

The Effect Of Employee Work Isolation On Employee Deviant Behaviour In The Hotel Industry Within South-South, Nigeria

Evwierhurhoma, Ejiroghene Daniel*, OGA, Kelechi Charles **

*Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

** Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.10.09.2020.p10504

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.10.09.2020.p10504>

Abstract- Today, the rate at which deviant behaviours occur in the workplace have become so worrisome as well as harmful to the wellbeing of the organization which is presently prevailing in most organizations including the hospitality industry. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to study the relationship that exist between employee work isolation and deviant behaviour in the hotel industry within the South-South Region of Nigeria. A survey design was adopted using questionnaire as the research instrument which was distributed to 291 employees of three selected hotels in the South-South region of Nigeria. The data derived were analyzed through the use of Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient Statistical as well as t-statistics to test the relationship between the variables of the study through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences within a significance level of 0.05. The findings showed that employee work isolation has significant influence on deviant behaviour vis-à-vis production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression as measures of deviant behaviour in the studied hotels. We therefore recommend that managers of the hotels should encourage and demonstrate collaboration and generosity among employees to reduce personal aggression and other deviant behaviours among employees in the hotel.

Index Terms- Work Alienation; Isolation; Deviant Behaviour

I. INTRODUCTION

The human resources in any organization are very essential to the attainment of the set goal(s) and objective(s) of the organization however to get the best from this important resource has been a major challenge facing both the human resource managers and general manager of all organizations including those in the hospitality industry. Due to the fact that employees bring to the organization different attitude, perception and behaviour that might be different from the culture of the organization, they often exhibit some behaviours (deviant behaviours) that might not be in conformity to the norms and value of the organization. Employee deviant behaviour in the workplace is massively receiving lots of attentions due to its inclination to negatively affect the productivity of the employee and the general performance of the organization, thus, Hamilton, Ogbuigwe and Gabriel (2017) articulated that deviant behaviours result in low

employee and organization's productivity, poor products quality as well as conflict within the organization.

Deviant behaviours in the organization have two major features vis-à-vis are not in prescribed job descriptions and they are in violation of standards in the organization. It has become a day to day happening in the work place and it cut across inconsequential things like going for longer breaks than what is stipulated to stern offence like that of coworkers assaults. Deviant behaviour is a general term for behaviours that are injurious or are anticipated to bring injury to the organization, organizational members or clients which includes lateness to work; filing fake accident claims, unauthorized absence from work, abusing sick day privileges, verbal attack on customers, keeping customers waiting longer than necessary, stealing organization's property and hoarding work-relevant information from a co-worker (Bolin & Heatherly, 2001). It also include playing with ones handset when one is supposed to be working, using the work place internet in downloading materials not related to ones work.

Furthermore, Kelloway, Lori, Matthew and James (2010) expressed that these workplace behaviours mostly do not manifest without been triggered which might be as a result of employee work alienation in the form of employee work isolation. Marx expressed that employee work alienation has to do with a state whereby an employee experience a form of isolation or seclusion and gets separated from their work environment (Deery & Plowman, 1991) which can originate from variation that is outside the control of the person due to the degree of span of control, task specialization as well as excess supervision in the organization. More so, work alienation mostly occurred in organizations where bureaucratic kind of working is dominant (Marshall, 1999) with features such stringent rules, order, task specialization are found to result in depersonalizing and alienation on employees. According to Adler (1999), organizations need to reduce their bureaucratic nature for the employees to be free. The fact remain that bureaucracy has brought lots of benefit to the organization including improvement in organization's effectiveness and output; it however causes employee alienation in the form of self-estrangement, isolation, meaninglessness and powerlessness (Blauner, 1964). Diener (1984) observed that employee that is suffering from work alienation, his or her confidence as well as self-worth might be reduced which can make them engage in deviant behaviour. In the same vein, Eryılmaz (2011) expressed that employees with suffering from work isolation perform very

poorly due to the feelings of incompetency that brings about lack of satisfaction on their work. Employee work isolation disconnect employees from their job as well from the organization which manifest in the form of reduction in worker job participation and commitment (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006).

