-test analysis.

1. The results of the study revealed significant positive inter-item correlation of Counter Work Behavior items-organization (CWB-O) and its four sub scales. Similarly the results showed significant positive inter-item correlation Withdrawal and Theft with largest value, while the Sabotage and Theft with lowest value. All the values are statistically significant with its components and sub components, except Sabotage and Theft (-0.020) which is negative and indicating no significant relationship.
2. The results of the study revealed significant positive inter-item correlation of Counter Work Behavior items-person (CWB-P) and its three sub scales. Similarly the results showed significant positive inter-item correlation between Personal Deviance and Property Deviance

with largest value, while the Abuse and Property Deviance with lowest value. All the values are statistically significant with its components and sub components, except Abuse and Property Deviance (-0.056) which is negative and indicating no significant relationship.

### ***Correlations between Teachers Deviance s in Government Boys' High School (Principal Response)***

1. The results of the study revealed significant positive inter-item correlation of Counter Work Behavior items-organization (CWB-O) and its four sub scales. Similarly the results showed significant positive inter-item correlation Sabotage and Production with largest value, while the Withdrawal and Sabotage with lowest value. All the values are statistically significant and showing strong correlations with its components and sub components.
2. The results of the study revealed significant positive inter-item correlation of Counter Work Behavior items-person (CWB-P) and its three sub scales. Similarly the results showed significant positive inter-item correlation Property Deviance and Abuse with largest value and showing strongest correlation, while the Abuse and Personal Deviance with lowest value. All the values are statistically significant and showing strong correlations with its components and sub components.

### ***Correlation Coefficients and Independent Samples t-test Teachers' Self-Report and Principals' Report about Teachers***

In independent samples t-test assess the difference between the means of two independent or unrelated groups. The t-test examines that whether the mean value of the test variable of teacher (self-Report) disagrees significantly from the mean value of the test variable of principals. In order to meet the objective of the study for each of the sub-scales and their effect on teachers deviance in schools, independent samples t-tests were conducted. In each of the sub scale the value of  $(p < 0.001)$  in all cases, there exists a significant effect in each of the above sub-scale. (Table 4)

The subscales in which teachers self-report measures are on means higher than the principals' report about teachers. These are:-

1. Sabotage (Teachers) is 9.958 whereas the mean of their principals' Sabotage (Principals) is 8.522,
2. Abuse (Teachers) is 84.052 whereas the mean of their principals' Abuse (Principals) is 74.886,
3. Personal Deviance (Teachers) is 10.619 whereas the mean of their principals' Personal Deviance (Principals) is 9.772,

The opposite values are true for the teachers' deviance in school.

The subscales in which teachers self-report measures means are lower than the principals' report about teachers. These are:-

1. Withdrawal(Teachers)is 14.023 whereas the mean of their principals' Withdrawal(Principals) is15.000,
2. Production Deviance (Teachers)is 13.955 whereas the mean of their principals' Production Deviance (Principals) is 14.068,
3. Theft (Teachers)is 36.257 whereas the mean of their principals' Theft (Principals)is 37.181,
4. Property Deviance (Teachers)is 15.220 whereas the mean of their principals' Property Deviance (Principals) is 15.772,

The teachers consider themselves (self) as less deviant in school, while the principals identify teachers as deviant and have a stronger tendency to demonstrate deviance in school (means of the teachers self-report are lower than the means of their principals).

The t-values point out that there is a significant difference in average results of teachers and principals in all the sub-scales. The p value is 0.000 for all the sub-scales, so the correlation is highly significant, showing that the teachers are highly inclined to deviance in Government Boys' High Schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Hence the causes of deviant behavior of teachers in Government Boys' High Schools were investigated and indicated. Furthermore, the average results of teachers are significantly higher than the principals; indicated the impact of this deviant behavior on school climate.

