

An Analysis of Teachers' Deviant Behavior and its Impact on Students' Academic Performance

Parveen Khan

University of Peshawar

The present study explored teachers' deviant behavior and its impact on students' academic performance of Peshawar University at BS level. The study was quantitative in nature. The population included all the departments of University of Peshawar. The sample constituted 08 departments which were randomly selected. The data was collected from (40) students through close-ended questionnaire based on five-point Likert's scale. The collected data was tabulated and analyzed by using Chi-square, MS Word and SPSS software. The major conclusions were that teachers' deviant behavior highly affected students' academic performance in different ways such as favoritism, wasting time during teaching, by taking longer breaks, through verbal abusing, by not following the course content last, but not the least, provoking students' against other teachers. The study has made some suggestions which included that head of institution may take initiatives or steps in order to deal with such type of teachers' behaviors. Effective monitoring and proper check and balance mechanism should be implemented. They may use positive techniques such as rewards, appreciations, shields, cash prizes etc for controlling such behavior of teachers. If the situation is out of control then the head may apply negative techniques like explanation, transfer, show cause notice, by stopping the promotion etc. There may be complete ban on political intervention during the recruitment of teachers.

Keywords: deviant teachers, behavior and academic performance

The success of any system depends on the quality of its personnel. If the staff has effective behavior, well-trained and well-qualified, the institution will definitely achieve its target in a better way. Especially the head of institution can improve the performance of its subordinates and pupils with his positive attitude (Anwar et al., 2011).

Deviant behavior among teachers at University level is prevalence and a major concern for organizational researchers, practitioners and the public at large (Alued, Omoregie, & Osa-edoh, 2006; Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Kidwell & Kent, 2008). Deviant behavior in educational institutions exists. And recently reports of deviant behavior have increased rapidly and no one is recognizing the fact that there is urgent need to tackle such abnormalities in educational institutions. It is considered that it will not result in any type of problems but it appears to be a major source of concern for higher authorities (Ibrahim, 2014).

The events of teachers' misbehavior and deviancy in educational institutions and their intentions adversely affects smooth functioning of institution and have, therefore, attracted considerable attention of the researchers. Some studies have reflected that the deteriorating relationship between teachers and students is the major reason for students to stay away from

school or have disruptive behavior. So, researcher decided to conduct a research on such topic because research in this particular area is scarce.

Deviant Behavior

Deviance is defined as the violation of any social norms of the institution (Kendall, 2005). Appelbaumetal (2005) defined deviant behavior as disregard of ethical rules or sub-standards. Deviant behavior is an action performed by teachers that harms an educational institution directly or indirectly its staff or both. It creates damage or is intended to create damage in an institution and staff members. It includes aggression, fraud, theft, violence, dishonest, sabotage and whistle-blowing (Spector & Fox, 2002).

Literature Review

Locke (2003) cited that deviance can be useful or harmful. It depends on the nature of norms and deviance. It is very ambiguous term; it is difficult to define it clearly (Bollin & Heatherly, 2003). identified the main causes of deviance of teachers which include lack of satisfaction, wastage of student's time, school disliking, absenteeism, theft, misuse of privileges, and creating hurdles in smooth running of schools.

Appelbaum et al., (2007) reported that negative deviance whether explicit or implicit, has negative consequences for schools. Teachers' deviance behavior may include leaving institution for some time during working hours, coming late to schools and leaving early and fights with head and colleagues. (Saks, 2006) documented that many educational administrators, principals, and research scholars consider deviant behavior as a cancer, which is found in large number of today's institutions.

Andreoli and LefRowitz (2009) reported that deviant behavior of teachers is particularly destroying the conducive environment of the institution. Deviant behavior is negatively impacting institutional interests (Berry et al., 2007). Deviance in the schools fairly exists and many teachers at some point engage in such behavior in school (Kaptein, 2011). Robbins and Judge (2007) cited that school principals wanted to understand the causes of teachers' deviant behavior, so in order to avoid disorganized work environment in school.