Today, workplace deviant behaviours have become so depressing as well as harmful to the wellbeing of organizations and is presently prevailing in most organizations including the hospitality industry, the hotels specifically based on the consistent evidences from media concerning workers' dishonesty, poor work attitude, sabotage, fraud, fight at work among many other issues. The characteristics of the hotel industry and its contributions to the economy necessitate quick attention in order to reduce the occurrence of deviant behaviours in the industry, hence the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between employee work alienation vis-à-vis employee work isolation and deviant behaviours of selected hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria. Through the analysis of the selected hotels, the study hopes to offer empirical evidence between employee work isolation and deviant behaviour. It is therefore hoped that the outcomes from this study will find practical application in the hotel industry and help to solve some of the inherent problems faced by the hotel sector in terms of consistent deviant behaviours witnessed in the sector.

II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions this paper seeks to answer are as follows:

- i. What is the relationship between employee work isolation and production deviance of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria?
- ii. What is the relationship between employee work isolation and property deviance of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria?
- iii. What is the relationship between employee work isolation and political deviance of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria?
- iv. What is the relationship between employee work isolation and personal aggression of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria?

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses are stated in the null form and they are as follows:

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between employee work isolation and production deviance of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria.

H0₂: There is no significant relationship between employee work isolation and property deviance of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria.

H0₃: There is no significant relationship between employee work isolation and political deviance of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria.

H0₄: There is no significant relationship between employee work isolation and personal aggression of Hotels in the South-South Region of Nigeria.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

Social exchange theory was adopted as the background theory for this research work. The theory explains that behaviour is an outcome of exchange processes which seeks to maximize gain and minimize loss. It further explains that the value of the give-and-take relationship that occurs between the employees and the organization is greater when it is voluntary (Blau, 1964). That is to say if an employee know that the organization in which he or she is working has his or her interest (welfare) at heart, the employee will do all within his or her competences in ensuring that the goal of the organization is attained and vice versa. Additionally, business enterprise plays major role in satisfying some certain needs of the workers like the need to be identified, physiological needs and the need of self-esteem; if these needs among others are meant, thus, based on principle of reciprocity; workers will be obliged to provide necessary support needed for achieving its goals since they are aware that the survival of the organization is an important source to satisfying their needs (Taleghani, Divandari & ShirMohammadi, 2009). Therefore, to achieve a balance, employees will try to adjust their interests and behaviours once they noticed that the organization is committed to them. For organizations to be committed to their employees, they have to be fully involved in the day to day operations of the firm. This is because workers who are alienated from their work might display deviant work behaviours as a way of making their angers known in the organizations for lack of involvement. Also, employee alienation in the form of isolation can result in psychological illness like apprehension, gloominess as well as dejection. Thus, the worker feel a sense of isolation which can bring about the feelings that he or she lacks control of his labour, which can result in the violation of substantial corporate values in that way threatening the organizational success. More so, when workers feels they are treated positively or negatively, they reciprocate by also developing corresponding behaviour. Employees who are alienated from their work feel that they are inoperable to their organization.

IV. EMPLOYEE WORK ISOLATION

Employee work isolation as used here has to do with the dimension of employee work alienation. Employee work alienation according to Kongar (2009) is a decline in an individual conformation with his or her surroundings and the reduction in his or her capacity to take control of his or her environments which leads to seclusion, dejection and despair. It mostly occurs when an individual has pessimistic behaviour about others and the world they live in that brings about the feelings that result in discontentment and despondency which can severely affect the performance and behaviours of the affected employee. Thus, Kanungo (1992) expressed that managers must be aware that employee alienation in the organization is an illness that must be prevented. Besides, an individual can experience alienation in himself or herself, home, family, as well as religion. Valadbeigi and Ghobadi (2011) explained that it was Hegel Georg that expanded and clarifying the notion of alienation in the work place. According to them, Hegel believed that alienation occurs when an aspect of an individual is looking strange to him or her. He pointed

out that three stages of alienation exist: the complicated connection between human mentality and object that is unable to be separated from all activity; form of capitalistic objection; and extensive philosophical generalization.

