Abstract – Deviant behavior is a recurring workplace behavioral problem. It happened in many organizations and has now transcends in public organization. An appropriate attention to deviance problem is necessary, because this problem brings harmful effects to the organization, economically and socially. Hence this article aims to identify the prevalence of deviant behavior and leadership behavior and to study the association between the two, as literatures indicate that the organizational leadership influences deviant behavior. In this study, two forms of leadership were emphasized which include control and flexibility leadership. Meanwhile two perspectives of deviant behavior are used to classify deviant behaviors, which are organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. These perspectives are useful as it identifies deviant behavior of different severity and target. Result indicated that, control and flexible leaderships are prevalence. The study also indicated that organizational and interpersonal deviance is present. While correlation analysis reveals that control and flexibility leadership influences organizational and interpersonal deviance negatively. In sum, the study supports the deviance literatures and showed that, leadership causes improvement in organizational environment which can deter deviant behavior.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Deviant behavior is a recurring behavioral problem in the workplace. This issue has long been discussed and is interchangeably described as counterproductive behavior, misbehavior and antisocial (Kaptein, 2011; Mohd Shamsudin, 2006; Estes & Wang, 2008). Hence, the behavior is known as prohibited workplace behavior and acts that are contrary to the values and norms of the organization (Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007; Appelbaum & Roy-Girard, 2007).

Early studies found that there are two perspectives of deviant behavior used, which refers to the organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance, and many studies utilizing this perspective (S. L. Robinson & Bennet, 1995; S. N. Robinson, Robertson, & Curtis, 2012). Thus, the recognized deviant behavior includes a wide aspect of minor and major deviance behavior which affects the organization and which affects individuals.

Deviance problem has also been identified to transcend in public organizations. Studies found that organizations with deviant behavior may experience failure in overall organizational performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Bolin & Heatherly, 2001). This is because, organizational deviance led to failure of employees to adhere to organizational work ethics, and as a consequence, organizations bear the burden of cost existed (Everton, Jolton, & Mastrangelo, 2007; Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006). Whilst interpersonal deviance has weaken the social-relationship in the workplace, due to psychological pressure experienced by the victim of this behavior (S. Appelbaum, Deguire, & Lay, 2005; Estes & Wang, 2008). As such, an organization with deviance problem would bring a bad image and negative implications to the organization and the employee.

Past research shows that there are two major factors that influence this problem which are organizational factors and personal factors (Avey, Palanski, & Walumbwa, 2010; Bodankin & Tziner, 2009). While previous studies focused on the importance of these two factors, organizational elements considered as a dominant factor that influence the existence of deviance problem (Biron, 2010; Browning, 2008; Mohd Shamsudin, Subramaniam, & Ibrahim, 2011), as many studies have demonstrated organizational factor are significant in work stress, and ultimately causing deviant behavior. Leadership is considered as an important organizational factor leading to deviant behavior, and shown in previous studies that it can influences deviant behavior (Ghosh, Dierkes, & Falletta, 2011; Avey et al., 2010).

Many empirical studies conducted in identifying the contribution of leadership to deviant behavior. Among the factors identified include leadership styles, leadership behavior, leadership approach and leadership personality (Bučiūnienė & Škudiienė, 2008; Dineen, Lewicki, & Tomlinson, 2006; Fleet & Griffin, 2006). In many instances, leadership styles which affect employee behavior has been proved to cause employee experience stress and eventually accompanied by physical and psychological symptoms that are partly reflected in deviant acts (Mayer, Kuenzi, & Greenbaum, 2011; Mayer, Thau, Workman, Dijke, & Cremer, 2012). From past studies, it is identified that the control and flexibility leadership contribute to deviant behavior (Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2006; Nyberg et al., 2011; Peng, Tseng, & Lee, 2011).

