

Constructing counterproductive behavior for supporting environmental management system research

Tiarapuspa^{1*}, D L Indyastuti², W R Sari¹

¹Faculty of Economic and Business, Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia.

²Faculty of Economic and Business, Universitas Jendral Sudirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: tiara.puspa@trisakti.ac.id

Abstract. This study aims to explore the definition of counterproductive behavior based on supervisors' and sub ordinaries' perceptions. Recently, environmental management system is a strategic tool to gain a competitive advantage. Human resource is the vital factor for successful environmental management system. Counterproductive behavior will destroy environmental management system. Unfortunately, the construct of counterproductive behavior is still debatable. Different culture show different dimensions and indicators of counterproductive behavior. The unclear construct results ambiguous empirical evidence. This study results that many items are included of counterproductive behavior, such as come late, impolite communication, playing gadget in working time, and the other negative behaviors.

Keywords: counterproductive work behavior, environmental management system, human resource, supervisor and subordinates perceptions.

1. Introduction

Today, we are in a global environment where money, intelligence, is and products flow easily from one country to another country. In globalization era, environmental management system becomes a great issue in scientific discussion [1], [2]. For reducing global crisis, firms need implement the effective environment management system [3]. The productivity of environmental management system increase firm performance [4].

Despite of the constructing factors of effective environmental management system, there are some destructing factors of effective environmental management system. One of the vital destructing factors of effective environmental management system is counterproductive work behavior. "Green" human resource management (HRM) positively affects environmental management system. Green HRM is managing human resource that fulfills firm's current need and social at large as well as confirming the fulfillment of future need. It implies that counterproductive behavior will destroy environmental management system [5]. Although many scholars posit that counterproductive work behavior negatively effect on effective environmental management system, but the measurement and construct of counterproductive work behavior is still debatable. Different countries have different construct of counterproductive work behavior.

Counterproductive behavior is the behavior of the organization and its members. Various kinds of counterproductive work behaviors are delays, theft, sabotage, and evil in both verbal and physical forms [6]. The key characteristic of counterproductive action, the action must have a purpose and not an accident. That is, a person must have malicious intent (e.g., deliberately damaging company's



equipment), or a malicious behavior without intent (e.g. employees refuse equipment or security procedures, do the accident itself is not expected) [7]. Employees are failure to complete the job because it does not have the ability or accidents that occur even though it is safe, excluding counterproductive behavior. [8] Behavioral counterproductive work is termed differently by the researcher. Different terms are given by researchers such as counterproductive behavior, workplace deviance, and aggression at work, antisocial behavior, retaliation and violence [9], [10].

The construct of counterproductive behavior is much discussed in Western literature, such as America. Some researchers in Indonesia [11], [12], [13] also conduct counterproductive behavioral studies. These studies [14], [15], [16] show that counterproductive work behavior is an important aspect of employment in Indonesia. Nevertheless, these studies generally use counterproductive behavioral items from Western countries; do not examine the items of behavior of counterproductive work across different cultures.

2. Research Method

To get the items that are the factors of the counterproductive behavior dimension, two steps are taken. The first step of a group of Indonesian managers and supervisors was asked to mention critical events. From these steps generated various events, but has not established the dimensions of behavior. Furthermore, a group of other Indonesian managers are invited to sort the incidents of counterproductive behavior that have been done in the first step. The order is grouped into several categories. Grouping of categories based on the dimensions selection of this dimension because the dimensions of Robinson and Bennet fit the typology of Buss's typology is the most common form of classification for counterproductive behavior [10].

The process is detailed as follows, step 1, raises the behavioral counterproductive behavioral items in Indonesia. Participants for step 1 are 170 respondents who work in service and manufacture industry in Jakarta. Procedure for Step 1, participants are invited to participate in the study on a voluntary basis. Participants presented a broad definition of counterproductive behavior followed by two examples of behavior. The definition of counterproductive behavior is voluntary behavior that violates organizational norms and harms organizational well-being [10]. This information is presented to the participants in Bahasa Indonesia. Participants were then asked to describe five incidents in the workplace that behave counterproductive. Respondents write it in Indonesian. Of the 170 respondents will produce approximately 850 events of counterproductive work behavior [10].

