COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOR MEASURE TO INCREASE EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY

JOROVLEA Elvira
ORCID: 0000-0001-8184-9951
Associate Professor, Doctor of Economics, ASEM, ase.md, Republic of Moldova,
jorovlea.elvira.leon@ase.md
PAȘCANEANU Tudor
ORCID: 0000-0002-1074-6186
pacaneanu.tudor.akyd@ase.md

ABSTRACT. *In recent years, there has been an increase in interest in researching workplace behaviors that cause harm to employees or the organization, especially, because of the harmful consequences and associated costs. Consequences include economic ones, for example, loss of productivity due to late work, theft or sabotage, and psychological ones such as withdrawal or low job satisfaction - for those who are targets of interpersonal counterproductive behaviors; the high degree of stress and insecurity – for those who perceive such behaviors. Consequences are important arguments for the need to identify predictors of counterproductive behaviors, both interpersonal and organizational. Such information will help organizational actors to find ways to prevent these acts during the selection process, focusing on those predictors of personality that determine counterproductive behavior or at the level of the organization, taking into account situational factors that may trigger or encourage such behaviors.*

In the intrapersonal stage, the degree of responsibility of the individual who records the observation is of great importance. This determines how the deviance is perceived (whether the „guilty" is guilty or not), the causes that the individual attributes to the perceived behavior (whether it is moral or immoral) and the actions he will take in connection with it (whether or not he discloses the information).

At the interpersonal level, the observer faces social influences from the "guilty" (presenting attenuated circumstances, using excuses or justifications, emphasizing the isolated character and even intimidation) issues that make it difficult to report.

KEYWORDS: *management, behaviors, counterproductive behaviors, organization, consequence, predictors*

JEL CLASSIFICATION: *M10*

INTRODUCTION

In modern organizations that, in the process of obtaining performance emphasize the human factor, personality, individual characteristics of the employee of each rank, a special interest, as a motivation, has the research of behaviors that cause harm to employees or even the entire organization. The damages are manifested by *consequences* of different nature of the mentioned behaviors:

- *economy*: loss of productivity due to late work, theft or sabotage;
- *psychological*: retirement, job dissatisfaction, high stress, insecurity.

The above-listed consequences serve as a basis for selecting the arguments for detecting behaviors that cause harm, called *counterproductive behaviors*, leading to the identification of adequate antecedents for predicting/correcting these manifestations.

Counterproductive behaviors are defined as abusive manifestations towards others, which consist of: physical and verbal aggression, intentional misconduct, sabotage, absences, delays, etc. [5] and in the variety of definitions. Emphasis must be placed on the fact that these behaviors are intentional and harm employees and organizations.

Research in the field of counterproductive behavior in the workplace has been done for about 20 years by scientists in the field R. Lanyon, L. Goodstein, S. Robinson, R. Bennett, P. E. Spector, S. Fox, D. Milles, M. Popa, C. Sulea who identified and examined:

- *the levels of counterproductive behavior* (interpersonal and organizational);
- *the forms and target of counterproductive behavior*;
- *areas of counterproductive behavior*, which referes to:
- intent to do harm, intent that may be present, absent, or ambiguous;
- the target of the act, a target that can be represented by individuals, by the organization or by both;
- types of violated norms, norms of the company, of the organization, of the working groups;
- the persistence of the act, which can be singular or repeated over time;
- the intensity and depth of the manifested behaviors;
  - *the degree of severity of counterproductive behavior:*
- *serious*, demonstrated by aggression, harassment, violence;
- *minors*, demonstrated by spreading rumors, disrespect for others, etc.;
  - *sources of evaluating counterproductive behaviors*, which are*:*
- objective registration systems;
- self-reporting;
- appreciation of other people.

BODY OF PAPER

The studies carried out are bidirectional: on the one hand, the determination of the shapes, dimensions, domains, the degree of behavioral deviations; on the other hand, the development of techniques and tools for detecting and analyzing the predictive factors of counterproductive behaviors.

One of the techniques for typifying counterproductive behaviors is that *of multidimensional scaling*, with two *explanatory labels*: *organizational/interpersonal*; *minor/major* (figure no.1).

Table 1. The typology of deviant behavior

Organizational			
Minor	*Minor and organizational deviance* **DEVIATION RELATED TO PRODUCTION** Leave earlier Take excessive breaks Intentionally working slower To waste resources	*Major and harmful deviance to the organization* **PROPERTY DEVIATION** Sabotage the equipment To accept bribes Lying about the hours worked Stealing from the company	**Major**
	Minor and interpersonal deviance **POLITICAL DEVIATION** Doing favors Gossiping colleagues To accuse / blame colleagues Being in the wrong competition	*Major and interpersonal deviance* **PERSONAL AGGRESSIVENESS** Committing verbal abuse Stealing from colleagues Endangering colleagues	
Interpersonal			

Sourse: Robinson, S., Bennett, R. (1995), A types of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study. In: Academy of Management Journal, nr.38 (2);

According to the table, we make the following observations:
- the *minor/major* label reflects the following: if at one pole we recorded minor deviations

of behavior that are not harmful to the organization and individuals, then, at the opposite pole, behavioral deviations are characterized by severity with severe implications for both the organization and individuals.

- the *organization/interpersonal* label tells us that if at one pole we find behaviors that are harmful to individuals but harmless to the organization, then at the other pole the behaviors are harmful to the organization, but not to individuals.

