

Project Dissertation Report on

HOW INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AFFECT NONVIOLENT WORK BEHAVIOR OF THE EMPLOYEES?

Submitted By

**Arushi Sharda (2K20/UMBA/07)
Manvi Goel (2K20/UMBA/19)
SharanyaVojjala (2K20/UMBA/36)
Shivani Joshi (2K20/UMBA/38)**

Under the Guidance of

**Dr. Naval Garg
Assistant Professor**



University School of Management & Entrepreneurship

Delhi Technological University

(2020-2022)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that Arushi Sharda (2K20/UMBA/07), Manvi Goel (2K20/UMBA/19), Sharanya Vojjala (2K20/UMBA/36), Shivani Joshi (2K20/UMBA/38) students of Delhi Technological University, MBA (General, semester-IV) have successfully completed this major work entitled “**HOW INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS AFFECT NON-VIOLENT WORK BEHAVIOUR OF THE EMPLOYEES**” during year 2021-2022 under the guidance of Dr. Naval Garg (Assistant Professor, USME, DTU)

SIGNATURE

Dr. Naval Garg
(Assistant Professor)
USME, DTU
New Delhi-11009

DECLARATION

We solemnly declare that the project report on “How Individual And Organizational Factors Affect Nonviolent Work Behavior Of The Employees?” is based on our own work carried out during the course of our study under the supervision of Prof. Naval Garg. We assert the statements made and conclusions drawn are an outcome of our research work. We further certify that

- I. The work contained in the report is original and has been done by me under the general supervision of our supervisor.
- II. The work has not been submitted to any other Institution for any other degree/diploma/certificate in this university or any other University of India or abroad.
- III. We have followed the guidelines provided by the university in writing the report.
- IV. Whenever we have used materials (data, theoretical analysis and text) from other sources, we have given due credit to them in the text of the report and given their details in the references.

Name of Candidate & Roll No.:

Arushi Sharda (2K20/UMBA/07)

Manvi Goel (2K20/UMBA/19)

SharanyaVojjala (2K20/UMBA/36)

Shivani Joshi (2K20/UMBA/38)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It gives us great pleasure to present the Major Project Report undertaken during MBA 4th sem. We owe special debt of gratitude to Prof. Naval Garg, University School of Management & Entrepreneurship, Delhi Technological University for his constant support and guidance throughout the course of our work. His sincerity, thoroughness and perseverance have been a constant source of inspiration for us. It is only his cognizant efforts that our endeavors have seen light of the day.

TABLE OF CONTENT

S NO	TITLE	PAGE NO.
1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2	INTRODUCTION	5
3	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
4	METHODOLOGY	12
5	DATA DESCRIPTION	16
6	DATA ANALYSIS (Finding & Results)	21
7	DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION	38
8	LIMITATION OF THE STUDY	39
9	RECOMMENDATION	40
10	REFERENCES	41
11	ANNEXURE	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The problems associated with violence during the workplace have been on the rise in recent decades. Many researchers have concentrated solely on environmental or individual reasons of violence, despite knowing that a combo of both factors proved as being the most effective predictor. The current study aims to assess the relevance of individual characteristics (personality traits, and historical and clinical factors linked to the risk of violence) & organizational factors in explaining non violent work behaviors in individuals

Following that, we created a matrix that could be used to measure these dimensions. The measures' factor structure, reliability, and validity were all investigated.

The findings show that nonviolent people can help disrupt the culture of violence that is behaving as an active agent. This study seeks to contribute in that it questions the basic assumption that nonviolence equals the absence of violence. Nonviolent personalities are active actors in stopping the cycle of violence, according to the findings.

Keywords :

nonviolence at workplace, scale-development, scale-validation, Indian professionals

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Nonviolence at workplace is defined as:

An individual's proclivity to respond to provocation, such as a violation at workplace of norms, or any provocation, through thoughts, words, and acts that do not injure the opponent in the four ways listed below:

1. **NVT_Ignore:** Ignore violations of justice and respect rules, even the perpetrator's violent acts, as they are unworthy of regard, and therefore defuse the violence spiral.
2. **NVT_Stress:** Violations of norms or violent acts can be triggered by excess stress. The opponent is given the benefit of the doubt, and the spiral of aggression is broken.
3. **NVT_Ability:** Violations of justice and respect rules, even violent acts, are seen as the result of the opponent's incompetence. The opponent is given the benefit of the doubt, and the spiral of aggression is broken.
4. **NVT_Constructive:** Violations of justice and respect rules, as well as violent acts, are met with a pro-social response: a productive change in self. The opponent is shown to be incorrect, and the violence spiral is broken.

Importance of Non Violence in Work Environment

Employee behavior can be defined as a person's reaction to a certain work scenario.

Employees must be cautious in the workplace not just to acquire the recognition and respect of others, but also to maintain a healthy work culture.

It is vital to adhere to the workplace's rules and regulations. Remember that the office is not a place where you may yell at coworkers, spread rumors', or criticize your boss. You just cannot afford to

be nasty to your coworkers. Always be courteous and speak gently. Remember people are not the only ones who are working; there are others nearby.

Sometimes people act in a specific way. No two people behave in the same way. Some people have a hard time dealing with stress, while others are able to smile through adversity.