## DISCUSSIONS

The theoretical background and the scales adopted for this study suggested that there may be a strong (positively) indication of teachers' deviance in Government Boys' High Schools which is discussed as below:-

### Counter Work Behavior Items

In order to investigate the deviant teachers in government boys high schools, the counter work behavior scale were used. It is further divided into:

#### **Counter Work Behavior- Organization (CWB-O)**

In the four sub scales of Counter Work Behavior –Organization (CWB-O), the highest mean value (M = 36.2578, SD = 6.68518) lied in sub-scale Theft Items (teachers) as compared to other three sub-scales. The other three subscales of Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O), are Withdrawal, Production Deviance and Sabotage. The respective mean scores of

the teachers on these scales were 14.0230, 13.9557 and 9.9589 respectively. It indicated that the teachers are involved in deviant attitude knowingly or unknowingly. It might be considered that the teachers do not understand the consequences of their acts, which they perform in the organization. They do not consider that these kinds of actions fall under the shadow of deviance, and make them deviant by doing or performing such actions as mentioned in these items. The Withdrawal and Production Deviance have also high values of means and std. deviations making them deviant in the school.

The principals response about teachers, the four sub scales of Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O), the highest mean value ( $M = 37.1818$ ,  $SD = 10.49977$ ) lied also in the same sub-scale Theft Items (principals) as compared to other three sub-scales. This is indicating a severe problem of deviance on behalf of teachers, because the principals' values also fall almost in the same proportion as marked by teachers. The other three subscales of Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O), are Withdrawal, Production Deviance and Sabotage. The respective mean scores of the teachers on these scales were 15.0000, 14.0682 and 8.5227 respectively.

The results revealed significant correlations in Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O) scale. The calculations of the Cronbach Alpha and principal axis factoring (PAF) yielded the results of School Situation with regard to teachers self report and principal's report about teachers of four subscales, reliable factor with a Cronbach Alpha for the teachers was 0.125 extracted and for principals was 0.680 extracted. These results indicated low internal consistencies for teachers and strong acceptable internal consistencies for the principals. The results of this study are according to those found by Bennett and Robinson (2000: 357) and Stewart et al (2009: 207), which notify that the results are justified. Both the respondents showing almost the same proportions, it is quite interesting to note that both respondents keep the same ratio in the subscales also. It is evident that the teachers are seriously involved in deviant activities in the school.

### ***Counter Work Behavior- Person (CWB-P)***

In the three sub scales of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P), the highest mean value ( $M = 84.0525$ ,  $SD = 10.10311$ ) lied in sub-scale Abuse Items (teachers) as compared to other three sub-scales. The other two subscales of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P), are Property Deviance and Personal Deviance. The respective mean scores of the teachers on these scales were 15.2200, and 10.6190 respectively. The highest values falls for the subscale Abuse items, this is quite alarming on teachers' self response. The teachers by self response repot consider, that they are involved in sever type of deviance, Abuse.

The principals response about teachers, the four sub scales of Counter Work Behavior – Person (CWB-P), the highest mean value ( $M = 74.8864$ ,  $SD = 21.07375$ ) lies also in the same sub-scale Theft Items (principals) as compared to other three sub-scales. The principals' values also indicate that teachers' score on subscale Abuse are not just misconceptions of the terms or items included in the opinionaire, but pointing a worse situation in organizations. The other two subscales of counter work behavior – person (CWB-P), Property Deviance and Personal Deviance. The respective mean scores of the teachers on these scales were 15.7727 and 9.7727 respectively.

The findings of the study denote that there is significant correlation in counter work behavior – person (CWB-P) scale. The calculations of the Cronbach Alpha and principal axis factoring (PAF) yielded the results of schools' situation with regard to teachers self report and principals report about teachers of four subscales, reliable factor with a Cronbach Alpha for the teachers was 0.057 extracted and for principals 0.564 was extracted. These results indicated very low internal consistencies for teachers and acceptable internal consistencies for the principals. These results are in line to Counter Work Behavior-Person (CWB-P) with the results of Douglas et al (2008:425) and Langton et al (2011:121).

## CONCLUSION

### Counter Work Behavior Items

To conclude our findings about teachers' attitudes in Government Boys High Schools, the counter work behavior scales are divided into:-

#### ***Counter Work Behavior- Organization (CWB-O)***

In the four sub scales of counter work behavior –Organization (CWB-O), the highest Mean value laid in sub-scale Theft Items (teachers) as compared to other three sub-scales. The other three subscales of Counter Work Behavior – Organization (CWB-O), are Withdrawal, Production Deviance and Sabotage. It denoted that the teachers are involved in deviant attitude knowingly or unknowingly. It might be concluded that the teacher do not understand the consequences of their acts, which they do in the institution. They do not know that these actions fall under the purview of deviance. The other subscale, Withdrawal and Production Deviance have also high values of means and SD. deviations making them deviant in the school.