Anwar et al., (2011) concluded from their study that the ratio of organizational 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 as compared to female teaching staff. He further stated that sometimes, unwanted behavior cannot be reduced through positive reinforcement then negative practices may be used like punishment, extinction, warning etc.

According to Galperin (2002) deviance has both effects i.e. constructive and destructive. Constructive deviance is defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational rules, which is against the destructive deviance, but it contributes to the welfare of institution and its personnel.

Teaching classes regularly, punctuality and developing conducive environment are the essential and expected norms of successful schools. On the other hand, all forms of deviance behaviors' are harmful for educational institutions and students (Sarwar, Awan, Alam, & Anwar, 2010). Therefore, identification of such type of behaviors in institutions is necessary and to take preventive measures against them so that it may not affect the academic performance of the students.

Researches on schools in Turkey revealed the breakdown of penalized teachers' behaviors .e.g. Caglar (2006) cited that 50% of the penalties on teachers were imposed due to their involvement in trade unions and 14% for not obeying the rules of the organizations. On the other hand, Demirel (2002) stated that 42% teachers were punished due to absenteeism.

Unal (2012) indicated from his study that administrators pay more attention to whether or not teachers act in accordance with the rules rather than to their performance. Positive class room management and good relationship among head, staff and students could improve the performance of deviant teachers.

Adler and Adler (2009) stated that individuals are recognized as deviance by their behaviors, by not following the organizational norms, values, and involved in unethical activities. Tepper et al., (2009) described that deviant behavior is to reject the institutional norms, policies and practices. In different practices and approaches, the head of institution also promote deviancy among teachers in school (Aquino et al., 2000)

Hung et al., (2009) stated that antisocial behavior is consisted of absenteeism; theft, poor quality of teaching, misuse of information, as well as destruction in school. Kaptein (2011) documented that deviance in the schools fairly exists and many teachers, at some point engage in such behaviors in school. Family type and family background is not significantly related to deviant behavior in schools (Jou, 2010). Berry et al., (2007) identified that deviant behavior is negatively impact institutional interests.

Robbins and Judge (2007) cited that school principals wanted to understand the causes of deviance and teachers' deviant behavior in order to avoid disorganized work environment in school. Warren (2003) stated a number of negative deviant behaviors which include misbehavior, lying, theft, aggression, disregard of school rules and involvement in political activities.

Lawerence and Robinson (2007) stated that if teachers do not receive the expected attention, respect and were not fairly treated in the institutions, they would show deviant behavior in the institution. A report of the International crisis Group (2010) documented that deviant behaviors of teachers in schools has been a major obstacle that exhibits the school to rise to the apex of excellence in Pakistan. Bryant and Higgins (2010) stated that teachers are recognized as deviance when they act against institutional norms, values and do not come up to the level of the expectations of the head of institution.

Knights and Kennedy (2005) cited that decrease in teachers commitment might result in deviant behavior. Appelbaum et al., (2007) stated that if the teachers are not getting what they are expecting from the principals and their colleagues, start showing deviant behavior. Shah (2009) identified different factors which affected the academic performance of students such as lack of confidence, no tolerance, disrespect, communication gap, aggressive attitude, and coming late to class etc.

Kelloway et al., (2010) cited that deviant behavior decreases institutional efficiency at different levels and diminishes achievement of students. As compared with other school deviant behaviors, interpersonal deviant behavior is commonly demonstrated by the teacher at departments.

Deviant behaviors of teachers' dimensions include interpersonal deviance and institutional deviance. Interpersonal deviance behaviors include such as belittling others, acting rudely, playing pranks on others, and physical aggression (Henle, 2005) where as institutional deviance is a behavior between the individual and the institution that includes such things as sabotage, lateness, fraud or putting little effort into teaching.

Objectives of the Study

1. To know the impact of teachers' deviant behavior on students academic performance level in Peshawar University.
2. To find out the relationship between teachers' deviant behavior and students' academic achievement.
3. To suggest implementable suggestions that how heads of department prevent such deviant behavior of teachers in educational institutions.