Male coworkers must show respect for their female colleagues. A child raised in a decent environment where girls are valued and regarded to be equal would never, ever consider abusing female coworkers.

Employees must understand that their violent behavior will not only degrade a person's reputation, but will also reflect poorly on his family background and upbringing.

Need of Non Violence in Work Environment

There is a high need for non violent work behavior in the work environment due to increase in workplace aggression. It is very common nowadays in the workplace and is reflected in employees' behaviour too.

Workplace aggression is a sort of aggressiveness that happens on the job.

Workplace violence can manifest itself in a variety of ways, ranging from verbal acts (e.g., insulting someone or spreading rumors) to physical assaults (e.g., punching or slapping).

Workplace aggressiveness can impair a person's ability to perform successfully at the workplace, lead to physical and mental health problems, and alter how a person acts at home and in public. Aggression at work may result in an increase in lost days (absence from work), and some employees may opt to leave their employment.

Individual behavior refers to how an employee interacts or behaves at work. It's a collection of responses to both internal and external stimuli. Individual behavior describes how a person reacts to various situations and expresses various emotions such as happiness, rudeness, love, rage, and so on. It refers to a certain activity taken by a person. Individual behavior is studied to learn about

how people behave in the workplace. An individual's actions have a significant impact on an organization's performance. Positive behavior results in increased productivity. Negative behavior, on the other hand, will cause harm to the company and result in significant losses.

The following are the individual and organizational factors:

1. **Age-** Age is a hereditary characteristic that is defined by a person's date of birth. Young people are expected to be more productive, energetic, risk-taking, innovative, and ambitious than older generations.
2. **Gender-** Gender is an inherited trait, as being a man or a woman is a genetic trait. Women are thought to be more emotional than men, which leads to a high rate of turnover. It's because more women are abandoning their jobs for personal reasons.
3. **Experience-** Experience is to assess a present skill set one have, such as for the area of knowledge. Human experience is the ultimate source and reason for all knowledge. Experience has accumulated in human memory and culture, gradually developing the ways of intellect known as "reason" and "science."
4. **Income-** The term "income" often refers to the amount of money, property, and other transfers of value received by individuals for a set period of time as compensation for services, payment for products, returns on investments, pension payments, gifts, and many other transfers of value.
5. **Status-** Employment Status helps us to know about individuals participation in an organization on which level. We can find out what level of management face non violent work behavior.
6. **Marital Status-** According to the research, a person's obligations are influenced by their marital status, and having regular, proper employment becomes more vital to them.

Employees with these characteristics had fewer absences, lower turnover, and higher job satisfaction.

7. **Employment level-** Individual behavior is heavily influenced by the level of employment options accessible inside the country. In the event of fewer career opportunities, he or she will remain at the same job level regardless of how satisfied he or she is.
8. **Sector-** Organization sectors include manufacturing or service sector.
9. **Type-** There are two types of sectors: Public which is governed by the government of the nation and others are private which are not governed by the government of India.
10. **Industry-**The field of the organization in which employees are working like IT, Finance, HR etc.

1.2 Problem Statement

We are here to study how individual and organizational factors affect the nonviolent work behavior of the employees. The aim for the research is to create a theoretically sound and experimentally validated instrument for measuring workplace nonviolence.

1.3 Objective

The objective is to implement workplace nonviolence, create a scale, and examine the factor structure, reliability, and validity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

NVT STRESS

Non violent stress refers to reaction that people experience due various reason and the same does not lead to extreme/aggressive behaviour unlike stress which lead to violent behaviour

Non-violent Stress can be observed at:

At Organizational Level:

Work-related stress is a reaction that people have when they are presented with work demands and pressures that are out of proportion to their knowledge and abilities, putting their ability to cope to the test. Workplace stress can be brought on by a variety of factors, but it's frequently exacerbated when employees believe they don't have enough support from their managers and coworkers, as well as little influence over work processes. Pressure, challenge, and stress are frequently misconstrued, which can be used as an excuse for poor management practices. Workplace pressure is inevitable in the work environment because of the requirements of the job. Individually appropriate pressure may keep workers alert, engaged, and able to work and learn, depending on available resources and personal characteristics. Stress, on the other hand, develops when pressure is severe or uncontrollable in some way. Employee health and organisational performance can both be harmed by stress.

Individual Stress: An individual's stress is experienced on a personal level. Some of the most common external sources of stress include:

- Problems in your relationship or a divorce
- A family member is suffering from a serious illness.
- Taking care of a dependent, such as a youngster or an old family
- Bereavement
- Debt problems

NVT IGNORE:

Non violent ignore refers to the situation where individual ignores the other individual with displaying non violent work behaviour & signs

Ignore is derived from the words 'in' (not) and 'gno' (know), which means 'not-knowing.' Ignoring what is known entails failing to recognise what one already knows or, with little effort, could learn. This perplexing condition manifests itself, we believe, in a lack of reaction to what one (partially) understands. When knowledge is neglected, it means that it is not responded to or used to guide action (Dedieu Jouzel, 2015)

NVT ABILITY:

Non Violent ability refers to an individual's ability to respond to a situation non violently i.e how does one handles an event & responds to it Physical and mental attributes that are reasonably stable over time and assist define an employee's ability to respond are referred to as abilities and talents. It is critical to recognise them in order to comprehend organisational behaviour.

