

Effect of Withdrawal Behaviourson Organizational Performance: A Study of Selected Private Universities in Edo State, Nigeria

Joy Itoya

Business Administration Department
Ambrose Ali University
Ekpoma, Edo State Nigeria
alizenny@gmail.com

Cletus A. Owuze

Business Administration Department
Ambrose Ali University
Ekpoma, Edo State Nigeria
cletusodion@yahoo.com

&

Peter A. Akhator

Business Administration Department
Ambrose Ali University
Ekpoma, Edo State Nigeria

Article Info

Volume 84

Page Number: 73 - 90

Publication Issue:

January - April 2021

Article History

Article Received: 04 October 2020

Revised: 14 November 2020

Accepted: 22 December 2020

Publication: 23 January 2021

Abstract

The study examined the effect of employee withdrawal behaviours on organizational performance, using selected private universities in Edo State, Nigeria as the study area. The relevant literature was reviewed in four distinct sections of conceptual review, theoretical framework, theoretical exposition and empirical review. The design for the study was descriptive survey. Major statistical tools of analysis include summary statistics, Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis through the use of SPSS 23.0 software package. Preliminary results of the analysis showed that with the F-Statistic of 20.494 and $P 0.000 < 0.05$,

the model is statistically significant and therefore fit and valid for predictions. The regression coefficient of 0.529 showed that 52.9 percent relationship exists between the dependent and independent variables. Similarly, the coefficient of determination of 0.408 showed that 40.8 percent variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables. Major finding showed that three components of withdrawal behaviours identified for the study (i.e.,) absenteeism, lateness and presenteeism, have significant negative effect on organizational performance. The study concludes that most of the employees withdrawal behaviours being experienced in the work environment are direct response to how the employees perceive their work environment and treatment they receive from the management. The study recommended among others that the management should monitor to detect the problems causing employee withdrawal behaviours in their organizations with a view to devising means of preventing or reducing them. The management should also try to improve organization's work environment.

Keywords: Withdrawal Behaviours, Organizational Performance, Private Universities

1.1 Introduction

Organizations are always interested in fostering productive and satisfied employees because that is one of the ways of achieving the expected performance from them. But many atimes, employees themselves disengage from their work for a variety of reasons among which are job dissatisfaction, poor conditions of service, perceived injustice perpetuated by the management, etc. The commonest form of work disengagement can be found in withdrawal behaviours and they manifest

in the workplace in form of absenteeism, lateness/tardiness, employee turnover, presenteeism, burnout, etc. Each of the behaviours present unique challenge to the employer in terms of how to profer solution (The Pennsylvania State University, Lesson 13, 2011). Therefore, achieving a workplace environment that is devoid of any manifestation of withdrawal behaviours is key to the realization of organizational goals.

Withdrawal behaviours are the negative actions employees take when they become physically and/or psychologically disengaged from the organization. As mentioned earlier, they include absenteeism, lateness and presenteeism among others. Such withdrawal behaviours are physical when they manifest in form of absenteeism, lateness/tardiness and employee turnover and psychological when they manifest in partial/passive compliance, minimal efforts in job execution, lack of creativity, etc. Psychological withdrawal behaviours often take the form of laziness, lack of intense thinking, lack of interest on the job which leads to many avoidable mistakes/errors (Pinde, 2008). As one of the physical withdrawal behaviours, absenteeism occurs when an employee fails to report to work for an extended period of time or for an excessive number of days that has not been excused. But when such non-presence at duty post is backed by medical appointment or pre-approved vacation, it seizes to be absenteeism (Cohen and Golan, 2017; the Pennsylvania State University, Lesson 13, 2011). Similarly, research results suggest that lateness is a good predictor of more severe type of withdrawal. This is more true when the employee is consistently late to the office because it is an indication that there is lack of motivation to get to the office on time (The Pennsylvania State University,

Lesson 13, 2011). However, it must be noted that employees who are never late to the office have higher job satisfaction, stronger organizational commitment and higher job involvement (Blau, 1994 in Itzkowitz, 2013). In other words, an employee who finds his/her work stimulating or challenging is less likely to engage in lateness as one of the withdrawal behaviours.

On the other hand, presenteeism as one of the psychological withdrawal behaviours occur when an employee actually show up for work but work in a manner that does not represent his/her full capacity. Many factors can give rise to such a situation and they include physical impairment like sickness or psychological strain which leads to lack of concentration. In any of the cases, an employee can be physically present but absent minded thereby leading to decreased performance and productivity in the organization. Trotter, Lambert, Burlingame, Rees, Carpenter, Steffen, Jackson and Eggett (2009) note that decreased productivity due to presenteeism is more difficult to identify and measure than absenteeism.