The next three-step process is used to analyze the 850 events. First, researchers review all events. This is to ensure that the event has a clear meaning in the Indonesian language and is behavioral. Events that are ambiguous or difficult to interpret are deleted and are not analyzed further. Second, researchers review each event and are grouped according to similar behavior. Examples of organizational statistics and organization fraud scams are grouped under organizational fraud. After cleaning 850 events will be obtained behavior to be in the next analysis. Third, summarize the entire event in a single table for further analysis (Table 1 for subordinate counter-behavioral behaviors assessed by the leadership and Table 2 for counterproductive behaviors assessed by subordinates) [10].

Furthermore, the work forms of counterproductive work that have been studied will be included in the dimensions of contraproductie behavior of work. These dimensions consist of property deviance, production deviance (denial of formal prohibitions and norms adopted by companies, by doing quality and quantity of work lower than they otherwise are), political deviance (involvement in social interaction that puts individuals in Misfortune personnel or political), and personal aggression (hostility with other individuals) [10].

Step 2: aims to determine the dimensions of counterproductive behavioral items in Indonesia. Participants for step 2 are a different group of 3 managers in Indonesia and asked to do sorting tasks. Procedure for Step 2, participants are invited to participate in this step on a voluntary basis [10]. Participants presented a set of instructions in which they were asked to sort a number of incidents in different categories based on behavioral similarities. Participants were labeled behavioral categories according to the dimensions, and were asked to carefully read each behavior and place it in a category that they believed had behavioral similarities. After each participant completes the sorting task, a research assistant records the number of categories that each participant uses to sort the events of

counterproductive behavior. The information in this second step is used as the basis for the analysis. Data analysis was analyzed using qualitative descriptive analysis [10].

Data have been derived from distributing questionnaires to 170 respondents consisting of 81 respondent's questionnaires for employees who assess the leaders and 89 respondent's questionnaires for leaders who assess the employees.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the respondent.

Description	Age (years)	Working period in the organization (years)	Work period in this position (years)
<i>Respondent's questionnaires for employees who assess the leaders</i>			
N	81	81	81
Mean	39	12	6
Std. Deviation	13	10	5
<i>Respondent's questionnaires for leaders who assess the employees</i>			
N	89	89	89
Mean	30	6	4
Std. Deviation	11	7	3

Table 1 showed that the number of respondent's questionnaires for employees who assess the leader is 81 with the age average are 39 years and standard deviation 13, for the working period in the organization average are 12 years and standard deviation 10, and also for the work period in this position average are 6 years and standard deviation 5. The number of respondent's questionnaires for leaders who assess the employees is 89 with the average are 30 years and standard deviation 11, for the working period in the organization average are 6 years and standard deviation 7, and also for the work period in this position average are 4 years and standard deviation 3.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. The list of counterproductive work behaviors described for employees by leaders

Based on interviewing respondents, we get four factors that form counterproductive work behavior of employee (Table 2). First factor is Production deviance. Production deviance have 37 item. Second factor is property deviance. Property deviance have 10 items. Third factor is political deviance. Political deviance 16 items. The forth factor is personal aggression. Personal aggression have five items.

Some of the actions that often arise when dealing with Indonesian workers are: first, behaviors such as thinking or making decisions by using more feelings, with the approach of the heart, and not including logic. Second, the attitude of restraint, prominent in interpersonal relations among the Javanese, and such values are widely embraced throughout Asia. While Americans have an emotional tendency and are not afraid of conflict. Yet Indonesia has a tendency to avoid conflict. Indonesian people do not like a direct confrontation because they do not like to embarrass others. Third, get respect from others. A manager who behaves and does justice to employees is a manifestation of respect done to employees. When leaders expect employees to perform better, then it's only natural that their business is rewarded. Respect is not only done to social relations, but also to regulations in state institutions and policies. Fourth, attitude wants to be known and viewed about who he is. This is very influential when a foreign country manager negotiates. The process will run smoothly if the negotiator has previously known who he is dealing with. Fifth, the attitude of the Indonesian people who always avoid conflict, thus affecting the communication style. Indonesians are reluctant to say "no" and many say 'yes' when they mean no, because they say what others think they want to hear, and do not want to give bad news.

Table 2. Four factors that form counterproductive work behavior of employee.