The mental and physical talents of an employee can be split into two categories.

Mental abilities refer to a person's cognitive talents, which are strongly tied to how they make decisions and process information. Verbal comprehension, inductive reasoning, and memory are all elements to consider.

Physical Abilities: The second set of factors is concerned with a person's physical capabilities. Basic physical talents (for example, strength) and psychomotor ability are both included (such as manual dexterity, eye-hand coordination, and manipulation skills). Industrial Psychology, E. J. McCormick and J. Tiffin (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976).

Understanding people's behaviour at work and how to properly manage them requires taking into account both mental and physical abilities.

NVT CONSTRUCTIVE:

Non Violent constructive behavior is when an individual takes constructive feedback and doesn't display any violent behavioral changes due to the same . They take the feedback in a positive manner & try to work on it .

Constructive behaviours are those that reduce tension and help resolve conflict. They are also classified according to whether they are active or passive. Overt replies are required for active constructive behaviours.

These four behaviours are: gaining perspective, developing solutions, expressing emotions, and reaching out.

Standing in the shoes of the other person is a term used to describe trying to see the conflict from the other person's point of view. This can be beneficial in reducing tension and learning more about how and why someone sees things differently than you do.

Creating Solutions entails brainstorming with the other person in order to come up with potential solutions to an issue. It can help transform a quarrel from an adversarial struggle to a collaborative problem-solving exercise when applied correctly.

Sharing your ideas and feelings regarding the conflict with the other person is part of expressing emotion. This can be difficult for people because they may be afraid of being judged for expressing their sentiments, and many organisational cultures do not encourage such sharing. It is critical, though, because repressed feelings frequently fester and finally manifest in disastrous ways.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Source of Data: PRIMARY DATA

Study	Descriptive
Sampling	Random Sampling
Sample Size	200
Tools Used for Analysis	SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) And Ms-Excel

SAMPLING

Sampling is a process which is used to determine the number of responses to be collected for the research. We have used random sampling in this research. It is a technique wherein each sample has an equivalent chance or likelihood of being selected. The total population can be represented in an unbiased manner by selecting a sample using random sampling.

SAMPLE

The sample was drawn from working individuals, employed with the private sector, government or self employed (Business). The data was collected with the help of an e-questionnaire. The completion of the questionnaire was entirely voluntary and the responses were kept confidential.

INSTRUMENT USED TO COLLECT DATA

A survey-based method was selected for the study in which a well-established questionnaire was adopted. The questionnaire had 3 sections.

Section 1 comprised the demographic profile of the respondents consisting of questions related to their age, gender, annual income and occupation.

Section 2 contained occupational background of the respondent i.e their occupational

status, type, sector, working field (domain) & name of their organization.

Section 3 aimed at assessing the degree to which one would respond to the situation given.

This section consisted of 32 statements which were analyzed using a 5-point Likert scale and frequency items using a 5-point rating scale.

FREQUENCY ITEM (6 POINT RATING SCALE)	FREQUENCY OF BEHAVIOUR
5	USUALLY
4	OFTEN
3	SOMETIMES
2	RARELY
1	NEVER

Reliability: Internal Consistency

Internal consistency reliability refers to the consistency with which a test's results are presented, ensuring that the numerous items measuring the various constructs produce consistent results.

An English test, for example, is separated into four sections: vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and grammar. The internal consistency reliability test ensures that each of these abilities is accurately and consistently measured. A test-retest approach, in which the same test is administered after the initial test and the results are compared, is one way to test this.

As we have used a pre defined structured questionnaire therefore it is assumed that the scales already have a good validity .

Table 1: Cronbach's Standards

Cronbach's alpha	Internal consistency
$\alpha \geq 0.9$	Excellent
$0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$	Good
$0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$	Questionable
$0.6 > \alpha \geq 0.5$	Poor
$0.5 > \alpha$	Unacceptable

Source: George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon

To check the reliability of the subscale in the questionnaire we calculated the Cronbach's Alpha which is commonly used to determine the fit of the tools and scales established for the research projects. A score of 0.7 is often considered to be acceptably good.

Introduction to ANOVA

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical method for assessing if the means of two or more groups are significantly different. ANOVA examines the means of different samples to see how one or more factors influence the outcome. Another way for comparing samples is the t-test. When there are just two samples, the t-test and the ANOVA yield the same results. A t-test, on the other hand, would be unreliable in situations involving more than two samples. When we employ repeated t-tests to compare more than two samples, the error rate of the result increases exponentially.

Terminologies related to ANOVA

Mean is a simple or arithmetic average of a set of variables is called a mean. We employ distinct samples, $(\mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ \& } \mu_3)$ and the grand mean (μ) . The grand mean is the average of sample means or the average of all observations, regardless of sample size

Variability

Variability in a one-way ANOVA is attributable to variations between groups as well as differences within groups. Each level and factor are paired together ("crossed") in a factorial

ANOVA. It aids in determining what interactions exist between the levels and components. When there is an interaction, variations in one aspect are influenced by differences in another

Assumptions of Factorial ANOVA

- Normality refers to the distribution of the dependent variable.
- Independent observations and groups: Observations and groups are independent of one another.
- Equality of Variance: The variances in the population are the same across factors/levels.