University environment is a place for training high level manpower, scientific discoveries and inventions through research efforts as well as technology incubation. This presupposes that much is expected from both the staff and management of the university community. The employees, in particular are expected to be up and doing towards the realization of the goals. But universities in Nigeria both private and public, have been facing various challenges chief among which is inadequate funding. Critical infrastructure as well as the necessary equipment are scarcely provided due to huge funding gap, the employees are poorly remunerated and research grants to the teaching staff are

hardly granted. A situation which has given rise to withdrawal behaviours in many universities across the country. Given the situation, it is doubtful if the universities are living up to expectations, especially the privately owned universities which happens to be the focus of this study.

1.2 The Problem

University workplace environment can harbor employees' withdrawal behaviours without the knowledge of the management, especially as it relates to the teaching staff who mainly interact with the students. When the lecturer skips lecture hours, come to lecture always late or come to lecture always unprepared, such behaviours are not always known to the management because the system was not designed to effectively monitor and take notice of that. But undoubtedly, this has been the experience in many universities, be it private or public universities. When such unethical conducts happen, the students who bear the brunt directly do not always have the courage to bring the misconduct to the knowledge of the management for necessary action due to fear of retaliation/victimization. It has been opined that the negative work attitudes are some times occasioned by lack of motivation and poor working conditions the employees find themselves in such inadequacies may include poor remuneration, unpaid earned academic allowances, delayed promotion, lack of conducive work environment, inadequate healthcare facilities, lack of access to research grants, among others. This study therefore tries to examine the effect of the resultant withdrawal behaviours (absenteeism, lateness to work and presenteeism) on the performance and productivity of the selected private universities in Edo State, Nigeria.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study is to examine the effect of withdrawal behaviours on organizational performance, using selected private universities in Edo State, Nigeria as the study area. But the specific objectives are to:

- (i) Determine the effect of absenteeism on organizational performance.
- (ii) Evaluate the effect of lateness to work on the performance of the organization.
- (iii) Ascertain the effect of presenteeism on the performance of the organization.

1.4 Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the objectives of the study as well as strengthen the analysis:

- (i) Absenteeism does not have significant negative effect on organizational performance.
- (ii) Lateness to work does not have significant negative effect on organizational performance.
- (iii) Presenteeism does not have significant negative effect on organizational performance.

Review of Related Literature

2. Conceptual Review

Employee Withdrawal Behaviour

Eder and Eisenberger (2008) define employee withdrawal behaviour as the actions employee take when he/she become physical and/or psychologically disengaged from the organization. They

are in form of lateness (tardiness), absenteeism, presenteeism and turnover. It could be voluntary or involuntary withdrawal behaviours. It is voluntary withdrawal behaviour if an employee begins to come to work late and/or leaving early because he/she no longer have interest in the job. On the other hand, involuntary withdrawal behaviour is outside the control of the employee. It could occur as a result of sudden car break down, accident, ill-health and the likes. Whatever be the type, the consequence is that job performance is negatively affected (Okache, 2020).

Absenteeism

Tiwari (2014) defines absenteeism as the absence of workers from regular work without prior permission. Berry, Lelchook and Clark (2012) define absenteeism as a situation when an employee misses an extended amount of time from work, usually a day or more, that is, unexcused. They note that it is an unpleasant situation because it generates great focus due to its perceived negative impact upon organizations such as the loss of production. Cascio (2003) defines absenteeism as any failure of an employee to report for or remain at work as scheduled, regardless of reason, expresses a monitory implication. The term 'as scheduled' is very significant, for this automatically excluded vacations, holidays, jury duty and the like.

Lateness

Lateness has been literally defined as a situation where an individual arrives after the proper scheduled or usual time (Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary, 5th ed., 2005). Lauby (2009) equally defines lateness as people not showing up on time. To Breeze (2010), it is viewed as "tardiness", which refers to being slow to act or slow to respond, thereby not

meeting up with proper or usual timing. However, there are two types of lateness, according to Okache (2020), avoidable and unavoidable lateness. Avoidable lateness is employee controlled and it occurs when employees have more important or better things to do rather than arriving duty post on time. It could be as a result of work-family conflict or over sleeping and/or reading newspapers in the morning before leaving the home. On the other hand, he states that unavoidable lateness could arise from transportation concerns such as late arrival of staff bus, train, accident on the way or sudden personal illness (Blau, 2011). Such factors cannot be controlled by the employee so they tend to be forgiven by the employer if their frequency of occurrence is minimal.

Presenteeism

Presenteeism occurs when an employee shows up for work but works in a limited capacity. Such a behaviour can occur due to physical impairment, such as being sick with cold or other ailments or due to mental or psychological strain. Such an employee might sit at his/her desk and be absent minded. Such employees easily become unreceptive, lack inspiration and conduct trifling efforts on the job. It is what Timms, Brough and Graham (2012) described as “the light being on but nobody at home.” Withdrawal behaviour is concerned primarily with presenteeism due to psychological reasons. Decreased productivity due to presenteeism is more difficult to identify and measure than other withdrawal factors because it is easy to think that all is well with the employee (Trotter, Lambert, Burlingame, Rees, Carpenter, Steffen, Jackson and Eggett, 2009).

