

A Little Aspect of Misbehavior in Organization (Case Study in Indonesia)

¹Nur Feriyanto, ²Syeh Assery, ³Chairul Saleh and ⁴Sri Suryaningsum
^{1,2}Faculty of Economics, ³Faculty of Industrial Technology,
Universitas Islam Indonesia, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
⁴Faculty of Economics, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran”,
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: The objective of this study want to explore a little aspect of misbehavior in organization in term of qualitative approach use case study method. Data was collected by interviewing 20 staff at a service company in Indonesia. Data was analyzed use Weft QDA software and follow the step of data reduction, data display and data verification. Findings are described into 1 theme is production misbehavior and then discussed.

Key words: Misbehavior organization, case study, Indonesia, collected, verification

INTRODUCTION

The term misbehavior in organization popularized since 1996 and then increasing attention from researchers with background in industrial sociology and organizational behavior. In some literature about misbehavior in organization can be obtained several definitions as follows. Misbehavior in organization is any intentional action by member of organisation that defies and violates shared organisational norms, core societal values, mores or standards of proper conduct (Vardi and Wiener, 1996). Anything you do at work you are not supposed to do is misbehavior in organization (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999). Misbehavior in organization as activities occurring within the workplace that according to official structure, culture and rules of the organization that should not happen (Watson, 2003).

Misbehavior in organizations are all forms of deliberate action by members of the organization in the form of perversion and destruction of norms, expectations, social values, moral and behavioral standards of organization. The word deliberates or intentional have the intent to do so intentionally and consciously therefore if unintentionally or incidental or unconscious is not included in the definition of misbehavior in organizations. The existence of an element of perversion and destruction of values and norms of the organization is a central component of misbehavior in organization (Vardi and Weitz, 2004).

The integrative model of Organizational Misbehavior (OMB) described as follows. OMB antecedents consists of individual levels, position/task level, group level and organizational level. While consequents or manifestation

of OMB consists of intrapersonal misbehavior, interpersonal misbehavior, production misbehavior, property misbehavior and political misbehavior. OMB had an influence on losses arising both from financial and social. So, it is necessary to intervene to both side of the antecedents and consequents of OMB. Intervention to OMB antecedents such as good selection, training as well as the redesign of work if necessary. While interventions to OMB consequents related with implementing a system of rewards and punishments, even to the termination of employment (Vardi and Weitz, 2004).

Furthermore, there are many researchers study misbehavior in organization such as Ferguson (2006), Richards (2008), Kidwell and Valentine (2009), Andreoli and Lefkowitz (2009), Fagbohunge *et al.* (2012) and Yousefi *et al.* (2012).

Ferguson (2006) conducted a study in the context of working groups was found that misbehavior working group can influence the misbehavior of individuals in the group. He also argued that misbehavior in organization is socially contagious as shown by the information circulating within the group.

Richards (2008) tried to remap misbehavior in organization of various viewpoints approaches: industrial sociology organizational behavior, industrial relations and gender studies and provide a foundation for future research such as why a violation of company rules and how deviant behavior of individuals within the organization could occur.

Kidwell and Valentine (2009) examined the relationship between the dimensions of the OMB in the group level such as cohesiveness, helping behavior, leadership and employee job attitudes, against in the

individuals. From this research, it can be seen that the occurrence of misbehavior of the individual is influenced by a group.

According to them, a group context may affect the individual, so that the conduct also require attention in research of OMB. Andreoli and Lefkowitz (2009) provide insight into what distinguishes the term organizational misbehavior, unethical behavior and organizational misconduct. Although, organizational misbehavior and unethical behavior both equally as interpersonal action that violates the rules and norms of the organization but they fall into the category of organizational misconduct. Organizational misbehavior is one form of irregularities in the context of the organization while unethical behavior is a form of irregularities in the context of the individual. Based on the research findings they noted that the lack of organizational compliance practices affect the occurrence of misconduct. Misconduct that could be due to the influence of organizational factors are not always influenced by individual factors only. It was found that the higher the moral development of the organization will further reduce misconduct.

Fagbohunge *et al.* (2012) examined the relationship between organizational reaction to deviant behaviors in the workplace and found that organizational reaction such as supervision, identification of the company, type of work, amount of work, physical working conditions and financial compensation is significantly affecting deviant behaviours. They also found that there are differences between men and women in performing deviant behaviors that women do more production deviance, personal aggression, political deviance however, men do more property deviance.

Yousefi *et al.* (2012) use case study to examined the university staff misbehavior production in Iran and found that the staff had a higher education level, the higher the level of production misbehavior that occurred. Judging from the experience of working, the staff who have work experience lower production levels will be higher misbehavior that occurred.

Of the various explanations above, showed that no conceptual clarity over the definition of misbehavior in organizations. Even in the original naming, alternated between misbehavior in organization with organizational misbehavior. Therefore, it is necessary to study more in-depth understanding of misbehavior in organization based on organizational and managerial process. The research topic on the misbehavior in organization are many but a bit different when conducting study in a service company.