T-Test

The t test determines the significance of variations in group means. It tells you whether the disparities in means were caused by chance. When data sets have a normal distribution but the population variance is unknown, the t test is commonly utilised.

The T Score.

The t score is calculated as a percentage of the difference between two groups divided by the difference between groups. The greater the t score, the greater the difference between groups. A lower t value means the groups are more alike. A t score of three implies that the groups are three times as different from one another. When using a t test, larger t-values suggest that the results are more likely to be repeatable.

T-Values and P-values

The likelihood that the findings of your sample data were obtained by random is shown by the p-value from a t test. P-values range from 0% to 100% and are usually stated as a decimal (for example, a p value of 5 percent is 0.05).

Your results are not random if your p-values are low. A p-value of .01, for example, means that the results of an experiment are only 1% likely to be random.

DATA DESCRIPTION

To conduct the study 200 responses were recorded. The tables below summarize the demographic data.

GENDER

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	74	37.0
Male	126	63.0
Transgender	0	0.0
Grand total	200	100%

The table demonstrates data based on Gender. The data statistics states that the female respondents were 74 in number which is 37% of the total data, whereas male respondents were 126 which is 63% of the total respondents received and the transgender respondents is 0.

AGE

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Below 25	112	56.5
25-35	47	23.5
35-45	12	6.0
Above 45	29	14.5
Grand total	200	100%

For conducting the study the age of the respondents was determined using the following brackets: (below 25, 25-35, 35-45, above 45). The age group below 25 is the highest frequency which is 56% and the age group of between 35-45 is the lowest frequency of 6%.

EXPERIENCE

Experience	Frequency	Percentage
-------------------	------------------	-------------------

Below 5 years	127	63.5
5-15 years	37	18.5
15-25 years	13	6.5
Above 25 years	23	11.5
Grand total	200	100%

This table shows the experience of the respondents where in the highest frequency of 127 is for experience below 5 years which is 63.5% of total respondents. Experience of above 25 years is 11.5% (23 frequency) of the total. The lowest respondents are for experience between 15-25 year which is 6.5% only.

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

Education qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Below graduation	16	8.0
Graduation	88	44.0
Post graduation	84	42.0
PhD	6	3.0
Others	6	3.0
Grand total	200	100%

The table tells about the education qualification of the data. Here the highest data is received for the qualification of graduation which is 44% (88 frequency) followed by post graduation which is 42% (84 frequency) of 200 respondents.

FAMILY STATUS

Family status	Frequency	Percentage
Nuclear family	132	66.0
Joint family	51	25.5
Extended joint family	17	8.5

Grand total	200	100%
-------------	-----	------

This table summarizes the family status of the data. In which the responses were collected on the division of nuclear family (Parents and children), Joint family (Grandparents, Parents and children) and Extended joint (Relatives, Grandparents, Parents and children). **Most of the respondents belong to the nuclear family which is 66% of the total data.**

MARITAL STATUS

Marital status	Frequency	Percentage
Unmarried	131	65.5
Married	69	34.5
Widow	0	0.0
Grand total	200	100%

The table classifies the data on the basis of marital status. The data collected on the basis of unmarried, married and widow.

INCOME

Income (per annum)	Frequency	Percentage
Below 5 lakhs	89	44.5
5-10 lakhs	56	28.0
10-15 lakhs	29	14.5
Above 15 lakhs	26	13.0
Grand total	200	100%

Above table is the classification of the data on the basis of income (per annum). The highest frequency is 89 for the income below 5 lakhs per annum. The lowest is 26 for the above 15 lakhs per annum.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Employment status	Frequency	Percentage
Supervisor	16	8.0
Lower management	43	21.5
Middle management	85	42.5
Top management	27	13.5
Other	29	14.5
Grand total	200	100%

This table shows the data of employment status of the respondents. Most of them are working in middle level management followed by lower level management. In others the data consists of retired employees, students, etc.

OCCUPATION STATUS

Occupation status	Frequency	Percentage
Job	150	75%
Business	24	12.0
Self employed	26	13.0
Grand total	200	100%

The table classifies the data on the basis of occupation. There were 150 respondents who are doing a job, 24 respondents who are having business and 26 respondents who are self-employed. The main reason for choosing these variables was to get overall representation of the population.

ORGANISATION TYPE

Organisation type	Frequency	Percentage
Public sector	71	35.5
Private sector	129	64.5
Grand total	200	100%

The organisation type table shows who many of the respondents are working in the public sector and private sector. It is concluded that 71 of the respondents work 9in public sector and 129 work in the private sector

ORGANISATION SECTOR

Organisation sector	Frequency	Percentage
Manufacturing sector	132	66.0
Service sector	39	19.5
Other	29	14.5
Grand total	200	100%

The table has distinguished the organisation sector as manufacturing sector, service sector and others. Where 132 respondents of the data work in the manufacturing sector , 39 that is 19.5% of the total work in the service sector.

WORKING FIELD

Working field	Frequency	Percentage
Finance	46	23.0
IT	58	29.0
Pharma	9	4.5
Academics	19	9.5
HR	21	10.5
Lawyer	6	3.0
Others	41	20.5
Grand total	200	100%

This table shows the frequency and percentage of the respondents on the basis of working fields including finance, IT, pharmacy, HR, etc. In the data maximum members work in the finance sector and minimum work as lawyers.