A tool for determining the typology of counterproductive behaviors is developed by Spector and collaborators, *Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist* (CWB-C) [6]. It contains 45 items (including the dimensions of counterproductive behavior) and with five categories of deviations:

- *abuse against others,* which consists of harmful behaviors directed against colleagues, to harm physically or mentally through threats, inappropriate comments, ignoring the person or undermining his authority to work effectively;devianţa legată de producţie este neefectuarea intenţionată a sarcinilor de serviciu;

- *sabotage* refers to the destruction or damage of physical property belonging to the employer;

- *theft* that refers to the theft of objects or information from an organization;

- *retirement,* is related to the adoption of a behavior that reduces working time (employees work less time than required, are absent, late, take longer breaks than expected).

The next tool, *Counterproductive Behavior Index (CBI)* [2], is presented by the authors in the form of an *integrity test*. This procedure is used to select and identify candidates whose work-related behaviors, attitudes and values are likely to interfere with their success as employees. CBI is a 140-item questionnaire with true/false answers based on 7 categories, such as *trust, aggression, substance abuse, computer abuse, sexual harassment, and other general issues*.

The application of techniques and tools in practice has led to the finding and finding of solutions to prevent and correct counterproductive behaviors. First of all, it is about detecting the *positive and negative dimensions of behavioral deviations*.

The deviance considered negative has the direct connotation of the counterproductive behavior. This is the main research interest in the field and, importantly, affects both targets of this type of behavior - *individual and organization*.

Thus, treating employees in a way that disadvantages them is an approach that has a negative impact on them. And sabotage, a form of employee behavior, is a deviation from productivity and ownership and harms the organization [8]. As, providing incorrect information, lying, dishonesty is a potential harm to individuals.

The *positive* connotation *of behavioral deviance* is to the advantage of the interests of individuals and the organization. The authors who studied this phenomenon introduced the phrase „*constructive deviance",* which is found when counterproductive behaviors have positive consequences on employees and organizations [7]. Such a treatment of divination reveals radical behaviors of employees that, in violation of certain rules, cause changes, contributing to the well-being of the organization, the people involved being called „*reformers with an innovative and entrepreneurial spirit*".

Therefore, it is found that approaches to the vector of deviance help to identify the factors that cause counterproductive behaviors and suggest possible responses to managers. This practice has been defined as „*the disclosure by members of the organization of illegal, immoral or illegitimate practices (which are under the control of employees) to persons or organizations that have the capacity to act in this regard" and is called "sounding the alarm"* [1].

The definition of the term "sounding the alarm" reveals the participation of two characters: *the one who manifests* the counterproductive behavior and *the one who reveals it* (the observer person). The practice takes place in two stages: *observing the direction of the deviation and processing the information and making the decision* [1].

1. During the stage of *observing the direction of deviation*, the cooperation of the

members of the group is helpful for the managers, because it is easier for the colleagues to observe the behavior of those next to them. In addition, it is easier to make a remark to a colleague to encourage/inhibit the behavior.

2. The stage of *information processing and decision-making* takes place at the *intrapersonal and interpersonal* levels.

In the intrapersonal stage, *the degree of responsibility* of the individual who records the observation is of great importance. This determines *how the deviance is perceived* (whether the „guilty" is guilty or not), *the causes* that the individual attributes to the perceived behavior (whether it is moral or immoral) and *the actions* he will take in connection with it (whether or not he discloses the information).

At the interpersonal level, the observer faces social influences from the "guilty" (presenting attenuated circumstances, using excuses or justifications, emphasizing the isolated character and even intimidation) issues that make it difficult to report.

It is important to emphasize that, the process of observation, the individual is in danger nimereşte of being tempted to imitate the perceived behavior and / or to suffer side effects, such as blame, from colleagues and even superiors. With these latest developments, the number of pieces of evidence in favor of adequate motivation of employees is increasing, so that they gain the necessary courage to denounce and not to imitate counterproductive behaviors.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, in the effective management of counterproductiveness by dealing with deviant behaviors, it is important to support initiatives to observe and encourage alarm signals. Early detection of harmful behavior facilitates and streamlines the intervention. On the other hand, the occasional absenteeism, the abuse of sick leave, the use of working time in personal interests can be, in some cases, manifestations consciously accepted by the organization, as part of the "daily comfort" of employees. Sometimes things go on for a long time. For example, an organization in financial difficulty, which has problems with the payment of salaries, can accept theft as a way of "payment" and as a solution to maintaining employee loyalty in times of crisis.

REFERENCES:

1. Gundlach, Michael I., Douglas, Scott C., Martinko, Mark J. (2003). *The decision to blow the whistle: A social information processing frameworrk.* În: Academy of Management Review, nr.28 (1);
2. Lanyon, R., Goodstein, L. *Counterproductive Index.* On: http://www.hrdpressonline.com/product_info/counterproductive_behavior.htm;
3. Popa, Marian. *Course of work psychology.* On: www.ro.scrib.com/doc/50006027/curs-de-psihologia-muncii;
4. Robinson, S., Bennett, R. (1995). *A types of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study.* In: Academy of Management Journal, nr.38 (2);
5. Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Milles, D. (2001). *Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stresors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions.* In: Journal of Vocational Behavior, nr. 59, pp. 291-309;
6. Spectror, P.E., Fox, S. (2005). *The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior.* In: Fox şi Spector (coord.) Counterproductive work behavior: investigations of actors and targets, Washington DC: APA, pp.151-176;
7. Sulea, Coralia. *Counterproductive behavior in organizations.* On: www.ohpedu.ro/articole/comportamente-contraproductive-in-organizatii/#CUPRINS. Online journal OHPEdu - Occupational Health Psihology a knowledge sparing project;
8. Warren, D. (2003), *Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations.* In: Academy of Management Review, nr.28 (4).