Significance of the Study

The current study would be significant for administrators, teachers and heads of educational institutions. It would help him to control and prevent deviant behaviors of teachers in their institutions and create conducive environment to teaching learning process. It would also provide guidelines for further researchers as well.

Method

The study was quantitative in nature. The data were collected through closed-ended questionnaire based on five point Likert's scale containing 38 statements in order to collect the views of students about deviant behavior of teachers and their impact on students' academic performance by using Chi-Square, MS Excel and SPSS software. The researcher personally collected the data. The population of the study included all departments of Peshawar University. The sample consisted 08 departments and 40 students (05 students from each department) were chosen randomly at B.S level.

Results and Discussions

Questions		SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total	X ²
Teachers have confident in their teaching abilities.	Responses	2	-	2	21	15	40	27.400*
	Percentage	5.00%	-	5.00%	52.50%	37.50%	100	
Teachers have a great deal of control over what happens in class.	Responses	2	2	4	20	12	40	31.000*
	Percentage	5.00%	5.00%	10.00%	50.00%	30.00%	100	
Teachers purposely waste time.	Responses	9	8	13	8	2	40	7.750
	Percentage	22.50%	20.00%	32.50%	20.00%	5.00%	100	
Teachers usually come to school late without any information.	Responses	10	7	13	6	4	40	6.250
	Percentage	25.00%	17.50%	32.50%	15.00%	10.00%	100	
Teachers stay home	Responses	6	8	11	11	4	40	4.750

from duty and assume that they are not feeling well.	Percentage	15.00%	20.00%	27.50%	27.50%	10.00%	100	
They usually left department earlier than usual time	Responses	7	8	11	9	5	40	2.500
	Percentage	17.50%	20.00%	27.50%	22.50%	12.50%	100	
Teachers usually take longer breaks during the class.	Responses	11	14	3	8	4	40	10.750*
	Percentage	27.50%	35.00%	7.50%	20.00%	10.00%	100	
Teachers purposely teach slowly only to kill the time.	Responses	10	17	4	7	2	40	17.250*
	Percentage	25.00%	42.50%	10.00%	17.50%	5.00%	100	
Teachers spend too much time in finalizing the decision instead of teaching.	Responses	7	11	9	8	5	40	2.500
	Percentage	17.50%	27.50%	22.50%	20.00%	12.50%	100	
Teachers take classes regularly.	Responses	-	4	4	23	9	40	24.200*
	Percentage	-	10.00%	10.00%	57.50%	22.50%	100	
Teachers submit their result at the given date.	Responses	10	5	4	11	10	40	5.250
	Percentage	25.00%	12.50%	10.00%	27.50%	25.00%	100	
Teachers provided guidance to you any time	Responses	3	5	6	18	8	40	17.250*
	Percentage	7.50%	12.50%	15.00%	45.00%	20.00%	100	
Teachers try to look busy while doing nothing.	Responses	11	7	8	8	6	40	1.750
	Percentage	27.50%	17.50%	20.00%	20.00%	15.00%	100	
Teachers tell people outside what a intrusive place it is	Responses	6	8	19	6	1	40	22.250*
	Percentage	15.00%	20.00%	47.50%	15.00%	2.50%	100	
Teachers taunt/embarrass you in front of the whole class.	Responses	5	8	10	11	6	40	3.250
	Percentage	12.50%	20.00%	25.00%	27.50%	15.00%	100	
Teachers blame you for their mistakes	Responses	7	10	8	10	5	40	2.250
	Percentage	17.50%	25.00%	20.00%	25.00%	12.50%	100	
Teachers start an argument with you.	Responses	6	9	8	13	4	40	5.750
	Percentage	15.00%	22.50%	20.00%	32.50%	10.00%	100	
Teachers try to solve your academic problems	Responses	6	3	2	19	10	40	23.750*
	Percentage	15.00%	7.50%	5.00%	47.50%	25.00%	100	