ANALYSIS

1. RELIABILITY ANALYSIS (SCALE RELIABILITY TEST)

Reliability for the Aspects of Non-violent work behavior' Subscales:

1.1 NVT_Stress

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.890	8

Interpretation:

It demonstrates that Cronbach's Alpha value for subscale NVT_Stress is 0.8 which is greater than 0.7 Cronbach alpha is applied to determine how reliable your items in questionnaire. If the Cronbach's alpha below than 0.50, it indicates that your items are inappropriate. Hence our subscale is reliable.

1.2 NVT_Ignore

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.864	8

Interpretation:

It demonstrates that Cronbach's Alpha value for subscale NVT_Ignore is 0.8 which is greater than 0.7. Cronbach alpha is applied to determine how reliable your items in questionnaire. If the Cronbach's alpha below than 0.50, it indicates that your items are inappropriate. Hence our subscale is reliable.

1.3 NVT_Ability

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.863	8

Interpretation:

It demonstrates that Cronbach's Alpha value for subscale NVT_Ability is 0.8 which is greater than 0.7. Cronbach alpha is applied to determine how reliable your items in questionnaire. If the Cronbach's alpha below than 0.50, it indicates that your items are inappropriate. Hence our subscale is reliable.

1.4 NVT_Constructive

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.863	8

Interpretation:

It demonstrates that Cronbach's Alpha value for subscale NVT_Constructive is 0.8 which is greater than 0.7. Cronbach alpha is applied to determine how reliable your items in questionnaire. If the Cronbach's alpha below than 0.50, it indicates that your items are inappropriate. Hence our subscale is reliable.

2. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Table 2.1: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	St. Deviation
NVTStress	200	3.090625	0.891
NVTIgnore	200	3.286875	0.862
NVTAbility	200	3.1	0.837

NVTConstructive	200	2.9625	0.886
Valid N (listwise)	200		

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows the mean which means average and standard deviation which means a measure of how dispersed the data is in relation to the mean. We can see that for the NVT Stress the values are 3.09 & 0.89 respectively. The values for NVT Ignore are 3.28 & 0.86 respectively. The values for NVT Ability are 3.1 & 0.83 respectively. The values for NVT Constructive are 2.96 & 0.88 respectively.

3. VARIANCE ANALYSIS

The data analysis has been done using Statistical Package For Social Sciences (SPSS). This mode was chosen due to its high acceptability in both academic and business operations. SPSS is a versatile programme that enables the user to analyze, transform and thus obtain the desired output for the data.

For the analysis of data, T-test and Analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been used in the research. ANOVA helps in determining the prominent differences between the groups. ANOVA helps in analyzing the differences in three or more groups. ANOVA produces an F value. If the probability of occurrence is less than 0.05 i.e., 5%, it establishes the fact that there are significant differences in the group and variation has not occurred by chance. The analysis was conducted taking age the grouping variable whereas the statement related to each subscale of appreciation was treated as a test variable.

T-TEST

- A t-test is a type of inferential statistic used to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two groups, which may be related in certain features.
- The t-test is one of many tests used for the purpose of hypothesis testing in statistics.

ANOVA

- Analysis of variance, or ANOVA, is a statistical method that separates observed variance data into different components to use for additional tests.
- A one-way ANOVA is used for three or more groups of data, to gain information about the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.
- If no true variance exists between the groups, the ANOVA's F-ratio should equal close to 1.

3.1 Below Tables show the significance value for all the subscales. Hypotheses related to factors have been framed to determine whether a variation exists or not between the subscale of Non-violent work behavior and the factor.

GENDER BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: T-test

Table 3.1: T-test (Gender)					
	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
NVTStress	1	3.209	0.924	1.449	0.149
	2	3.021	0.867	1.426	0.156
NVTIgnore	1	3.454	0.866	2.125	0.035
	2	3.188	0.847	2.113	0.036
NVTAbility	1	3.157	0.856	0.739	0.461
	2	3.066	0.827	0.732	0.465
NVTConstructive	1	3.064	0.916	1.246	0.214
	2	2.903	0.866	1.228	0.222

H1: There is a no gender-based variation in NVT_Stress

H2: There is a no gender-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H3: There is a no gender-based variation in NVT_Ability

H4: There is a no gender-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for the subscale NVT_Stress is greater than alpha value of 0.05, Hence there is no gender based variation in it.

Since the all the Sig. Value for the subscale NVT_Ability is greater than alpha value of 0.05, Hence there is no gender based variation in it.

Since the all the Sig. Value for the subscale NVT_Constructive is greater than alpha value of 0.05, Hence there is no gender based variation in it.

Since the all the Sig. Value for the subscale NVT_Ignore is less than alpha value of 0.05, Hence there is gender based variation in it.