The principals' response about teachers, the four sub scales of counter work behavior – Organization (CWB-O), and the highest mean value lay also in the same sub-scale Theft Items (principals) as compared to other three sub-scales. This is denoting a severe problem of deviance on behalf of teachers, because the principals' values also fall almost in the same

proportion as marked by teachers. The other three subscales of counter work behavior – Organization (CWB-O), Withdrawal, Production Deviance and Sabotage.

Both principals and teachers are pointing almost the same situation; it is worthwhile to note that both respondents indicating the same ratio in these subscales. It might be concluded that the teachers are involved in deviant activities in the school. The conclusion of this study is according to finding of Bennett and Robinson (2000:358) and Stewart et al (2009:207), these conclusions are justified.

### ***Counter Work Behavior- Person (CWB-P)***

The three sub scales of counter work behavior – person (CWB-P), the highest Mean value is laid in sub-scale Abuse Items (teachers) as compared to other three sub-scales. The other two subscales of counter work behavior – person (CWB-P), Property Deviance and Personal Deviance. The highest Mean value falls for subscale Abuse items, which is unacceptable for teachers' self response. It might be concluded that the teachers' self response report accepts, that they are involved in sever type of deviance and Abuse of property. Principals' responses about teachers, the four sub scales of counter work behavior – person (CWB-P) and the highest mean value is laid also in the same sub-scale Abuse Items (principals) as compared to other three sub-scales. It might be concluded that the principals' response values also indicate that teachers' score on subscale Abuse are not just misconceptions of the terms or items included in the opinionnaire, but indicating a worst type of deviant situation in schools.

The findings of the study denote that there is a significant correlation in counter work behavior – person (CWB-P) scale. Teachers accept that they are involved in deviant attitudes and actions and principals also testify with positive responses that the teachers' are deviant. This indicates that the administrative situation is quite worse in the schools. The principals might consider themselves helpless, while performing their managerial duties in school. It might be concluded that principals cannot perform their managerial duties effectively, because the teachers are creating hurdles in their way. They do not let him to perform according to the rules and regulations of the institutions. The conclusions of Counter Work Behavior-Person (CWB-P) are in line with the conclusions of Douglas et al (2008:425) and Langton et al (2011:121).

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the basis of findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Principals may be empowered to ensure the implementation of rules and regulations in schools by delegating them authority to take action against their teachers and by involving them in the process of recruiting and selection of teachers.

2. Necessary steps may be taken to improve the performance of teachers in government schools through motivational techniques and by monitoring the behavior and conduct of teachers continuously. Teachers may be motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic incentives, such as cash rewards and issuance of good performance certificates etc.
3. Those teachers, who are found deviant, and disobeying the rules and regulations, may be penalized by stopping of annual increment, censures, and if they do not change their attitudes may not be recommended for promotion.
4. There is an urgent need to frame Code of Ethics for teachers and principals.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY**

Like other researches, this research study may also contribute in some way to give suggestions to improve the quality of education specifically in public sector. This study had some limitations too:

#### **Research Topic**

Deviance is a new concept especially in government schools and in education department in the developing countries. There is scantiness of local published and unpublished research material and awareness about deviance in education specifically in teachers' deviance. Deviance is a vast term and has a wide approach to encompass all the attitudes and behavior of teachers in school. This necessitates of institutional-wise study to know with its causes.

#### **Sample Size and Gender Comparison**

This research is delimited to three districts. A similar study may be conducted in other districts/divisions of the province and also in other province of the country. Future studies may also include a comparison of public and private schools.

#### **Research Nature**

The limitations of the present research did not allow the researcher to examine any specific type of attitude or social behavior that is responsible for teachers' deviance in school. It is out of range of the study to trace out the association of teachers' interpersonal attitudes, intrapersonal attitudes, institutional environment adaptability and behavior during conflict with teachers (colleagues) or with principals, behavior when facing the stress and other personality disorders.

### **REFERENCES**

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. E. (2009). *Constructions of Deviance : Social Power, Context, and Interaction*. (5<sup>th</sup>Edition). Australia: Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Australia.