The present study showed that this deviant behavior arises from employees’ perception of the organization’s leadership style. The model of this research is shown in figure 1. From figure 1, we could identify that leadership is divided into two forms; control leadership and flexibility leadership. While deviant workplace behavior is classified into two; organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Thus, the study was undertaken to examine the frequency of deviant behavior and leadership and whether the two forms of leadership have any association with two classifications of deviant behavior.
Hence, this study is aimed to examine the employees’ perception of deviant behavior and leadership, and to determine its association within the Malaysian public sector environment. The research finding is hoped to assist the government in finding the causes and solutions to the problem.

II. DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Organizational success depends on its human resources. If the employees showed the desired behavior, it facilitates achievement of organizational goals (Raelin, 1986; Rahman & Rahim, 2011). If the employee showed contradictory behavior, or termed as deviant behavior, this will not benefitted the organization because the employee failed to meet the demands of the organization and cause dissatisfaction among users (Stacy, 2000; Steven & Barbara, 2006; Suquet, 2010).

Deviant behavior termed as acts done to bring negative implications to the organization and organizational members (S. H. Appelbaum et al., 2007; Bashir, 2009). Reviews of deviant behavior indicate that, the behavior is also known as resistance behavior or pessimistic behavior as a direct consequence of perceived negative work environment (Agboola & Salawu, 2011; Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001).

This article emphasizes the two perspectives of deviant behavior as identified by Robinson and Bennet (1995). The two perspectives defined deviant behavior as organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. The two perspectives have been widely used and the most comprehensive deviance model that determine deviance behavior of different target and level of severity (Mohd Shamsudin, Subramaniam, & Alshaubaibi, 2012; Mohd Shamsudin et al., 2011; Mohd Shamsudin, 2006).

Organizational deviance is classified as behaviors that give harmful effect to the organization. The behaviors include production and property deviance (Robinson & Bennet, 1995). Overall, organizational deviance is divided into two different forms and the behaviors violating organizational norms and causing huge financial loss including low in productivity and bad organizational performance (Kuvaas, 2009; Lau & Heldman, 2009; Miller, 1999). Production deviance involve behaviors such as taking excessive break, work slow, and focus on self-interest. Whilst property deviance involve the acts of stealing and financial abuse (Marino, 1998; Weber, Kurke, & Pentico, 2003; Wells, 2003). However, production deviance is justifiable deviant conduct. With the consent of the organization, this behavior is allowed to enable employees to rejuvenate and continue their commitment (Dodig-Crnkovic & Anokhina, 2008; Ellwardt, Labianca, & Wittek, 2012).

Meanwhile interpersonal deviance is classified as behaviors that cause harmful effect to the individual. This behavior can be divided into political deviance and personal aggression (S. L. Robinson & Bennet, 1995). Political deviance involves behaviors such as gossiping, favoritism, and blaming others. Personal aggression involve yelling or screaming, aggressive eye contact negative rumors, and physical intimidation (Meier & Robinson, 2004; Miron-Spekter, Efrat-Treister, Rafaeli, & Schwarz-Cohen, 2011; O’Boyle, Forsyth, & O’Boyle, 2010).

Interpersonal deviance emerges as a consequence of social relationship at work. Employees involve with this behavior through informal communication, chatting and social networking. These behaviors causing pressure to others, especially targeted victims. As consequence, it affect social-relationship and later dissatisfaction among the employees (Prendergast & Topel, 1996).

III. LEADERSHIP AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Leadership perception plays significant roles within the organizational context (Andrews & Boyne, 2010; Bean, Ordowich, & Westley, 1986). There are many studies which attempt to investigate the effect of leadership perception on organizational outcomes, such as towards organizational performance, employee involvement and employee commitment (Bučiūnienė & Škudienė, 2008). The result of the research have indicated that, leadership in an organization is prevalent and necessary in all organizational cycle (Choi & Choi, 2009).