Performance

Bates and Holton (1995) in Egboh and Okeke (2009) define performance as a

multidimensional construct, whose measurement varies depending on a variety of factors. The multiangularity of the term ‘performance’ has given impetus to its divergent connotations. For instance, Armstrong (2004) defines it as the record of outcome achieved, but to Mullins (1999) cited in Egboh and Okeke (2009), it is the efficient and effective utilization of organization’s resources to achieve equitable ratio of outputs to inputs to the satisfaction and delight of all stakeholders. Anya, Umoh and Worlu (2017) were of the opinion that performance should be related to such factors as increasing profitability, improved service delivery or obtaining the best results in all the activities of the organization. Consequently, organizational performance is conceptualized as the extent to which organizational goals and objectives are accomplished.

Theoretical Framework

The underpinning theory for the study is the Equity Theory developed by Adam in 1963. The theory is based on the idea that employees basically expects a fair balance between their inputs and outputs. In other words, what this means is that the employees are likely to be de-motivated both in relation to their employer and the job and begin to manifest withdrawal behaviours if they perceive that their inputs (efforts, loyalty, hard work, commitment, ability, adaptability, tolerance, flexibility, skills, etc) are greater than their outputs (salary, benefits, recognition, reputation, responsibility, sense of belonging and achievement, sense of advancement or growth, job security, praise, etc).

The theory describes the relationship between how fairly an employee perceives his/her treatment and how hard he/she is motivated to work (Cory, 2006). The basic

idea behind the Equity Theory is that workers, in an attempt to balance what they put into the jobs and what they get from them, will unconsciously assign values to each of their various contributions. Obviously, when workers perceive inequity, they tend to react in various ways which include withdrawal behaviours. What should be understood from the theory is that workers need adequate compensation for their efforts otherwise, they will find expressions in ways that may not be in the best interest of the organization. Therefore, the phenomenon under investigation can be explained under the framework of Adam's Equity Theory.

Theoretical Exposition

The literature presents employee withdrawal behaviours in the nature of absenteeism, lateness (tardiness), presenteeism and turnover (Aller, 1981; Clegg, 1983; Rosse, 1988 in Okache, 2020). Hanisch and Hulin (1990) observe that such behaviours manifest at work and may be physical or psychological. In their opinion, physical withdrawal behaviour are the most recognizable and they include absenteeism, lateness/tardiness, leaving the job, internal job transfer and turnover. They note that individuals who are psychologically disengaged are often considered "lazy" or "burnout", they easily become unreceptive, lack inspiration, uncreative and conduct trifling efforts on the job. They are also perceived as employees with low job satisfaction and as such, they are less productive merely because they are less available to perform.

Absenteeism as a habitual pattern of absence from duty or obligation without good reason has been viewed as an indicator of poor individual performance and a breach of an implicit contract between the employee and his/her

employer. It is indeed a management, a disruptive incident when it is unplanned or unexcused (Allen, Jimmieson, Bordia and Irmer, 2007). It is the responsibility of the human resource department and the line managers to monitor and determine reason(s) for unexcused absenteeism. In a university setting, absenteeism means that the class under the schedule of the absentee lecturer would not hold on the days he/she is absent and there are usually no make up days for the lost time of contact. It is a regrettable experience because employers have never escaped the salary costs of such time off the job. Absenteeism as one of the withdrawal behaviours is also an unethical behaviour which has bang wagon effect on co-workers. What it requires is just for one employee to become a habitual absentee and the colleagues will follow suit if something drastic did not happen to check it (Koslowsky, 2009).

Okache (2020) notes that late employees can be found in any organization, including university environment. The problem is that lateness has cost organizations millions of dollars in lost productivity or revenue as an employee's lateness behaviour impacts not only his/her performance but others as well (Torre, Pelagatti and Solari, 2014). Similarly, time lost in lateness is never regained. For instance, in a university work environment, if a lecturer's first period class is expected to start at eight O'clock in the morning, he/she would be considered to be late if he/she arrives to the class at one minute past eight. Diana Delonzor, the author of *Never Be Late Again*, has stated that the adrenaline rush of the last-minute rush from over-scheduling may cause people to be chronically late. An employee may not realize that he/she is acting this way until he/she takes the time to sit down and

ponder over what is causing chronic lateness (Delonzor, 2015). However, it should be noted that employees who are never late to the office have higher job satisfaction, stronger organizational commitment and higher job involvement (the Pennsylvania State University, 2013) and employees who find their work stimulating or challenging are less likely to engage in lateness as a withdrawal behaviour.