<i>Counterproductive Work Behaviour</i>	
Production Deviance:	Property Deviance:
1. Come late for many reasons	1. Behavior of sabotage
2. Rest longer than the time specified	2. Office expenses without approval
3. Homework earlier than the time specified	3. Using office facilities for personal use
4. Not coming to work for no reason	4. Data manipulation
5. Postpone the job	5. Stealling
6. Work not in accordance with the SOP	6. Corruption
7. Busy with gadgets in working hours	7. Do additional work if given extra money
8. Out of office during work hours for personal matters	8. Leaking information to unauthorized parties
9. Ask for a big salary but not performance	9. Falsify receipts for personal use
10. Leave the office for longer than the specified time	10. Always negative thinking about the company
11. Playing game in working hours	
12. Joking in working hours	Political Deviance:
13. Not responsible for the work	1. Impolite communication
14. Not attending the meeting without permission	2. Not entering the meeting without permission
15. Did not clean up the laboratory	3. Ignore command of leader
16. Sleeping in working hours	4. Not attending the meeting without permission
17. Delegate tasks to other divisions	5. Telling lie
18. Do not use work uniform	6. Delegate tasks to other divisions
19. Error creating report	7. Not following regular training
20. Not following regular training	8. Did not provide a full report when representing the meeting
21. Do not close the door of air-conditioned room	9. Not much contribution in the group
22. Do not use safety clothes	10. Bribery
23. Eat in working hours	11. Illegal charges
24. Streaming YouTube in working hours	12. Hiding the problem
25. Gossip in working hours	13. Lack of communication
26. Field employees did not back to the office after the visit	14. Gratuities
27. Did not update technology	15. Not sharing information
28. Do additional work if given extra money	16. Choose your boss's favor to your subordinates
29. Document archiving is not systematic	
30. Not keeping the office clean	Personal Aggression:
31. Less careful in carrying out the work	1. Arguing with colleagues
32. Slow down the work process so that the target is not	2. Commit acts of violence to other employees
33. Lack of creativity in work	3. Affects other employees to act counterproductive as well
34. Working with no systematic	4. Behavior attacks others
35. Did not spend all his ability in duty	5. Disturbing colleagues
36. Slow in handling problem solving	
37. Doing the task is not wholehearted	

Table 2 showed that the leaders usually evaluate their employee doing counterproductive behavior which is more subtle like (didn't update technology, lack creativity). They choose these behavior because the consequence more lenient than property deviance. These phenomena also happened to leader, they choose to do behavior which addressed to action with vague consequences, such as production deviance because by doing these, they could express their dissatisfaction with the organization but without fear of being explicitly known.

3.2. The list of counterproductive work behaviors described for leaders by employee

Based on interviewing respondents, we get four factors that form counterproductive work behavior of leaders (Table 3). First factor is production deviance. Production deviance have 12 item. Second factor is property deviance. Property deviance have 5 items. Third factor is political deviance. Political deviance 20 items. The fourth factor is personal aggression. Personal aggression have 2 items.

Table 3. Four factors that form counterproductive work behavior of leaders.

<i>Counterproductive Work Behaviour</i>	
Production Deviance:	Political Deviance:
1. Coming late	1. Making policies regardless of the opinions of others
2. Homework earlier than the time specified	2. Ignoring the Deputy Director's instructions for not having too
3. Busy with gadgets in working hours	3. Less of coordination between leaders with subordinates
4. Out of office during work hours for personal matters	4. Do not appreciate the work of employees
5. Falsify receipts	5. Choose your boss's favor to your subordinates
6. Gratuities	6. Not fair in giving assignments
7. Bribery	7. Giving too many tasks without thinking about the ability to work
8. Making policies that do not comply with the rules	8. Less communication to employees
9. Conducting meetings beyond the working hours	9. Not convey information to subordinates
10. The work instructions provided are inconsistent and confusing	10. Not coordinate subordinate well
11. Violate work rules	11. Not appreciate the work and contribution of employees
12. Violate decisions already made	12. Payroll is not timely
	13. Do not know employees personally
Property Deviance:	14. Unfair in treating its employees
1. Using office facilities for personal use	15. Create an uncomfortable environment for employees who are not needed by the company
2. Data manipulation	16. Never pay attention to employee performance
3. Corruption	17. Employee salaries are rarely reviewed so that the increase is long-time
4. Often giving work out of working hours	18. Cut employee salaries
5. Provide company confidential information	19. Not guiding subordinates
	20. Forged a signature of payment to get a big turn
Personal Aggression:	
1. Angry for no reason and looking for the faults of his subordinates	
2. Often argue with employees	

Indonesia is known as the most difficult and frustrating task place. Such a situation occurs because between a foreign country, such as America has a different value with the state of Indonesia. Controlling undesirable behavior is a common characteristic of government in certain societies, including Indonesia. From the perspective of convergence theory, some counterproductive behaviors identified in Western workplaces, such as not stealing from the organization, will also occur in various cultural environments such as in Indonesia. However, from the perspective of divergence theory, people in different social and cultural contexts may have different conceptions of actions that are counterproductive behavior [11]. In other words, social and cultural contexts can form different specific information about counterproductive behavior.