The concept of leadership is based on behavioral theories of leadership. Leadership can be defined as leaders competency, and more specifically how they conceptualize, align, interact and creating success (Dineen et al., 2006; Elçi, Şener, Aksoy, & Alpkan, 2012). Previous research has identified that effective leaders possess two leadership behaviors, which are control leadership and flexibility leadership. These leadership are the most commonly studied by many researchers (Brown, 2003; Burke et al., 2006; Huang, Iun, Liu, & Gong, 2010; Hooijberg & Choi, 2001). Result has indicated that leadership perception has an association with deviant behavior, which also supported by studies of Dineen and friends (2006), Fleet and Griffin (2006), Mulki and friends (2006), and Myers and Myers, (1986).

A. Control Leadership and Deviant Behavior

Control leadership is defined as leaders’ behavior that concern on task and stability. They emphasized on systematic task governance through an effective workload distribution. This is to ensure that the workload is at the acceptable level. At the same time, leaders also concern on effectiveness of resources deployment such as financial resources, work equipment and work flow (Feldman, 2003; Brown, 2003).

Considerable evidence shows that control leadership significantly associated with deviant behavior. Involvement of leaders at the grass-root level for program implementation and evaluation lead to organizational sabotage. Control leadership also causes hostility, and undesirable behaviors among followers (Ouellette, Lazaer, & Chambers, 1999; Agboola & Salawu, 2011).
B. Flexibility Leadership and Deviant Behavior

While flexibility leadership, concerned on people and organizational adaptability. Leaders show support and sensitive to followers’ situation, and environmental change. They show support in humanizing the organization, through various human resources strategies. Leaders develop organizational adaptive-ness to ensure well balanced emphasis between internal and external environment (Boal & Schultz, 2007; Kellett, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2002).

The flexibility leadership is also significantly associated with organizational and interpersonal deviance. Past studies identified the negative association between flexibility leadership and deviant behavior. Flexibility leadership avoid the occurrence of workplace bullying and encourage workplace participation and willingness (Van Ginkel & Van Knippenberg, 2012; Stouten et al., 2010).

IV. METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in four Malaysian Federal Ministries and the populations are the managerial employees. In this study, 77 managerial employees agreed to participate. Since the study measure the sensitive issue, the sample are drawn by using non-probability convenience sampling method to ensure respondents voluntarily agreed to involve and to protect their confidentiality (Biron, 2010; Syaebani & Sobri, 2004).

For this study, the data was gathered through questionnaire as deviant behavior is a sensitive issue. The questionnaire used to measure leadership perception is developed by Quinn (1988)(in Hooijberg & Choi, 2001). The leadership perception is measured using 20 items and was scored using likert scale including (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Often and (4) Very Often. The respondents were asked to report the presence or lack of control and flexibility leadership in their organizational environment.

Questionnaire for deviant behavior is measured using questionnaire developed by Robinson and Bennet (1995). The respondents were asked to report how frequent they observed deviant behavior in the workplace, and deviant behavior was classified into organizational and interpersonal deviance. The deviance behavior was measured using four scale (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Often and (4) Very Often.

V. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The following are the demographic and results of the study. In this study, four ministries involve which include Ministry of Trade and Industry (26%), Ministry of Human Resources (29%), Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water (24.7%), and Ministry of Home Affairs (19.5%). The study was conducted among public managers. A total of 77 respondents participated in the study. Majority of the respondents is 20-30 years of age (45.5%). Others include 31-40 (42.9%), 41-50 (6.5%), and more than 51 years of age (5.2%). In term of gender, there are 24 (31.2%) male respondents and 53 (68.8%) female respondents. Majority of the respondents married (61%), only 36.4% were unmarried and few divorces (2.6%). The data also showed that majority of the respondents are Muslims (94.8%) and having a degree (48.1%).

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviations of Leadership Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Leadership</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding reveals that, the leadership behavior in public sector is influenced by the organization’s contextual factor. Due to environmental pressures, public organizations experienced several changes, and ventured into partnership that facilitate organizational objectives (Acar & Robertson, 2004; Bies, 2010). Control and flexibility leadership became a desirable leadership behavior to enhance organizational effectiveness and efficiency that would assist in accommodating organizational and environmental change (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Metcalf & Benn, 2012).