Teachers usually use verbal abuse in the class.	Responses	14	16	6	2	2	40	22.000*
	Percentage	35.00%	40.00%	15.00%	5.00%	5.00%	100	
Teacher use mobile phone during teaching	Responses	8	10	6	12	4	40	5.000
	Percentage	20.00%	25.00%	15.00%	30.00%	10.00%	100	
Teachers usually put little effort into their teaching	Responses	5	12	13	7	3	40	9.500*
	Percentage	12.50%	30.00%	32.50%	17.50%	7.50%	100	
Teachers act rudely toward colleague in the department	Responses	8	9	12	9	2	40	6.750
	Percentage	20.00%	22.50%	30.00%	22.50%	5.00%	100	
Teachers provoke you to misbehave towards others teachers.	Responses	15	7	12	3	3	40	14.500*
	Percentage	37.50%	17.50%	30.00%	7.50%	7.50%	100	
Teachers do not manage their class well.	Responses	7	20	8	2	3	40	25.750*
	Percentage	17.50%	50.00%	20.00%	5.00%	7.50%	100	
Teacher do not follow syllabus.	Responses	13	14	3	4	6	40	13.250*
	Percentage	32.50%	35.00%	7.50%	10.00%	15.00%	100	
Teachers leave the class early.	Responses	14	11	5	4	6	40	9.250
	Percentage	35.00%	27.50%	12.50%	10.00%	15.00%	100	
Teachers do not make essential preparation for the lesson	Responses	9	12	8	9	2	40	6.750
	Percentage	22.50%	30.00%	20.00%	22.50%	5.00%	100	
Teachers encourage you for good performance.	Responses	3	5	4	12	16	40	16.250*
	Percentage	7.50%	12.50%	10.00%	30.00%	40.00%	100	
Work assignment is not fully explained.	Responses	8	9	9	9	5	40	1.500
	Percentage	20.00%	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	12.50%	100	
Teachers take the attendance regularly.	Responses	2	4	5	6	23	40	36.250*
	Percentage	5.00%	10.00%	12.50%	15.00%	57.50%	100	
Teachers provide extra time to research scholar.	Responses	7	3	14	11	5	40	10.000*
	Percentage	17.50%	7.50%	35.00%	27.50%	12.50%	100	
Teachers' behavior	Responses	6	7	9	10	8	40	1.250

ever made you to change your mind of becoming teacher	Percentage	15.00%	17.50%	22.50%	25.00%	20.00%	100	
	Responses	5	3	7	12	13	40	9.500*
Teachers do favoritism in the class.	Percentage	12.50%	7.50%	17.50%	30.00%	32.50%	100	
	Responses	4	3	2	23	8	40	37.750*
Teachers make the teaching learning process effective	Percentage	10.00%	7.50%	5.00%	57.50%	20.00%	100	
Teachers' harsh behaviors ever create any psychological problem for you	Responses	4	4	8	11	13	40	8.250
	Percentage	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	27.50%	32.50%	100	
Teachers clearly explain the problem identified by you.	Responses	1	8	8	15	8	40	12.250*
	Percentage	2.50%	20.00%	20.00%	37.50%	20.00%	100	
Teachers provide financial help to you.	Responses	11	9	12	5	3	40	7.500
	Percentage	27.50%	22.50%	30.00%	12.50%	7.50%	100	
Teachers' deviant behaviors ever affect your personality.	Responses	6	12	11	7	4	40	5.750
	Percentage	15.00%	30.00%	27.50%	17.50%	10.00%	100	

*Significant

df = 4

Table Value X^2 at 0.05 level = 9.488

Discussion

Table- 1 shows X^2 values of the responses of students are greater than the table values at 0.05 level of probability. Analysis of Table-1 of students' responses showed that teachers appear to be confident, competent in teaching, possess classroom management skills and provide guidance to students. They further agreed that teachers used to take longer breaks during the class and teach slowly only to kill the time due to which the courses are not completed in a given specified time. Majority of the students agreed that teachers have opinion that their departments are not appropriate place for doing job as the teachers used to pull one another legs all the time. Some of the teachers use verbal abuse in class which not only effect the students' academic achievements but also affect their personality as well.