Indonesia is one of the countries that uphold the law. Although Indonesia is known as a state of law, it does not mean that Indonesia is a safe, orderly, and far-away country from behaviors that deviate from the norms of the rule of law. One of the most commonly perverted behaviors is corrupt behavior. Corruption is not only money, but also time and energy. This obviously counterproductive deviant behavior is detrimental to the organization and even the state. The experience of foreign managers working in Indonesia as mentioned above provides for the development of counterproductive behavior.

Table 3 showed that the leaders who are judged by their employees are more likely to engage in counterproductive behavior, namely political deviance. This can be understood because leaders are more often faced with others. However, all forms of counterproductive behavior conducted by leaders or subordinates tend to be selected behavior of a subtle nature. For employee these process which aimed to organization referred as production deviance. Meanwhile for leader these process aimed to personal referred as political deviance.

4. Conclusion

Behavioral counterproductive work influences the planned environmental management system susceptibility. Behavioral counterproductive behavior perceived by subordinates to the leadership and perceived by the leadership of subordinates. This study still requires further research, some of which include the process of inserting the description into dimensions. The process is still using a qualitative approach, for further research using Multidimension Scalling Technique can be an alternative to sort out the description in a dimension.

References

- [1] Marcus W. 2009. Business Strategy and the Environment. *National Culture, Regulation and Country Interaction Effects on the Association of Environmental Management Systems with Environmentally Beneficial Innovation*.18:122–136
- [2] Scoot S, Katherine A D, and Jane E D. 2014. It's Not Easy Being Green: The Role of Self-Evaluations in Explaining Support of Environmental Issues. *Academy of Management Journal*. 57(1):7–37
- [3] Alin E A. 2011. Reducing The Effects of The Global Crisis on SME's by Implementing an Environmental Management System. *Economic Studies*. 4:137-140
- [4] Gustavo L, Javier G B, and Oscar G B. 2015. Business Strategy and the Environment. Input, Output, and Environmental Management Productivity: Effects on Firm Performance. 24:145-158
- [5] Marcus W. 2013. Do They Matter as Determinants of Environmental Management System Implementation? *Journal of Business Ethics 'Green' Human Resource Benefits*. 114(3):443-456
- [6] Everton W J et al, 2007. Be nice or else: understanding reasons for employee's deviant behaviors. *The Journal of Management Development*. 26(2):117.
- [7] Jennifer R, Suzanne V, and Ben E. 2011 Bullying in early adolescence and its association with anti-social behavior, criminality and violence 6 and 10 years later. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*. 21(2):117-127
- [8] Gorod B J. 2007. Rejecting 'Reasonableness': A New Look at Title VII's Anti-Retaliation Provision American University Law Review. 56(6).
- [9] Aytolan Y, and Dilek E. 2007. Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: Mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in... *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 16: 1444–1453
- [10] Maria R, and Jia L X. 2008. Understanding the domain of counterproductive work behavior in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 19(5):856-877
- [11] Christopher M B, Nichelle C C, and Clare L B. 2012. A Do other-reports of counterproductive work behaviour provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? Meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 97:613-636
- [12] Castiglione A. 2010. Counterproductive work behaviors: The role of employee support policies, envy, and narcissism. (Doctoral dissertation) Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 1493097)
- [13] Charbel J C J, and Fernando C A S. 2008. Relationships between human resource dimensions and environmental management in companies: proposal of a model. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 16:51-58
- [14] Tiarapuspa. 2015. Pengingkaran Kontrak Psikologis dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif. Unpublished Dissertation, Gajah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [15] Ariani D A 2013. The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*. 4(2):46-56
- [16] Agustin N, and Seger H. 2013. Hubungan Antara Keadilan Distributif dan Perilaku Kerja Kontraproduktif dengan Mengontrol Leader Member Exchange (LMX). *Jurnal Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi*. 2(3):183-190