The presence of control and flexibility leadership is also a consequence of leaders’ personal influences. Leaders’ behaviors are influenced by leaders’ attitude, personality and self-esteem (Alavi & Askaripur, 2003; Alkahtani, Abu-Jarad, & Sulaiman, 2011). These personal factors are more influencing rather than contextual and organizational factor to develop motivation, interest at work and leader’s behavior. As such, leaders’ personal factor develops their personal quality which enhances positive or desirable leadership behavior shown through control and flexibility leadership (Bipp, Steinmayr, & Spinath, 2008; Bjørkelo, Einarsen, & Matthesien, 2010).

B. The Occurrence of Deviant Behavior

The occurrence of deviant behavior in Malaysian Public Sector as observed by the managerial employees is as in Table 2. From the table, it indicates that all types of deviant behaviors observed within the public sector context, regardless of its size, structure and their unique characteristics. It is also showed that, all organizations are exposed to deviant behavior...
due to contextual and situational factor (Bashir, 2009; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001).

The findings showed that, most of the respondents agreed that organizational deviance was observed with the highest indicating taking excessive or longer break (83.1%) reported. Followed by employees worked on personal matter (53.3%) observed and employees intentionally worked slower (50.7%). On the other hand, less frequent organizational deviance reported in these ministries included padded account (20.8%), accepting gift (16.9%), and stealing (19.5%).

Besides, it is also evidenced the occurrence of interpersonal deviance, with the highest behavior which involves organizational gossip (72.7%), followed by favoritism (45.5%). Other than that, the act of blaming others is also observed (35.1%). Less frequent interpersonal deviance involves cursed at work (16%), harassing remark or joke (16%) and physical intimidation (7%).

Table 2: Frequency of Deviant Behavior Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviant Behavior</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Deviance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Production Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Worked on personal matter</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead of worked for your employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Taken an additional @ longer break than acceptable at your place at work</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Intentionally worked slower that you could have worked</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Deviance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Padded an expense account to get reimbursed for more money that you spent on business expenses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Accepted a gift / favor in exchange for professional treatment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Taken property from work without permission</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Deviance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Political Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Showed favoritism for a fellow employee @ subordinate employee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Blamed someone else @ let someone else take the blame of your mistake</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Repeated gossip about a co-worker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Cursed someone at work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Made an ethnic @ sexually harassing remark @ joke at work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Made someone feel physically intimidated either through threat @ carelessness at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant negative relationship exist between organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance with both control and flexibility leadership shows that employees agreed with leaders as a reliable role model in developing organizational social norms (Fleet & Griffin, 2006). The emphasis of control and flexibility leadership has a positive effect on employees’ behavior. In contrary, if leaders fail to focus on control and flexibility leadership, this will invite negative or harmful behavior among followers, or leaders able to influence the attitudinal aspect (Johnson & Klee, 2007).

Although deviant behavior correlates with the control and flexibility leadership, the insignificant correlation coefficient values indicate that, leadership is not a sole influencing factor of deviant acts. Under interpersonal deviance, gossip was frequently observed, however it has an insignificant correlation value which indicate that leadership is not the influencing factor to this behavior. As mentioned by Kantur (2010), and Lee and Brotheridge (2011), there are various factors that can influence the employees behavioral outcome, which include various contextual factors, situational factors and personal factors. Within the organizational environment, these factors interact with each other and potentially influence deviant behavior. As such, deviance behavior is still occurring despite the organizational leadership factor.

**Table 3: Correlation between Leadership and Deviant Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Control Leadership</th>
<th>Flexibility Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Leadership</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.844**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility Leadership</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.844**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Matter</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>-.246*</td>
<td>-.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional break</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.246*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked slower</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>-.324**</td>
<td>-.321**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padded an account</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting gift</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking property</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming others</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>-.241*</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursed others</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassing remark</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Intimidation</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant relationship**
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