Furthermore, employee work isolation emphasizes the separation of an employee from other individual, teams, events and circumstances that blight his or her relationships (Sells, 2008). Employee isolation occur when they withdraw from their environments and they feel they don't have the ability to fit into any group as well the organization and isolation manifest in two forms: when a person feels he or she is not wanted in the organization; as well when a workers no longer desire the organization in which he or she belongs (Eryilmaz & Burgaz, 2011). Isolation is a form of alienation and experience of loneliness that negatively affects workers especially health-wise (Nicholson, 2009). It can voluntary in the sense that the workers purposely isolate him or herself from activities or events while involuntary isolation are those isolation is forced on workers by others (Biordi & Nicholson, 1995).

V. EMPLOYEE DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

Employee deviant behaviour has to do with rudely attitude with vague intent to harm and violate organizational norms (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). It is a bad comportment as well as impertinent behaviours individuals display either intentionally or unintentionally to harm the targets who received such behaviours (Everton, Jolton & Mastrangelo, 2007). Deviant behaviours are behaviours exhibited by employees that are not in conformity with organizational norms and values which overall outcome has negative effect on the productivity and performance of the employee as well as the organization. Deviant behaviours are also counterproductive behaviours which are workers actions that violate organizational standards capable of harming organizational wellbeing and its members as well as other stakeholders (Bennett & Robinson, 2003). These behaviours includes but not limited to sabotage, theft, wasting of organizational resources, absenteeism, arriving late to work and leaving early before the closing time. Bennett and Robinson (2000) expressed that organizational deviance has two targets: the number one target is against the individual and it includes behaviours like gossiping, behaving boorishly towards others, and every other action that affect individuals in the organization while the number two target is on the organization itself and includes actions such as, sabotaging organizational properties, coming late to work, using organizational time for individual benefit, misuse of organizational resources, and other behaviours that negatively affects the success of the organization. These behaviours affect organization efficiency and performance as well as its competitive strength. More so, deviant behaviour was categorized to include property deviance which are negative behaviours that are targeted towards damaging tangibles properties of the organization (it include sabotage, thievery, fraud, among others); production deviance which are negative behaviours of employees that are not in line with organizational values including alteration of organization's work required quantity or quality like lateness, taking too much time to executing a given task and smoking when at duty; political deviance are behaviours or communal relationship that puts others in political drawback such as

favourism (gossiping about fellow co-workers to gain favour) and; personal aggression which are displayed behaviours against other workers in the organization such as verbal assault and abuse, sexual harassment and so on (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

VI. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the survey research design vis-à-vis correlational design that examines the relationship between employee work isolation and deviant work behaviour. The time horizon that was adopted is cross-sectional while the unit of analysis was on the employee of three (3) selected Hotels in the South-South Nigeria. One each from Rivers State, Akwa-Ibom State and Cross-Rivers State and a visit to the 3 Hotels (the various hotels' human resource managers), we discovered that they have 1014 employees made up of junior staff, middle-cadre staff, senior staff, and management cadre. Out of the 1014 employees in the 3 hotels, 291 employees were used as the sample size gotten through the use of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination. We also used cluster sampling to get the number of respondents in each hotel, a hotel been a cluster. More so, selection from the clusters to arrive at sample size was by proportionate sampling complemented with simple random sampling techniques which was done using Bowley's (1964) technique in the determination of unit sampling. More so, the study adopted questionnaire as the research instrument. Employee work isolation is the predictor variable and is used as a dimension of work alienation thus it is operationalised as a uni-variable using Merkke (2015) questionnaire which consist of four respond choices with 5 Point Likert scales ranging from 1 to 5 indicating strongly disagree, disagree, indifference, agree and strongly agree respectively. The criterion variable is deviant behaviour with measures as production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression which was operationalised using Bennett and Robinson (2000) deviant behaviour questionnaire consist of four respond choices with 5 Point Likert scales ranging from 1 to 5 indicating strongly disagree, disagree, indifference, agree and strongly agree respectively. Face and content validity was also used for the validity of the research instrument while the reliability of the research instrument indicates a Cronbach Alpha value higher than 0.7; specifically the employee work isolation = 0.925; production deviance = 0.914; property deviance = 0.931; political deviance = 0.928 and personal aggression = 0.919. From the 291 questionnaire distributed, 276(94.81%) copies of questionnaire were retrieved while the remaining 15(5.19%) were not retrieved. More so, out of the 276 number of questionnaire retrieved, 13(4.71%) copies was not useful because it was not filled properly while the remaining 263(95.29%) copies of the retrieved questionnaire were filled correctly which were used for data analysis. The data derived were analyzed through the use of Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient Statistical as well as t-statistics to test the relationship between the variables of the study through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Windows version 25 within a significance level of 0.05.