Presenteeism as has been noted earlier is more of psychological issue than physical. It is a withdrawal behaviour concerned primarily with psychological reasons. It represents individuals who are psychologically disengaged and it can also be caused by job dissatisfaction (Eiseberger, 2008). When an employee is bodily present but absent minded while performing task, such an employee can hardly accomplish anything (Bratton, 2007). A university lecturer with such a mindset can scarcely impact knowledge to the students thereby hindering the university from accomplishing its goals. Spector (2012) notes that an employee experiencing presenteeism can gradually degenerate into other forms of withdrawal behaviours such as absenteeism and finally turnover intention. The effect of this particular withdrawal behaviour on the students in a university environment is undesirable because the tendency is for them to receive from the lecturer what is not thereby affecting learning negatively.

The phenomenon of employee withdrawal behaviour is a grave impediment to performance because it deprives the organization of the benefits when employees experience a strong commitment to the job and the organization. A primary and necessary condition for the realization of employees' potential for performance is the existence

of an almost indissoluble bond between employees and their organization. Such a bond predisposes employees to strive for successful job performance and the set of extra-job role behaviours that are indispensable for performance endeavours that give a competitive edge to the institution/organization. Therefore, withdrawal behaviours create physical and psychological distance between employees and their work environment a situation which is most detrimental to organizational effective performance (Kanungo and Mendonca, 2011).

Empirical Review

Orly and Shmuel (2011) did a study on the ethical perspective of withdrawal behaviour syndrome in Northern Israel. The study adopted descriptive survey design. The findings showed that lateness was positively related to absence frequency which was in turn negatively related to intent to leave. The findings also indicated that each withdrawal behaviour exhibited unique relationships. The study concludes that the results would be of immense benefit to policy-makers in focusing on improving the ethical environment in order to increase commitment and reduce tendency for negative behaviours. Okache (2020) carried out a study on skill variety and employee withdrawal behaviour in telecommunication firms in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria. The study adopted cross-sectional survey in its investigation of the variables. Results from analysis of data revealed that there is a significant relationship between skill variety and employee withdrawal behaviour. In another study, Qian, Zhang and Jiang (2020) did a study on leader humility and subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour and withdrawal behaviour: exploring the mediating mechanisms of subordinates' psychological capital. The

study adopted a two-wave panel design. The empirical analysis found the following: leader humility was positively related to subordinates' OCB and negatively related to subordinates' withdrawal behaviour. Leader humility was positively to subordinates' psychological capital; and psychological capital played a cross-level mediating role in the leader humility-subordinate's OCB relationship and the leader humility-subordinates withdrawal behaviour relationship.

In a related study, Wang, Liu and Zhu (2018) did a study on humble leadership, psychological safety, knowledge sharing and follower creativity: a cross-level investigation. The study used descriptive survey method and found that transformational leadership could enhance employees' psychological capital (Psycap) by influencing their cognitive processes. Similarly, Bouckenvoghe, Zafar and Raja (2015) investigated how ethical leadership shapes employees' job performance by mediating the roles of goal congruence and psychological capital. The study used survey method and found that ethical leadership has a positive effect on employees' psychological capital via a role model effect.

Methodology

3. Research Design

The study adopts descriptive survey design because the results of the study would be generalized for the entire population of interest. The data is principally primary in nature. Survey method is always handy in studies of this nature because it provides access to the necessary data when such are not available in any statistical records (Obasi, 2000).

Population and Sample Size Determination

The population of the study consists of all teaching staff of Benson Idahosa and Igbinedion Universities, Benin, Edo State, Nigeria. Two hundred and ninety one (291) of this category of staff both regular and part-time were identified from the institutions as the population. The sample size was determined through the application of Taro Yameni's statistical formula outlined as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

n = Sample size to be determined

N = Entire population of interest

e = Error margin (0.05)

1 = Constant (unity)

Substituting the values in the formula we have:

$$n = \frac{291}{1 + 291(0.05)^2} = 168.451519536$$

n = 168 (Nearest whole number)

Thus, 168 is the sample size for the study. Concerning the sampling technique for selecting units of observation, Convenience method was used to ensure that the sample was exhausted.

Model Specification

The study examines the effect of withdrawal behaviours (absenteeism, lateness and presenteeism) on organizational performance. Thus the functional relationship is stated as follows:

$$OP = f(EMA, EML, EMP)$$

(1)

While the econometric relationship is:

$$OP = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 EMA + \alpha_2 EML + \alpha_3 EMP + \mu_t \quad (2)$$

Where:

OP = Organizational performance

α_0 = The intercept

μ_t = Stochastic error term
 EMA = Employee absenteeism
 EML = Employee lateness/tardiness
 EMP = Employee presenteeism

The theoretical expectations or a priori is that the coefficients (α_i 's) will have negative relationship with the dependent variable (organizational performance).