Majority of the students agreed that teachers provoke them to misbehave with other teachers and students and usually do not follow course content which makes the students confuse and are not able to obtain good grades in exam. The teachers used to take the attendance regularly, appreciate students for their good performance, and make teaching learning process effective by using different teaching techniques. Majority of the students transpired that teachers do favoritism in the class which becomes a major problem for them and it also affect their academic performance and result.

The relationship between teachers' deviant behavior and students' academic performance showed that there was a highly significant correlation between the behavior of teachers' and academic performance of students.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The result of the study showed that the teachers' deviant behavior has a negative impact on students' academic performance. Deviant behavior of teachers' become an alarming issue for higher authorities especially in educational organizations where teachers play an important role in the holistic development of students and to make them useful citizens of the society. So, for the teachers it is necessary that they themselves should exhibit such behavior which leads their students towards the right path. The students claim that behavior of teachers is a major reason for their weak academic performance and disrupting lessons. If teachers develop positive relation with one another and with students', show true loyalty and sincerity with their institutes, then institute will flourish in a quick manner. It has been proved that freshly appointed teachers usually perform their duty honestly in the start but with the passage of time they become less active, less enthusiasm in their work. They start disobeying the rules and regulations and show deviancy in their behavior.

The study also made some recommendations which include that effective monitoring and supervision are the strong tools of head of department to control the teachers' deviant behavior. Full authority may be given to them so that they implement proper rules & regulations in institutions. Positive reinforcement techniques such as rewards, incentives, feedback, motivation and appreciation may be used by heads in order to minimize the occurrence of deviant behavior of teachers. Sometimes, unwanted behavior cannot be controlled with positive reinforcement then negative techniques may be used like warning, punishment, to stop their promotion, call explanation etc. There may be a proper check by the heads of departments to make it possible that some students may not be favored without merit by the teachers. There may be a complete ban on political intervention during the recruitment of teachers. No check and balance mechanism, weak monitoring system, lack of effective reward and punishment system in educational department causes to promote deviant behavior among teachers.

References

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. E. (2009). *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction*. (5th Edition). Australia: Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Australia.
- Alued, O., Omoregie, E.D., & OSA-Edoh, G.I. (2006) Academic dishonesty as a contemporary problem in higher education: How Academic advisers can help. *Reading Improvement*, 43(2).
- Andreoli, N., & Lefkowitz, J. (2009). Individual and organizational antecedents of misconduct in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.85 (3), pp.309-332. Journal of Business Ethics, Dordrecht; Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Co., USA. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9772-6
- Anwar,M.N.,Sarwar,M.,Awan,R.,Arif,M.I.(2010). Gender Differences in Workplace Deviant Behaviour of University Teachers and Modification Techniques. *International Education Studies*. Vol.4. No.1.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviours: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance*, Vol.7 (5), corporate governance, [Bradford, West Yorkshire]: MCB University Press, UK.
- Appelbaum, S.H., Deguire, K.J., & Lay, M. (2005). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behavior, *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 5(4). Corporate Governance, [Bradford, West Yorkshire]: MCB University Press, UK.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (2000). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol.20, Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, UK.
- 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*, Vol. 92.