MARITAL STATUS BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: T-test

Table 3.2: T-test (Marital Status)					
	MaritalStatus	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
NVTStress	1	3.156	0.855	0.750	0.454
	2	3.056	0.911	0.765	0.446
NVTIgnore	1	3.268	0.868	-0.223	0.824
	2	3.297	0.862	-0.222	0.824
NVTAbility	1	3.116	0.814	0.195	0.846
	2	3.092	0.851	0.198	0.844
NVTConstructive	1	2.947	0.860	-0.174	0.862
	2	2.970	0.903	-0.176	0.860

H21: There is a no Marital Status-based variation in NVT_Stress

H22: There is a no Marital Status-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H23: There is a no Marital Status-based variation in NVT_Ability

H24: There is a no Marital Status-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no marital status based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

AGE BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.3: ANOVA (AGE)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.038	0.937	0.647	0.586
	2	3.245	0.740		
	3	2.990	0.828		
	4	3.086	0.967		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.263	0.895	0.097	0.962
	2	3.316	0.797		
	3	3.385	0.804		
	4	3.289	0.895		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.057	0.872	0.938	0.423
	2	3.277	0.709		
	3	3.000	0.815		
	4	3.022	0.899		
	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	2.971	0.916	0.679	0.566
	2	3.077	0.799		
	3	2.802	0.893		
	4	2.810	0.912		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H5: There is a no Age-based variation in NVT_Stress

H6: There is a no Age-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H7: There is a no Age-based variation in NVT_Ability

H8: There is a no Age-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no age based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

EXPERIENCE BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.4: ANOVA (EXPERIENCE)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.02	0.909	1.517226263	0.211305532
	2	3.301	0.671		
	3	3.375	0.944		
	4	2.984	1.03		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.233	0.878	0.971195853	0.407381666
	2	3.49	0.736		
	3	3.154	0.937		
	4	3.332	0.914		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.039	0.847	2.016289996	0.112954134
	2	3.389	0.658		
	3	3.154	0.866		
	4	2.94	0.959		
	Total	3.1	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	2.935	0.899	1.527073774	0.208749391
	2	3.209	0.768		
	3	2.933	0.896		
	4	2.734	0.954		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

Experience based Variation

H9: There is a no Experience-based variation in NVT_Stress

H10: There is a no Experience-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H11: There is a no Experience-based variation in NVT_Ability

H12: There is a no Experience-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no experience based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

EDUCATION BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.5: ANOVA (EDUCATION)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.3047	0.892	0.50133493	0.7347849
	2	3.0227	0.928		
	3	3.0938	0.859		
	4	3.2292	0.691		
	5	3.3333	1.077		
	Total	3.0906	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.3203	0.874	0.07296225	0.9902538
	2	3.2656	0.905		
	3	3.2872	0.868		
	4	3.3542	0.599		
	5	3.4375	0.333		
	Total	3.2869	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.2109	0.932	0.22624874	0.9234798
	2	3.0497	0.837		
	3	3.122	0.857		
	4	3.0625	0.546		
	5	3.2708	0.682		

	Total	3.1	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	3.2813	0.762	0.91047362	0.4588719
	2	2.892	0.926		
	3	3	0.896		
	4	2.625	0.689		
	5	2.9583	0.465		
	Total	2.9625	0.886		

H13: There is a no Educational Qualification-based variation in NVT_Stress

H14: There is a no Educational Qualification-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H15: There is a no Educational Qualification-based variation in NVT_Ability

H16: There is a no Educational Qualification-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no education based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

FAMILY STATUS BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.6: ANOVA (Family Status)

		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.074	0.849	0.921	0.400
	2	3.042	0.976		
	3	3.368	0.951		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.337	0.877	1.819	0.165
	2	3.098	0.847		
	3	3.463	0.727		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.124	0.821	0.242	0.786
	2	3.029	0.872		
	3	3.125	0.888		
	Total	3.100	0.837		

NVTConstructive	1	2.976	0.880	0.319	0.727
	2	2.890	0.927		
	3	3.074	0.843		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H17: There is a no Family Status-based variation in NVT_Stress

H18: There is a no Family Status-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H19: There is a no Family Status-based variation in NVT_Ability

H20: There is a no Family Status-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no family status based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

INCOME BASED VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.7: ANOVA (INCOME)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.142	0.887	0.248	0.863
	2	3.071	0.782		
	3	2.983	0.755		
	4	3.077	1.244		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.437	0.802	2.442	0.065
	2	3.270	0.763		
	3	2.970	0.735		
	4	3.163	1.246		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.225	0.807	1.511	0.213
	2	3.076	0.826		
	3	2.931	0.629		
	4	2.913	1.102		

	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	3.076	0.891	1.130	0.338
	2	2.944	0.794		
	3	2.802	0.704		
	4	2.793	1.186		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H21: There is a no Income-based variation in NVT_Stress

H22: There is a no Income-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H23: There is a no Income-based variation in NVT_Ability

H24: There is a no Income-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no income based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.8: ANOVA (EMPLOYMENT STATUS)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.250	0.988	3.030	0.019
	2	3.238	0.784		
	3	3.071	0.784		
	4	2.597	1.210		
	5	3.302	0.814		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.555	0.729	3.580	0.008
	2	3.291	0.780		
	3	3.140	0.793		
	4	3.093	1.210		
	5	3.746	0.692		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.352	0.841	2.671	0.033
	2	3.160	0.744		
	3	3.079	0.781		
	4	2.685	1.061		
	5	3.319	0.797		
	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	3.289	0.852	3.026	0.019
	2	3.093	0.747		
	3	2.909	0.826		
	4	2.519	1.158		
	5	3.159	0.858		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H25: There is a no Employment Status-based variation in NVT_Stress