That is:

$\alpha_1 < 0$, $\alpha_2 < 0$ and $\alpha_3 < 0$.

4 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The background of the respondents were evaluated in this section of the analysis to determine their experience and hence how much they can discuss the issues relating to employees' withdrawal behaviours and their effect on organizational performance. Thus features such as gender, age, educational attainment and organizational tenure were evaluated.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Table 4.1: Background Data of the Respondents

S/N	Demographic Features	Frequency	Percentage of Total	
1.	Gender:	Male	79	53.7
		Female	68	46.3
		Total	147	100.0
2.	Age Bracket:	18 – 37 years	39	26.5
		38 – 57 years	61	41.5
		58 and above years	47	32.0
		Total	147	100.0
3.	Educational Attainment:	First degree	10	6.8
		Masters	39	26.5
		Ph.D	98	66.7
		Total	147	100.0
4.	Organizational Tenure:	< 5 years	19	12.9
		5 – 10 years	67	45.6
		11 and above years	61	41.5
		Total	147	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2020

: SPSS Analysis, 2020

The analysis in Table 4.1 shows that there are slightly more male lecturers than there female in the two institutions, 53.7 percent and 46.3 percent respectively. It shows also that age bracket 38 years and above constitutes about 73.5 percent of the sample. In terms of educational qualification, more than 66 percent of the respondents have doctoral degree. Regarding organizational tenure, more than 87 percent of the sample have worked

in the institutions for five years and above. The implication therefore is that the respondents are in a good position to effectively discuss all issues relating to the effect of withdrawal behaviours and organizational performance.

Table 4.2: Correlation Analysis

Correlation Matrix

Variables		Organizational Performance	Employee Absenteeism	Employee Lateness	Employee Presenteeism
Organizational Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	-.397**	-.431**	-.524**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.001	.000
	N	147	147	147	147
Employee Absenteeism	Pearson Correlation	-.395**	1	.298**	.403**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.002
	N	147	147	147	147
Employee Lateness	Pearson Correlation	-.431**	.298**	1	.207**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000		.011
	N	147	147	147	147
Employee Presenteeism	Pearson Correlation	-.524**	.403**	.207**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.011	
	N	147	147	147	147

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

The correlation matrix in Table 4.2 show that relationships between the dependent and independent variables are weak in most cases and negative all round. However, it shows also that positive but

weak relationships exist among the independent variables. It is interesting also to note that there is no presence of multicollinearity or orthogonal relationships among the variables. Thus regression analysis can be carried out on the data.

Table 4.3: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
ANOVA^b

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-ratio	Sig.
Regression	4	1759.601	439.900	20.494	.000 ^a
Residual	70	1502.507	21.464		
Total	74	3262.108			

Source: SPSS Analysis, 2020

a. Predictor (constant), employee absenteeism, employee lateness and employee presenteeism

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Table 4.3 shows that F-Statistics is 20.494 and it is an indication that the model is statistically significant and therefore fit for predictions.

Table 4.4: Summary of Regression Analysis

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R-Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.529	.408	.325	0.31146	1.305

Source: SPSS Analysis, 2020

a. Predictor (constant), employee absenteeism, employee lateness and employee presenteeism

coefficient of determination represented by R^2 with the value of 0.408 shows that 40.8 percent variation in the dependent variable can be accounted for by the independent variables. Similarly, the Durbin Watson Statistic of 1.305 is an indication that the model does not contain serial autocorrelation.

Table 4.4 shows that regression coefficient represented by R has a value of 0.529 and it means that 52.9 percent relationship exists between the dependent and independent variables. Furthermore, the

Table 4.5 Summary of Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients, t-value and Sig. Level

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Error	Beta		
1(Constant	.181	.204	-	-609	.425
Employee Absenteeism	.154	.067	-.425	8.104	.000
Employee Lateness	.147	.083	-.401	3.627	.000
Employee Presenteeism	.352	.059	-.519	2.548	.001

Source: SPSS Analysis, 2020

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Table 4.6: Post Estimation Test: Eigen Values, Condition Index and Variance Proportion

Model	Eigen Values	Condition Index	Variance Proportion			
			Constant	EMA	EML	EMP
1.	4.417	1.003	.00	.00	.00	.00
2.	.069	6.514	.07	.06	.05	.09
3.	.053	7.206	.02	.02	.23	.22
4.	.082	8.157	.08	.07	.21	.24

Source: SPSS Analysis, 2020

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Specifications: In this post estimation test, the rule is that eigen values that are close to zero have dimensions that explain little or no variance, and for the condition index, when the values are more than 15 for any of the variables, then there is a possibility of presence of multicollinearity relation in the model. In our analysis in Table 4.6, the values of 2, 3 and 4 are close to zero

thereby expressing very little variance in the model. Similarly the values of condition index are in the range 1.003, 6.514, 7.206 and 8.157 thus showing absence of multicollinearity relationship in the variables.