VII. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULT

Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Production Deviance

Table 1: Correlations Analysis showing the strength of Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Production Deviance

			Isolation	Production Deviance
Spearman's rho	Isolation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.972**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	263	263
	Production Deviance	Correlation Coefficient	.972**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	263	263

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

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

Table 1 above indicates that rho = 0.972 and a PV= 0.000 less than 0.05; it means that the relationship between isolation and production deviance in the studied Hotels is very strong, positive and significant. The relationship is further tested applying t-statistics as shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Effects of Employee Work Isolation on Production Deviance Coefficients^a

Model		UnStandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.687	.357		4.726	.000
	Isolation	.782	.081	.775	9.705	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Production Deviance

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

The table 2 above shows a ($t_{-cal.} = 9.705$ and $t_{-crit.} = 1.96$) at significant level of ($P = 0.000 < 0.05$) which indicates a significant relationship between employee work isolation and production deviance. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis; we therefore conclude that employee work isolation had a positive and significant relationship with production deviance in the studied Hotels in Nigeria.

Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Property Deviance

Table 3: Correlations Analysis showing the strength of Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Property Deviance

			Isolation	Property Deviance
Spearman's rho	Isolation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.987**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	263	263
	Property Deviance	Correlation Coefficient	.987**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	263	263

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

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

Table 3 above indicates that rho = 0.987 and a PV= 0.000 less than 0.05; it means that the relationship between isolation and property deviance in the studied Hotels is very strong, positive and significant. The relationship is further tested applying t-statistics as shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Effects of Employee Work Isolation on Property Deviance
Coefficients^a

Model		UnStandardised Coefficients		Standardised	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	6.584	.390		16.890	.000
	Isolation	.188	.042	.154	2.134	.034

a. Dependent Variable: Property Deviance

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

The table 4 above shows a ($t_{-cal.} = 2.134$ and $t_{-crit.} = 1.96$) at significant level of ($P = 0.034 < 0.05$) which indicates a significant relationship between employee work isolation and property deviance. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis; we therefore conclude that employee work isolation had a positive and significant relationship with property deviance in the studied Hotels in Nigeria.

Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Political Deviance

Table 5: Correlations Analysis showing the strength of Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Political Deviance

			Isolation	Political Deviance
Spearman's rho	Isolation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.588**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	263	263
	Political Deviance	Correlation Coefficient	.588**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	263	263

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

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

Table 5 above indicates that $\rho = 0.588$ and a $PV = 0.000$ less than 0.05; it means that the relationship between isolation and production deviance in the studied Hotels is strong, positive and significant. The relationship is further tested applying t-statistics as shown in Table 6 below:

Table 6: Effects of Employee Work Isolation on Political Deviance
Coefficients^a

Model		UnStandardised Coefficients		Standardised	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	.277	.203		1.367	.173
	Isolation	.150	.041	.248	3.464	.005

a. Dependent Variable: Political Deviance

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

Table 2 above shows a ($t_{-cal.} = 3.464$ and $t_{-crit.} = 1.96$) at significant level of ($P = 0.005 < 0.05$) which indicates a significant relationship between employee work isolation and political deviance. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis; we therefore conclude that employee work isolation had a positive and significant relationship with political deviance in the studied Hotels in Nigeria.

Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Personal Aggression

Table 7: Correlations Analysis showing the strength of Relationship between Employee Work Isolation and Personal Aggression

			Isolation	Personal Aggression
Spearman's rho	Isolation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.782**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	263	263
	Personal Aggression	Correlation Coefficient	.762**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	263	263

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

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

Table 7 above indicates that rho = 0.782 and a PV= 0.000 less than 0.05; it means that the relationship between employee work isolation and personal aggression in the studied Hotels is very strong, positive and significant. The relationship is further tested applying t-statistics as shown in Table 8 below:

Table 8: Effects of Employee Work Isolation on Production Deviance Coefficients^a

Model		UnStandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	4.305	.282		15.273	.000
	Isolation	.290	.064	.275	4.560	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Personal Aggression

Source: SPSS Windows Version 25

Table 8 above shows a (t-cal. =4.560 and t-crit. =1.96) at significant level of (P=0.000 < 0.05%) which indicates a significant relationship between employee work isolation and personal aggression. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis; we therefore conclude that employee work isolation had a positive and significant relationship with personal aggression in the studied Hotels in Nigeria.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Any behaviour undertaken by the employee that is not in conformity to the firm's values and standards can be considered as deviant behaviour. In the organization, every employee is expected to follow a set of specific rules and regulations. If an employee does not enact these behaviours deviance may occur. Employee work isolation can reinforce deviance by creating an illusion of invulnerability and complete autonomy. Employee work isolation is perceived as a state of incapability in social dialogues differently from the state desired by the individual (Savikko, Routasalo, Tilvis, Strandberg & Pitlaka, 2005). Work isolation means the cessation of communication with society and with one's close social environment along with the avoidance of making contacts with others in the organization. The analysis of collected data shows that employee work isolation has significant influence on all the dimensions of deviant behaviour vis-à-vis production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression in the studied firm. In line with the above finding, Faridahwati, Chandrakantan and Hadziroh (2011) observed that employee work isolation is positively related to deviant behaviour. If employees are isolated from their work it might affect the productivity of the firm, thus Mulki, Locander, Marshall, Harris and Hensel (2008) observed that relationship exist between organizational isolation and the commitment of the employee. When a worker is committed his or her motivation to carry out given task is enhanced whereby he or she ensures that organization attain its goal of productivity. However, when he or she is isolated from the organization, his or her desire to be

committed is truncated. Thus, isolation as a form of alienation reduces one's commitment to the organization which can then lead to negative feelings towards the organization that can affect its productivity. When workers are not fully involved in the organization's processes, they are more likely to exhibit behaviours that are not in line with the standard of the organization (Banai & Reisel, 2007; Leiter, 2005) such as deliberately wasting organization's resources, intentionally, working slowly as well as closing before time which can lead to the reduction of organizational performance. More so, Abdul, Rahim and Aizzat (2016) expressed that when a worker's job lacks identity he or she is very more likely to engaging in deviant behaviour, thus the worker may utilize the organization's properties for him or herself, sabotage the organization's asset and so on. In other words, when workers in the organization are not carried along in the process of taking decision in the organization, the workers feel a sense of alienation which results in developing negative behaviours (such as sabotaging organization's properties) that are not in conformity to the firm's standard. Therefore, organizations need to clarify employees on the roles they will play constantly so that they won't be isolated from their job and the general organization. Workers involvement in decisions making is very important in regards to determining employees' attitudes towards the organization (Nassehi, 2005), thus if employees are isolated from decision making in the organization it may lead to deviance like sabotage and making intentional errors in work. This is because Gilbert, Laschinger and Leither (2010) observed that employees participating in an organization's decision making leads to right