- Anwar, M.N., Sarwar, M., Awan, R.N., & Arif, M.I. (2011). Gender differences in workplace deviant behaviour of university teachers and modification techniques. *International Education Studies*, Published by Canadian Center for Science Education, Vol. 4(1), pp. 193-197.
- Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.38 (2), pp.555–572.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 349-360.
- Bryant, M. & Higgins, V. (2010): Self-confessed troublemakers: An interactionist view of deviance during organizational change, *Human Relations*, Vol. 63(2), pp. 249-278.
- Chiu, S.F. & Peng, J.C. (2008). The relationship between psychological contract breach and employee deviance : The moderating role of hostile attributional style, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, pp. 426–433.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp. 425-445.
- Cowen, A. P., & Marcel, J. J. (2011). Damaged goods: Board decisions to dismiss reputationally compromised directors. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54(3), pp. 509–527.
- Everton, W.J., Jolton, J.A., & Mastrangelo, P.M. (2007). Be nice and fair or else: understanding reasons for employees' deviant behaviors, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26(2), pp. 117-131.
- Gay, L.R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational Research: competencies for analysis and application* (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.). NJ: Upper Saddle River: Merrill Publishing Company, USA.
- Greenberg, J. (2010). *Insidious workplace behaviour*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, Inc., 530 Walnut Street, Suite 850, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting WD from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 17, pp.247-63.
- Higgins, P. C., & Mackinem, M. B. (2008). *Thinking about deviance : A realistic perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 4501 Forbes Blvd., Suite 200 Lanham, MD 20706, UK.
- Hollinger, R. C. (1986). Acts against the workplace: Social bonding and employee deviance . *Deviant Behaviour*, Vol.7, pp. 53–75.
- Iqbal, M. (2012). *Essentials of Educational Administration*. Unpublished Book, Peshawar, Pakistan: Sarhad University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan.
- Iranzadeh, S., & Chakherlouy, F. (2011). A study on the relationship between citizenship behavior and organizational justice with Job Satisfaction among the employees. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, Vol.13, pp.806-818.
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, Job Attitudes, and Workplace Deviance : Test of a Multilevel Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91(1), pp. 126-138.
- Kennedy, D. B., Homant, R. J. & Homant, M. (2004). Perception of injustice as a predictor of support for workplace aggression. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 18, pp. 323-336. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Springer International Publishing AG, Gewerbstrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland
- Kidwell, R.E., & Kochanowski, S.M. (2005). The Morality of Employee Theft: Teaching about Ethics and Deviant Behavior in the Workplace, *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 29(1), pp. 135-152.
- Knights. J. A., & Kennedy. B. J. (2005). Psychological Contract Violation: Impact on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Australian Senior Public Servant. *Applied HRM Research*, Vol. 10(2), pp. 57-72.
- Lawrence, T.B., & Robinson. S.L. (2007). Workplace Deviance as Organizational Resistance, *Journal of Management*, 2007, Vol. 33(3), pp. 378-394.

- Martin, D. E., Rao, A., & Sloan, L. R. (2009). Plagiarism, integrity, and workplace deviance : A criterion study. *Journal of Ethics and Behavior*, Vol.19 (1), pp. 36-50.
- Mccardle, G.J. (2007). Organizational Justice and workplace deviance : The role of organizational structure, powerlessness, and information salience. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando, USA.
- McClurg, L.A. & Butler, D.S. (2006). Workplace Theft: A Proposed Model and Research Agenda, *Southern Business Review*, Vol.31, pp. 25-34.
- Peterson, D.K. (2002). Deviant Workplace Behavior and the Organization's Ethical Climate, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol.7, pp. 47-61.
- Rossouw, D., & Van Vuuren, L. (2010). *Business ethics*. (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). Cape Town, SA: Oxford University Press Southern Africa, South Africa.
- Sarwar, M., Awan, R., Alam, M., & Anwar, M. N. (2010). Location and gender differences in deviant behaviour among primary school teachers. *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 5(12), pp.97-101.
- Spector, E., & Fox, S. (2002). Emotions, Violence and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Kellowa, Journal of Organizational Behaviour and Management*, pp: 29.
- Stewart, S.M., Bing, M.N., Davison, H.K., Woehr, D.J., & McIntyre, M.D. (2009). In the eye of the beholder: A non-self-report measure of workplace deviance . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.94, pp. 207-215.
- Thau, S., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Self-gain or self-regulation impairment? Tests of competing explanations of the supervisor Abuse and employee deviance relationship through perceptions of distributive justice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.95 (6), pp. 1009-1031.