4.2 Test of Hypotheses

The hypotheses formulated to guide the objectives of the study and strengthen the analysis were re-stated and tested in this section of the analysis to verify the claims of the null hypotheses. Accordingly, the

null and alternative hypotheses were stated as follows:

1. H_0 : Employee absenteeism does not have significant negative effect on organizational performance.
 H_1 : Employee absenteeism has significant negative effect on organizational performance.
2. H_0 : Employee lateness to work does not have significant negative effect on organizational performance.
 H_1 : Employee lateness to work has significant negative effect on organizational performance.
3. H_0 : Employee presenteeism does not have significant negative effect on organizational performance.
 H_1 : Employee presenteeism has significant negative effect on organizational performance.

Interpretation of Regression Results

Regression results presented in Table 4.5 shows that coefficient of employee absenteeism represented by α_1 in the model is -0.425 thus showing that when employee absenteeism increases by one unit, organizational performance will reduce/decrease by 42.5 percent if other variables in the model are held constant. The t-value of 8.104 and corresponding probability of $P\ 0.000 < 0.05$ is an indication that the coefficient is significant thus the null hypothesis was rejected while accepting the alternative which suggests that employee absenteeism has significant negative effect on organizational performance.

In the same vein, the coefficient of employees' lateness to work represented by α_2 in the model is -0.401 and it means that when employees' lateness to work is increased by one unit, organizational performance will reduce by 40.1 percent if other variables in the model are held constant. The t-value of 3.627 and its corresponding probability of $P\ 0.000 < 0.05$ shows that the coefficient significant. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative which suggests that employees' lateness to the office has significant negative effect on organizational performance was accepted.

Finally, the coefficient of employees' presenteeism represented by α_3 in the model is 0.519 and it means that when employees' presenteeism increases by one unit, organizational performance will reduce by 51.9 percent if other factors in the model are not allowed to vary. The t-value of 2.548 and its corresponding $P\ 0.001 < 0.05$ shows that the coefficients is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and we concluded that employees' presenteeism has significant negative effect on organizational performance.

Discussion of Research Results

The correlation analysis showed that weak and negative relationships exist between the dependent and the independent variables. However, there are positive and few strong relationships among the independent variables. From the first test of hypothesis, the result showed that employees' absenteeism significantly and negatively affects organizational performance. The result is consistent with that of Onikoyi, Awolusi and Boyede (2015) when they found that absenteeism has significant negative effect on corporate performance. It goes to show that employees' absenteeism as one of the

withdrawal behaviours has a way of lowering productivity of an organization.

Employees' absenteeism can be voluntary or involuntary. It can also be excused or unexcused. It is excused and accepted by the employer if it is based on sickness or vacation leave which the law provides for. The unexcused or unplanned absence is the one that hurts the organization most because of its loss of production. Most times, the unplanned absence is a direct result of employee-organization relationship. An employee who is not experiencing job satisfaction as a result of poor conditions of service can begin to react through such withdrawal behaviour as absenteeism. In this case the management can improve the conditions of service to motivate the employees to come to work. Management can also create room for conversation with the employees to see what is or is not motivating them to come to work. In attractive work environment will surely enhance employees' morale and motivate them to shun absenteeism when it is not necessary.

The result of the second test of hypothesis showed that employees' lateness to work has significant negative effect on the performance of the organization. The finding is in line with the result of Berry, Lelchok and Clark (2012) when they found from their study that lateness as well as absenteeism and turnover have significant negative effect on organizational performance. Lecturers that are late to classes all the times may not be taken serious by the students. This is because starting a class behind schedule means that the time for next class would be depleted unless the lecturer decides not to exhaust the time for the class in which he/she came late. There is a psychological effect of such negative behaviour on the students. Furthermore, one employee's

lateness can have a trickle-down effect on co-workers who believe they too can get away with lateness because it goes unnoticed with no serious corrective action taking place but just like absenteeism, increasing chronic lateness can be handled by the management because it could also be as a result of the misgivings the employee have about the management. An employee that is happy with his/her workplace environment is not likely to engage in chronic late coming or any withdrawal behaviour for that matter. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the management to find out why some employees are chronically late to work, find the underlying factor/emotion that may be causing chronic lateness.