and appropriate behaviours like satisfaction, commitment as well as firm's citizenship behaviour that is void of deviant behaviour. Furthermore, Pelin and Funda (2013) observed that organizational injustice, abusive supervision, and work alienation such as isolation have a positive relationship with counterproductive behaviours in the organization. In the same vein, Cooper and Kurland (2002) observed that employee work isolation is positively related to workplace deviant behaviours. They further suggest that isolation may influence the likelihood of acts of deviance under the conditions of diminished oversight. Employee work isolation can lead to deviant behaviour (Gilbert et al, 2010) such as lobbying to get undue promotion, spreading of false rumours or gossip and bullying other employees in a bid to be in a better position in the organization. By consistently indulging in these deviant behaviours, the general success of the firm can be affected. More so, employees that exhibit non-compliance with the approved procedures and regulations in the organization could actually take care not to be enmeshed in clearly deviant behaviours, such as absenteeism, tardiness, and gossiping about their co-workers in a bid to get undue favour. Abiodun (2013) further expressed that isolation is a major influencer of psychological maltreatment and aggression. Social isolation results in the emergence of emotional and/or psychological disorders in the individual that may lead to deviant behaviour such as verbal abuse on other employees, sabotaging and endangering other co-workers and co-worker backstabbing. Due to the fact that anger, sadness, and anxiety are among the significant symptoms of isolation. Also, workers begin to experience alienation in their organization when they lack informal relationship with others in the organization. More so, one could argue that employee work isolation may lead to workplace deviance leading to increased levels of bullying, harassment, disrespect, and sabotage. This could be due to the illusion of control and social exclusion. The feelings that an employee is not accepted by other workers, he or she may begin to skip work, comes late to work or start bullying other colleagues. Thus, employee work isolation is often the reason for gloominess, which is a pointer to underlying well-being issues that might result in personal aggression such as threats of physical harm and verbal abusive attack.

IX. CONCLUSION

Based on the result of analysis of data collected, we therefore conclude that work isolation significantly affect deviant behaviours vis-à-vis production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression of the studied hotels in the South-South region of Nigeria. In other words, if employees are isolated from their work, they are more likely to indulge and exhibit deviant behaviours in their place of work. Every employee in the organization has a set of behaviours, which have to be taken into account to attain firm's purpose and if these behaviours are not in line with set standards, the purpose of the firm could be defeated. The consequences of feeling apart or estranged from the organization can lead to mental-emotional disorder which can lead to deviances. More so, employee alienation may provide organizational climate where workers lacks commitment. Workers who are alienated from their work, have more tendencies to be absent from their work and misbehave in their work resulting in low productivity in the organization. However, while we

recognized that employee work alienation vis-à-vis work isolation can lead employee into behaving defiantly in the organization, it does not generally apply for all employees, due to the fact that some employee might be constraint for fear of been sanctioned as well as losing their job.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are our recommendations based on our findings

1. The managers of the hotels should encourage and demonstrate collaboration and generosity among employees to reduce personal aggression and other deviant behaviours among employees in the hotel.
2. Managers of the hotels should proliferate and enhance the variety of skills possessed by employees through training to facilitate the movements of workers from one department to the other to avoid work isolation in order to minimize the occurrence of deviant behaviours among employees.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdul, R.A., Rahim, A.S. & Aizzat, M.N. (2016). Effects of job characteristics on counterproductive work behavior among production employees: Malaysian experience. *International Journal of Business and Development Studies*, 8(1), 117-139.
- [2] Abiodun, G. (2013). Emotional isolation, degradation and exploitation as correlates of adolescents' self-concept in Nigeria. *International Journal of Psychology and Counseling*, 5(3), 45-52.
- [3] Adler, P.S. (1999). Building better bureaucracies. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13(4), 36-49.
- [4] Andersson, L.M. & Pearson, C.M. (1999). Tit-for-tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 452-471.
- [5] Armstrong-Stassen, M. (2006). Determinants of how managers cope with organizational downsizing. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 55(1), 1-26.
- [6] Banai, M., & Reisel, W. D. (2007). The influence of supportive leadership and job characteristics on work alienation: a six-country investigation. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 463-476.
- [7] Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.J. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
- [8] Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [9] Biordi, D.L., & Nicholson, N.R. (1995). *Social isolation*. Boston: Jones and Bartlett
- [10] Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- [11] Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and freedom: the factory worker and his industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [12] Bolin, A. & Heatherly, L. (2001). Predictors of employee deviance: the relationship between bad attitudes and bad behavior. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 15, 405-418.
- [13] Cooper, C., & Kurland, N.B. (2002). Telecommuting, professional isolation and employee development in public and private organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 511-532.
- [14] Deery, S.J. & Plowman, D.H. (1991). *Australian industrial relations* (3rd edn.). Sydney: McGraw Hill.
- [15] Eryilmaz, A. & Burgaz, B. (2011). Levels of organizational alienation for private and state high school teachers. *Education and Science*, 36(161), 271-286
- [16] 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*, 26(2), 117-131.