H26: There is a no Employment Status-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H27: There is a no Employment Status-based variation in NVT_Ability

H28: There is a no Employment Status-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no employment status based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

OCCUPATION STATUS VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.9: ANOVA (OCCUPATION STATUS)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.027	0.866	1.556	0.214
	2	3.276	0.949		
	3	3.288	0.958		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.233	0.890	1.275	0.282
	2	3.500	0.786		
	3	3.404	0.744		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.037	0.862	2.018	0.136
	2	3.198	0.679		
	3	3.375	0.780		
	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	2.897	0.878	3.109	0.047
	2	2.943	0.916		
	3	3.361	0.832		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H28: There is a no Occupation Status-based variation in NVT_Stress

H29: There is a no Occupation Status-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H30: There is a no Occupation Status-based variation in NVT_Ability

H31: There is a no Occupation Status-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no occupation status based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

ORGANISATION TYPE VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.10: ANOVA (ORGANISATION TYPE)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.056	0.897	0.162	0.687
	2	3.109	0.891		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.097	0.868	5.472	0.020
	2	3.391	0.844		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	2.975	0.890	2.460	0.118
	2	3.169	0.801		
	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	2.901	0.890	0.522	0.471
	2	2.996	0.885		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H31: There is a no Organization Type Status-based variation in NVT_Stress

H32: There is a no Organization Type-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H33: There is a no Organization Type-based variation in NVT_Ability

H34: There is a no Organization Type-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no organization type based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

ORGANISATION SECTOR VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.11: ANOVA (ORGANISATION SECTOR)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.338	0.845	2.097	0.126
	2	3.018	0.911		
	3	3.167	0.660		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.259	0.825	0.231	0.794
	2	3.281	0.890		
	3	3.448	0.632		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.263	0.697	1.150	0.319
	2	3.047	0.884		
	3	3.208	0.592		
	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	3.206	0.827	2.077	0.128
	2	2.890	0.915		
	3	3.042	0.544		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H31: There is a no Organization Status-based variation in NVT_Stress

H32: There is a no Organization Status-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H33: There is a no Organization Status-based variation in NVT_Ability

H34: There is a no Organization Status-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no organization sector based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

WORKING FIELD VARIATION

Technique Used: ANOVA

Table 3.12: ANOVA (WORKING FIELD)					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
NVTStress	1	3.057	0.912	0.663	0.679
	2	3.168	0.836		
	3	2.944	1.033		
	4	2.961	1.020		
	5	2.991	0.842		
	6	3.063	0.761		
	7	3.430	1.007		
	Total	3.091	0.891		
NVTIgnore	1	3.432	0.823	1.342	0.240
	2	3.379	0.899		
	3	2.875	0.760		
	4	3.125	0.891		
	5	3.119	0.840		
	6	3.021	0.953		
	7	3.500	0.829		
	Total	3.287	0.862		
NVTAbility	1	3.161	0.881	1.110	0.358
	2	3.200	0.811		
	3	2.806	0.781		
	4	2.842	0.941		
	5	3.006	0.800		
	6	2.875	0.617		
	7	3.367	0.836		
	Total	3.100	0.837		
NVTConstructive	1	3.036	0.954	0.873	0.516
	2	2.974	0.915		
	3	2.653	0.886		
	4	2.743	0.974		
	5	2.895	0.809		
	6	3.000	0.454		
	7	3.305	0.780		
	Total	2.963	0.886		

H35:

There is a no Working Field-based variation in NVT_Stress

H36: There is a no Working Field-based variation in NVT_Ignore

H37: There is a no Working Field-based variation in NVT_Ability

H38: There is a no Working Field-based variation in NVT_Constructive

Decision:

Since the all the Sig. Value for all the subscales are greater than the alpha value i.e. 0.05 so we fail to reject the hypothesis. Hence there are no working field based variation in non-violent work behavior in work place.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Today the working culture is such that the organizations have a staff of various generations operating along making a pool of ideologies within the firm. There are various factors of the organization which affect the work behaviour of an employee. The work behaviour of an employee depends on organization's policies, work culture or work environment present, etc. and also depends on co-employee's behaviour.

Non violence in the working environment is very important as it will help employees or people within the organization to work hard to attain the common objective of both on organizational level as well as on individual level. One must know how to deal with critical situations without using means of violence and staying calm to avoid unnecessary chaos or damage to the reputation of their own as well as of their company.

The purpose of the research is to know how individual and organizational factors affect non-violent work behaviour of the employees. This is to create a theoretically sound and experimentally validated instrument for measuring workplace nonviolence and what all factors do affect it. A predefined structured questionnaire measuring the factors affecting non-violence behaviour of the employees have been circulated. We had received 200 responses from employees of various organizations and different employees.

For the analysis of data, T-test and Analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been employed in the research and also the significance level was checked. Because if the significance level was less than 0.05 i.e. 5%, the null hypothesis has been rejected that concluded that a major relationship does exist between Individual & Organizational factors and non-violent work behaviour and vice-versa. There are various Individual & Organizational factors whose relationship has been checked with various subscales or dimensions of non-violent work behaviour in an Organizational workplace. For each individual subscale Hypotheses were framed to work out whether or not a relationship exists or not between the subscale of non-violent work behaviour and also the factors.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The sample is small & not enough to represent the whole population of India. So, the study could not make concrete testimonials.
- The study was confined to few areas/states and hence cannot be taken as generic findings.
- Error in the data due to the respondent's biasness or incapability to point to the main motive.
- Less interaction between the researcher and the respondents leading to error. Because we lack many years of experience conducting analyses, the depth of this project's debates is hampered on many levels when compared to the works of more experienced researchers. Hence the result could not be generalized to the whole population. There are many aspects of appreciation that have not been included, thereby under-representing the construct.