The third test of hypothesis is on effect of presenteeism and the result showed that it has significant negative effect on organizational performance. As noted earlier, presenteeism is more of psychological or mental strain. It is a situation where an employee would be physically/bodily present but absent-minded, not being able to coordinate effectively. The decrease in productivity due to presenteeism is more difficult to identify and measure than other withdrawal behaviours which are physical in nature. A lecturer under the influence of presenteeism is very dangerous in a class session because due to improper coordination, he/she can be saying another thing thinking that he/she is really communicating. In the process, the students may end up being fed with wrong knowledge thereby negating the goal of the institution. Psychological disengaged employees are easily burnout, easily become unreceptive, lack inspiration and conduct trifling efforts on the job. The reason could also be as a result of poor working conditions and low job satisfaction. Whenever the job becomes

less pleasurable as a result of bad pay or less opportunity for promotion, the employee is likely to come down with any of the withdrawal behaviour discussed above.

Conclusion

The study examined the effect of withdrawal behaviour (absenteeism) lateness and presenteeism on organizational performance, using selected private universities in Edo State, Nigeria as the study area. Withdrawal behaviours create physical and psychological distance between employees and the work environment that is detrimental to organizational effectiveness and performance. The prevailing organizational conditions to a large extent fosters in the employees whether the desire and willingness to perform their duties effectively would be available or not. Bad conditions of service seriously weaken and rupture the bond between the employees and the organization by introducing all kinds of withdrawal behaviour, including absenteeism, lateness and presenteeism. Low job satisfaction and other demotivating factors contribute significantly to employees' withdrawal behaviours in the organization.

Withdrawal behaviours among the members of teaching staff are impediments to the realization of goals and set objectives in the university environment because they are the line staff who determine whether the programmes in the institutions are functioning or not. Consequently, it is the responsibility of the university management or those who should know to monitor the employees and determine how to prevent or stop the appearance of withdrawal behaviours among the employees because they hinder the institutions from achieving set goals. Employees who are satisfied with the

prevailing conditions of service in their places of work do not engage in any form of withdrawal behaviours.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and the conclusion drawn from them, the following recommendations were made:

1. Organizations, especially the university management should monitor and identify the causes of employees' absenteeism and device means of preventing or at least reducing it. This, the management can do by making the organization a place which employees enjoy coming to work. Encourage the employees to stop in and talk about anything regarding their work that may be creating negative motivation. Finally, introduce some stringent measures against absenteeism. Some employees are not likely to miss work if they know that action would be taken against regular unexcused absences.
2. Negative effect of lateness on organizational performance is enormous. Management should be prepared to sanction lateness with the measures it deserve. It is also necessary for the person who is chronically late to try and find out the underlying emotion that be causing chronic lateness. Understanding the causes can hopefully lead to a change in emotions and behaviours causing the chronic lateness.
3. There may be no remedy to presenteeism than psychological solution because it is more of psychological than it physical. Issues that lead to mental or psychological strain should be avoided in addition to providing

conducive working conditions to enhance job satisfaction among the employees. Presenteeism can be controlled by engaging the employees suffering from it in a heart-to-heart talk always.

References

1. Adams, J.S. (1965). Injustice in social exchange. In Berkowitz, L. (ed.). *Advances in experimental psychology*. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press.
2. Allen, J., Jimmieson, L., Bordia, P. and Irmer, E. (2007). Uncertainty during organizational change: managing perceptions through communication. *A Journal of Change Management*, 7(2): 36-48.
3. Anya, A., Umoh, R. and Worlu, S. (2017). Human resource planning and organizational performance in oil and gas firms in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Management Sciences*, 3(9): 110-129.
4. Armstrong, M. (2004). *A handbook of human resource management practice*, 9th edition. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
5. Bates, R.A. and Holton, E.F. (1995). Computerized performance monitoring: a review of human resource issues. In Egboh, E.A. and Okeke, I.M. (eds.). *Foundation of Personnel Management in Nigeria*. Enugu: Bismark Publications.
6. Berry, C., Lelchook, A. and Clark, M. (2012). A meta-analysis of the interrelationships between employee lateness, absenteeism and turnover. Implications for models of withdrawal behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 33: 678-699.
7. Blau, G. (1994). Developing and testing a taxonomy of lateness behaviour. In Itzkowitz, M.R. (ed.). *Meta-Analysis of relationships between absenteeism, lateness and turnover and employee performance*. *Withdrawal Behaviours*, No. 13.
8. Bouckenoghe, D., Zafar, A. and Raja, U. (2015). How ethical leadership shapes employees' job performance: the mediating roles of goal congruence and psychological capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129: 251-264.
9. Bratton, J. (2007). *Work and organizational behaviour*. New York: Paul Grave Mac Milan. 2.
10. Breeze, L. (2010). Relations among lateness, absence and turnover: is there a progression of withdrawal? *Human Relations*, 41: 517-531.
11. Cohen, A. and Golan, R. (2017). Predicting absenteeism and turnover intentions by past absenteeism and work attitudes. *Career Development International*, 12(5): 416-432.
12. Delonzor, D. (2015). Running late: dealing with chronically late employees who cost the organization in productivity and morale. *Human Resource Magazine*. Retrieved November 20, 2015.
13. Eder, P. and Eisenberger, R. (2008). Perceived organizational support: reducing the negative influence of co-worker withdrawal behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 55-68.
14. Hornby, A.S. (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. Oxford: University Press.
15. Kanungo, R.N. and Mendonca, M. (2017). Employee withdrawal behaviour: role of the performance management. *Faculty of Management*, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec H3A IG5, Canada.
16. Koslowsky, M. (2009). A multi-level model of withdrawal: integrating and synthesizing theory and findings. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19: 283-303.
17. Lauby, G. (2009). Lateness as a withdrawal behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 06(5): 544-554.
18. Mullins, L.J. (1999). Management and organizational behaviour, 5th edition. In Egboh E.A. and Okeke, I.M. (eds.).