- [17] Faridahwati, M.S., Chandrakantan, S. & Hadziroh, I. (2011). HR practices and deviant behavior at work: an exploratory study. *International Conference on Business and Economics Research*, 16, 13-18.
- [18] Gilbert, S., Laschinger, H.K.S., & Leiter, M. (2010). The mediating effect of burnout on the relationship between structural empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(3), 339-348.
- [19] Hamilton, D.I., Ogbuigwe, T. & Gabriel, J.M.O. (2017). Narcissistic bossing and deviant workplace behavior among subordinates in the Nigerian civil service. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1(9), 735-762.
- [20] Kanungo, R.N. (1992). Alienation and empowerment: some ethical imperatives in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 413-422.
- [21] Kelloway, E.K., Lori, F., Matthew, P. & James, E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 18-25.
- [22] Kongar, E. (2009). Social change theories and the reality of Turkey. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- [23] Leiter, J. (1985). Work alienation in the textile industry: reassessing Blauner. *Work and Occupations*, 12, 479-498.
- [24] Marshall, G. (1999). *Dictionary of sociology*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- [25] Merkke, J.S.S. (2015). The impact of perception of organizational injustice on work alienation. Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Business Administration, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Business, Middle East University, Amman.
- [26] Mulki, J.P., Locander, W.B., Marshall, G.W., Harris, E.G., & Hensel, J. (2008). Workplace isolation, salesperson commitment, and job performance. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 28(1), 67-78.
- [27] Nassehi, A. (2005). Organizations as decision machines: Niklas Luhmann's theory of organized social systems. *The Sociological Review*, 53(1), 178-191.
- [28] Nicholson, N.R. (2009). Social isolation in older adults: an evolutionary concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 65(6), 1342-1352.
- [29] Pelin, K. & Funda, U. (2013). The effect of organizational climate on counterproductive behaviours: an empirical study on the employees of manufacturing enterprises. *The Macrotheme Review*, 2(4), 144-160.
- [30] Savikko, N., Routasalo, P., Tilvis, R.S., Strandberg, T.E. & Pitlaka, K.H. (2005). Predictors and subjective causes of loneliness in an aged population. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 41, 223-233
- [31] Sells, S.B. (2008). *The taxonomy of man in enclosed space*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction
- [32] Taleghani, G.H., Divandari, A. & ShirMohammadi, M. (2009). Effects of organizational perceived support on the organizational commitment and organizational performance: a case study of Bank Mellat Branches in Tehran. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(16), 1-25.
- [33] Valadbigi, A., & Ghobadi, S. (2011). The study of the elements of work alienation: a case study of the Urmia White Cement Factory, Western Azarbaijan province, Iran. *Asian Social Science*, 7(6), 206-221.

AUTHORS

First Author – EVWIERHURHOMA, Ejiroghene Daniel
Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
Second Author – OGA, Kelechi Charles, Department of
Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of
Port Harcourt, Nigeria.