This case study focused at a service company in Indonesia due to absent togetherness of several staffs in

one day that affect on production. Furthermore, we proposed research question: how is a little aspect of misbehavior in organization happened in a service company.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

To maintain a holistic and meaningful characteristic of a real-life events such as an organizational and managerial process we conduct a case study method. There are 8 types of cases study; individual, group organization, partnership, community, relationship, decision or project (Yin, 2013). This case study aims to explore more deeply about misbehavior in organization in a service company in Indonesia. The company has 80 staffs. In one day, 20 staffs were absent together, it means 25% of staffs were absent together, so the company can not be running production in normal way at that day.

There are many sources of data were collected in a case study; interviews, observation, documentation, records and artifacts. In collecting the data there are 4 important principles; using multiple sources and triangulation, building a database of case study, understand the relationship between the data obtained and be careful in using the data (Yin, 2013). This case study use interview questions are why did they absent together at that day how did they inform to their supervisor and did they still want to work in the company or resign. Data were collected use interview at April 2016 in Surabaya, Indonesia.

The steps of analyze the data are: organizing relevant files, reading of the entire text, make notes as required, describe the data into the appropriate code using aggregation categorical to form a theme, interpret the data carried by using a straightforward interpretation, develop generalizations about the important lessons that can be drawn and make presentation of the report uses narrative, tables and images (Creswell, 2012). Data were analyzed using Weft QDA Software, following the steps of data analysis such as data reduction, data display and data verification. Then make categorization and coding to obtain the general themes of the case.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are several findings as follows. Related with the question why did they absent together at that day? They argued that they have no money for transportation to the office 15 staffs (75%) have a personal business 4 staffs (20%), just follow the others or just solidarity 1 staff (5%). Related with the question why did not inform to their supervisor. They argued that they have no pulse to

call supervisor/manager 8 staffs (40%), already call to HR department but not to direct supervisor/manager 7 staffs (35%) have no idea to call supervisor/manager 5 staffs (25%). Related with the question did they still want to work in the company or resign. They argued that they still want to work at the company 17 staffs (85%) want to resign 2 staffs (10%) want to follow the top management decision 1 staff (5%).

Based on these findings we found that staffs were absent together affect production cycle and this is a typical of misbehavior in organization. Many reasons they argued such as have no money to go to the office (75%) have no pulse to contact supervisor/manager (50%) but they still want to work at the company (85%). This is seeming contradiction in one side they did absent together and affected the production cycle as well as a production misbehavior but in other side they still want to work at the company. The management of the company can not terminate these staffs because of just absent in a day even they did it together and affected production cycle.

CONCLUSION

In this case study, we summarized that absent togetherness of several staffs even this is just individual level but can affect group level and vise versa, due to affect the production cycle that we stated as production misbehavior. This misbehavior in organization had an influence on losses arising both from financial and social. So, it is necessary to intervene by management level as soon as possible by redesign of work if necessary and implementing a system of rewards and punishments. This finding support on what is proposed by Vardi and Weitz (2004).

Misbehavior in organization need to be understood by the all managers related. The managers need to pay attention to the antecedent of misbehavior in organization so that it can previously anticipated. And if the misbehavior in organization is happened, it has to be intervened properly to make a better performance to all parties.

LIMITATIONS

The limitation of this study was conducted only in one company and only is focused interviews as data source has not been much use multi sources data such as

observation and documentation. For future research, may do a triangulation of multi sources of data and do a quantitative approach to support a better finding.

REFERENCES

- Ackroyd, S. and P. Thompson, 1999. *Organizational Misbehaviour*. Sage, Berlin, Germany, ISBN:0-8039-8735-8, Pages: 183.
- Andreoli, N. and J. Lefkowitz, 2009. Individual and organizational antecedents of misconduct in organizations. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 85: 309-332.
- Creswell, J.W., 2012. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. 3rd Edn., Sage Publications Inc., California, USA., ISBN-13: 978-1412995306, Pages: 472.
- Fagbohungebe, B.O., G.A. Akinbode and F. Ayodeji, 2012. Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *Intl. J. Bus. Manag.*, 7: 207-221.
- Ferguson, M.J., 2006. *From bad to worse: A social contagion model of organizational misbehavior*. Masters Thesis, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.
- Kidwell, R.E. and S.R. Valentine, 2009. Positive group context, work attitudes and organizational misbehavior: The case of withholding job effort. *J. Bus. Eth.*, 86: 15-28.
- Richards, J., 2008. The many approaches to organisational misbehaviour: A review, map and research agenda. *Employee Relat.*, 30: 653-678.
- Vardi, Y. and E. Weitz, 2004. *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research and Management*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey, USA.,
- Vardi, Y. and Y. Wiener, 1996. Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Sci.*, 7: 151-165.
- Watson, T.J., 2003. Ethical choice in managerial work: The scope for moral choices in an ethically irrational world. *Hum. Relat.*, 56: 167-185.
- Yin, R.K., 2013. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th Edn., SAGE Publications, California, USA., ISBN:9781483302003, Pages: 312.
- Yousefi, M., M.A. Shomami and S. Gharagoozloo, 2012. The production misbehavior of university's staff (case study of Iran). *Interdiscipl. J. Contemp. Res. Bus.*, 4: 532-542.