- Foundations of Personnel Management in Nigeria.* Enugu: Bismark Publications.
19. Okache, G.O. (2020). Skill variety and employee withdrawal behaviour in telecommunication firms in Port Harcourt, River State, Nigeria. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing*, 6(5): 32-46.
 20. Onikoyi, I.A., Awolusi, O.D. and Boyede, M.A. (2015). Effect of absenteeism on corporate performance: a study of Cadbury Nigeria PLC, Ikeja, Lagos State. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 3(2): 58 – 71.
 21. Orly, S.L. and Shmuel, E.Z. (2011). Withdrawal behaviours syndrome: an ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103: 429-451.
 22. Pinder, C.C. (2008). *Work motivation in organizational behaviour*. New York: Psychology Press.
 23. Qian, X., Zhang, M. and Jiang, Q. (2020). Leader humility and subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviour and withdrawal behaviour: exploring the mediating mechanisms of subordinates' psychological capital. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2): 1-14.
 24. Seitz, S.T., Hulin, C.L. and Hanisch, K.A. (2020). Simulating withdrawal behaviours in work organizations: an example of a virtual society. *Nonlinear Dynamics Psychological Life Science*, 4: 33 – 65.
 25. Spector, P.E. (2012). Relationship among lateness, absenteeism and turnover: is there a progression of withdrawal? *Human Relations*, 25(3): 293-315.
 26. The Pennsylvania State University (2011). Lesson 13: lateness, absenteeism, turnover and burnout: am I likely to miss work? Work Attitudes and Motivation. World Campus.
 27. The Pennsylvania State University (2013). Psych 484: *work attitudes and motivation*, Lesson 13. Retrieved March 29, 2013.
 28. Timms, C., Brough, P. and Graham, D. (2012). Burnout but engaged: the co-existence of psychological burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50: 327-345.
 29. Tiwari, U. (2014). Impact of absenteeism and labour turnover on organizational performance at Iti, Nani Allahabad, India. *Abhinav National Monthly Referred Journal of Research in Commerce and Management*, 34(10): 9-15.
 30. Torre, E.D., Pelagatti, M. and Solari, L. (2014). Internal and external equity in compensation systems, organizational absenteeism and the role of explained inequalities. *Human Relations*, 68: 409-440.
 31. Trotter, V.K., Lambert, M.J., Burlingame, G.M., Rees, F., Carpenter, B.N., Steffen, P.R., Jackson, A. and Eggett, D. (2009). Measuring work productivity with a mental health self-report measure. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 51(6): 739-746.
 32. Wang, Y., Liu, J. and Zhu, Y. (2018). Humble leadership, psychological safety, knowledge sharing and follower creativity: a cross-level investigation. *Front Psych*, 9(5): 128-141.

APPENDIX SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Instruction: (please tick [] as appropriate in the boxes provided)

SECTION A:
Personal Data:

1. Gender: Male []; Female []
2. Age Bracket:
18 – 37 years []
38 – 57 years []

	perform effectively due to impairment.						
12.	As a result of psychological reasons, an employee who is under the influence of presenteeism can be bodily present but absent minded thereby negatively affecting overall productivity in the organization.						
13.	A lecturer experiencing presenteeism is more likely to tell students what is not because of improper coordination.						
14.	Decreased productivity due to presenteeism is more difficult to identify and measure than absenteeism or lateness thereby making the effect more harmful.						
15.	Major cause of presenteeism is lack of job satisfaction which arises from poor conditions of service due to poor management						
	Total						

Note: (SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree and UND = Undecided)

IV: Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

S/N	Items of the Questionnaire	Options of the Likert Scale					Total
		VGE	GE	ME	LE	VLE	
1.	To what extent do you believe employees' absenteeism negatively influences organizational performance?						
2.	To what extent do you think employees' lateness to work can negatively affect organizational performance?						
3.	To what extent do you think employees' presenteeism can negatively affect organizational performance?						
	Total						

Note: (VGE = Very Great Extent; GE = Great Extent; ME = Moderately Extent; LE = Little Extent and VLE = Very Little Extent)