- [Washington: American Psychological Association.], USA. Retrieved from, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410>
- Bolin, A. & Heatherly, L. (2003). Predictors of employee deviance: The relationship between bad attitudes and bad behaviour. *Journal of Business and Psychology, Vol. 25* (3). New York, N.Y.: Human Sciences Press, USA.
- Brimble, M., & Stevenson- Clarke, P. (2005) Perceptions of the prevalence and seriousness of academic dishonesty in Australian Universities. *The Australian Educational Research; 32*(3), 19-44. Doi: 10.1007/bf03216825.
- Bryant, M. & Higgins, V. (2010): Self-confessed troublemakers: An interactionist view of deviance during organizational change, *Human Relations, Vol. 63*(2). Human Relations, [New York, N.Y.]: Plenum Pub. Corp, USA. doi: 10.1177/0018726709338637
- Caglar,S.(2006).Discipline crime of teachers who in primary schools and the discipline punishments which take.Unpublished Master Thesis. Inonu University. Malatya, Turkey.
- Chapman, K.J., & Lupton (2004). Academic dishonesty in a global educational market: compassion of Hong Kong and American University business students. *International Journal of Educational management, 18*.
- Demirel. I. (2002).*Received causes of disciplinary actions of teachers working in primary schools*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Inonu University. Malatya, Turkey.
- Galperin,B.L.(2002).*Determinants of deviance in the work place: An empirical examination of Canada and Mexico*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Concordia University. Montreal, Canada.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting WD from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues, Vol. 17*. ResearchGate, Corporation 350, Third Street #1201Cambridge, MA02142, USA.
- Hung, T., Chi, N., & Lu, W. (2009). Exploring relationships between perceived co-worker loafing and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating role of a revenge motive. *Journal of Business and Psychology, Vol.24*. New York, N.Y.: Human Sciences Press, USA. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9104-6
- Ibrahim,M.(2014) *An analysis of Deviant Behaviours of Teachers in GovernmentBoys' High Schools of khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan)*.(Ph.D Disseration). Sarhad University.Peshawar:Pakistan
- Iqbal,M.Z., Arif,M.I., & Badar,S.(2011).A Comparative Study of Deviant Work Place Behaviour of Teaching Staff of Public & Private: Universities of Punjab(Pakistan). *International Journal of Asian Social Sciences.2*(12):2128-2137
- International Crisis Group (2010). Reforming Pakistan Civil Service. Crisis Group Asia Report N-185, published on 16 February 2010. International Crisis Group, 149 Avenue Louise, Level14, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium.
- Jou, M. D. (2010). The transition model for ethical deficit to a corporate transparent culture: A response to the family background. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics, Vol. 12*(2), pp.312-323. Academic and Business Research institute, P.O. 350997 Jacksonville, Florida 32235-0997, USA.
- Kaptein, M. (2011).Developing a measure of unethical behaviour in the workplace: A stakeholder perspective. *Journal of Management, Vol. 34*(5). SAGE Publications, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, USA.
- Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010).Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 20*. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.014., Elsevier BV, Radarweg 29, Amsterdam, 1043 NX, Netherlands.
- Lawrence, T.B., & Robinson. S.L. (2007). Workplace Deviance as Organizational Resistance, *Journal of Management, 2007, Vol. 33*(3). Journal of Management. SAGE Publications, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, USA.

- Locke, E. A. (2003). Good definitions: The epistemological foundation of scientific progress. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science (2nd Edition)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, USA.
- Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour (12th Edition)*. Upper Saddle, River, New Jersey: Education, Inc. USA.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 21(7)*. Bradford, West Yorkshire, England: MCB University Press Ltd. UK.
- Shah, S.A. (2009). *Impact of Teacher's Behaviour on the Academic Achievement of a University Students*. Ph.D Thesis. University Institute of Education and Research. Arid Agriculture University Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
- Spector, E., & Fox, S. (2002). Emotions, Violence and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. Kellowa. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour and Management. Chichester*, England: John Wiley & Sons, UK.
- Tepper, B.J., Carr, J., Breaux, D. M., Gieder, S., Hu, C. & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit and employee's workplace deviance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 109*. Organizational Behavior, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, USA.
- Unal, A. (2012). Deviant teacher behaviors and their influence on school rules and interpersonal relationships at school. *Egotism Arastirmalari - Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 49*, 1-20.
- Warren, D. (2003). Constructive and destructive deviance in organization. *Academy of Management Review, Vol. 28*. Mississippi State, Miss.: Academy of Management, USA. Retrieved from, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30040751>

Received: Feb 1st, 2017
Revisions Received: Nov 21st, 2017