RECOMMENDATION

Our research on “How individual and organizational factors affect non-violence work behaviour of the employees' ' can proceed in many useful directions. Following recommendations are made for the same:

- Larger sample size can be considered for more accurate results, showing the equidistribution of different generations.
- Experimental studies can be done to show whether the theoretical results can be implemented or not.
- Major public sector undertakings can be targeted as a sample size for the survey.
- A contrast between public and private sector employees could be undertaken.

REFERENCES

- Mattaini, M. A. (2002). Editorial: *The science of nonviolence*. Behavior and Social Issues, 11, 100-1004.
- Sarkar, A., & Palo, S. (2019). *Nonviolence Behaviour in the Workplace: Myth or Reality?*. In Spirituality in management (pp. 65-81). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Kumari, G., & Pandey, K. M. (2011). *Analysis of an Individual's Behaviour in Work Environment For A Better Output*. International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 2(2), 156.
- Howard, J. L. (2001). *Workplace violence in organizations: An exploratory study of organizational prevention techniques*. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 13(2), 57-75.
- Bhalerao, H., & Kumar, S. (2015). *Nonviolence at workplace—scale development and validation*. Business Perspectives and Research, 3(1), 36-51.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/anova.asp>
- <https://www.statisticshowto.com/probability-and-statistics/hypothesis-testing/anova/>
- <https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/stress.html>

ANNEXURE

Gender *

- Male
 - Female
 - Transgender
-

Age *

- Below 25 years
 - 25- 35 years
 - 35- 45 years
 - Above 45 years
-

Experience *

- Below 5 years
 - 5- 15 years
 - 15- 25 years
 - above 25 years
-

Educational qualification *

- Below graduation
 - Graduation
 - Post graduation
 - PhD
 - Other: _____
-

Family Status *

- Nuclear (Parents and children)
 - Joint (Grandparents, Parents and children)
 - Extended joint (Relatives, Grandparents, Parents and children)
-

Marital Status *

- Married
 - Unmarried
 - Widow
-

Income (per annum) *

- Below 5 lakhs
 - 5- 10 lakhs
 - 10- 15 lakhs
 - Above 15 lakhs
-

Employment Status *

- Supervisor
 - Lower management
 - Middle management
 - Top management
 - Other: _____
-

Occupation status *

- Job
 - Business
 - Self employed
-

Organization type *

- working in Public sector
 - working in Private sector
-

Organization sector *

- Manufacturing sector
 - Service sector
 - Other: _____
-

Working Field *

Finance

IT

Pharma

Academics

HR

Lawyer

Other: _____

Name of the Organization *

Your answer

Use this scale and rate your opinion *

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Usually
I gently inquire if a subordinate is under some sort of pressure, if he /she gives me cold look.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I excuse verbal insults made by coworkers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I quietly probe if something is disturbing my subordinate, if he/she is impolite.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I ignore threats of coworkers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel a coworker lacks communication skills if he /she interrupts me continuously when I speak.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I inquire if coworker is under any anxiety, when he /she takes full credit for my work.

I ignore unjust criticism of my work

I put in extra effort to improve my work quality when a coworker criticizes me in an unjust manner.

I feel colleagues lack etiquettes when they verbally insult me.

I seek a private confrontation when a coworker insults me publicly at workplace.

I feel threats of coworkers may be due to inability to deal with issues

I query if my coworker is under stress if he/she interrupts me continuously.

I re-evaluate if the goals were too aggressive when a subordinate fails to achieve targets.

I feel a coworker is critical when he/she does not understand my work.

I make queries if there are budgetary constraints, when resources are refused to me.

I ignore cold looks of coworkers

I try to find out if a colleague is under nervous tension, when he /she insults me.

I ignore impoliteness of coworkers.

I inquire if the subordinate is upset due to some reason, if he /she threatens me.

I feel resources are refused at workplace due to inability to manage budget.

I try to improve my feedback when a person fails to perform as per expectation.

I excuse when a coworker takes full credit for my work.

I query if
coworker is
under some
pressure, if he
/she criticizes
me.

When resources
are refused at
work, I try to
improve the
quality of the
proposal
requesting
resources.

I feel covert
negative glances
of colleagues
are due to lack
of social
etiquettes.

I try a different
approach to
explain my
rationale when a
coworker snubs
/brushes-off my
views.

I feel rudeness
of a colleague is
due to inability
to express.

I review if I have been disciplined enough when I see my subordinate's indiscipline.

I ignore continuous interruptions of a coworker while I speak.

I feel a coworker may not be realizing when he/she takes full credit for my work.

I ignore it if I am refused resources at workplace

I improve performance monitoring when a subordinate falls short of his /her responsibility.

Are you comfortable in sharing these details with us for our academic project? *

Yes

No