

Impact the Antisocial Behaviors on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Abdulfatah Salem Saadi

Abstract- The importance of moral behavior to a corporation has ne'er been more apparent, and in recent years researchers have generated an excellent deal of knowledge about the management of individual moral behavior in organizations. we review this literature and attempt to give a coherent portrait of the current state of the field. we discuss individual, group, and organizational influences and consider gaps in current knowledge and obstacles that limit our understanding. we tend to conclude by providing directions for future research on behavioral ethics in organizations. The organization needs to develop its human resources in a way that can build a high level of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Antisocial Behaviors and organization commitment can become an important factor affecting OCB. The aim of this study is to spot the There is relationship between Antisocial Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB). The samples were derived from a survey using thirty items questionnaire distributed to the two hundred workers. All respondents hold positions in faculties and organizational. The results of the regression analysis showed that there is a statistically significant effect of the behavior of the variables that are directed to the behavior of the organization and the employee in the behavior on the anti-social behaviors. This indicates that whenever the employee's works are good and the staff's morals are excellent, the work will succeed.

Index Terms— Antisocial Behaviors, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

I. INTRODUCTION

The most important and the greatest resource of any organization, especially any science-based organization, is its humanitarian resource that affects other investments of the organization. One of the problems of today's organizations is the existence of behaviors such as work avoidance, aggression, oppression, obstinacy, intimidation, and revenge. These behaviors affect both the performance of the organization and interpersonal relations and the cooperative sense of workers. These kinds of behaviors are considered as anti-citizenship behaviors (ACB) and are in contrary to organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) that lead to improvement of performance an effectiveness of organizations, satisfaction and faithfulness of clients, social interest, etc (Bolino et al., 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Yoon and Suh, 2003). ACB can act as obstacles on the way of the performance of organizations (Ball et al., 1994), lead to a decrease of income or damage of its credit, and have negative consequences for the society. While in the private section, dismissing workers, losing clients, a bankruptcy of weak institutions are considered as negative consequences of ACB. The appearance of ACB in organizations and public institutions- because of their importance and enormity- may cause a more serious crisis. The commonality of ACB among

workers of organizations that should normally be trusted by people will damage public trust and will interrupt the public functions of these organizations. Therefore, it is necessary to find out the reasons behind ACB in order to be able to control them. Organization performance considered an important aspect. In order to achieve its goals, the organization needs to serve better products or services to their customers. The competition to gain the market is intense. The company needs its human resources as its new strategy to gain a competitive advantage. They want their employees to perform well at all times in their job. They also need employees who willing to contribute more and perform extra-role behaviors to help the organization become more effective. The extra-role behaviors also known as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as defined by Organ & Lingl [1] as an individual contribution that neither contractually rewarded nor enforceable by supervision or job requirements. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of Antisocial Behaviors on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors OCB.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The performance of the organization depends on the behavior of its employees or workers while they are working individually or collectively, thus contributing to the reduction of anti-social behavior. The study problem can be summed up in the following question:

Are the good behaviors of individual and group workers affect the behavior of the community?

III. AIMS

Stakeholders exert increased pressure on organizations to manage staff behavior in ways that reduce the illegal and immoral behavior of individuals. Two decades ago, researchers focused more attention on the socio-scientific study of ethical and immoral behavior in organizations and produced a range of useful and useful research. This ethical and behavioral research paper aims to provide an integrated picture of much of this work and to identify future research trends.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

While ACB leads to the loss of millions of dollars annually (Pearce and Giacalone, 2003), studies recently done on ACB are not comprehensive. After the appearance of the concept of ACB in the management language, Ball, Trevino, and Sims (1994) have defined it as a misbehavior that decreases the output of work; also some terms such as aggression (Neuman and Barron, 1998), antisocial behavior (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997), counterproductive work behavior (CWB) (Fox et al., 1999), delinquency (Hogan and Hogan, 1989), retaliation (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997), revenge (Bies at al., 1997), and deviance (Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Hollinger, 1986) are used to describe ACB. The researchers

working in this field have found out that these behaviors may include a vast continuum of reactions such as problem-making, theft, revenge, fighting, aggression or even fun making (Pearce and Giacalone, 2003). In many cases, improper behavior is in contrast to proper citizenship behavior. For example, citizenship behavior due to work conscientiousness will become more evident when it is observed in contrast to work avoidance, being absent and having a delay (Spector and Fox, 2002). But it is so important to be aware that ACB is not the low level of citizenship behavior. It is in accordance with Puffer's idea that ACB is not the opposing point of positive aspects of social behaviors and is not necessarily considered as deviant behaviors (Mackenzie et al., 1998). Studies on ACB mainly have focused on the damaging effects of these behaviors on the operation of trading organizations. For example, in the language of the buyer-seller, the behavior, and manner of seller affects the process of trading (Crosby et al., 1990; Dwyer et al., 1987; Ramsey and Sohi, 1997). The concept of ACB has been also used under different names. Although these concepts do not totally overlap but the extent of similarities between them is interesting. We will provide a brief description of such terms used in the literature representing ACB Employee deviance behavior- Robinson and Bennett (2001) consider the abnormal behavior of employees as an optional act that violates the important organizational norms and threatens the credit of an organization, its members, or both. They have made a difference between the abnormal and the unethical behavior of employees. In their opinion abnormality defines those behaviors that violate organizational norms, while unethical behaviors violate the laws and traditions of a society. Authors have also proposed a bilateral type of workplace behavior: "non-important" against "seriously important" and "interpersonal" against "organizational" (Robinson and Bennette, 2001). Anti-social behavior- Giacalone and Greenberg (1997) define anti-social behavior as a behavior that brings damage to the organization, employees, and stakeholders. Some of the anti-social behaviors can be named as follows: arson, blackmail, bribery, discrimination, espionage, extortion, fraud, kickback, lying, sabotage, theft, violations of confidentiality and violence. This definition includes the behaviors inside and outside the organization and also the behaviors that bring damage to individuals and organizations (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997). Dysfunctional behavior- Griffin et al., (1998) believe that dysfunctional behavior in organizations causes negative consequences for individuals and organizations. This conceptual framework includes behaviors that based on their purpose are functional and dysfunctional. These behaviors can be divided into two general groups: behaviors that directly damage individuals or groups' behaviors. It is clear that so many dysfunctional behaviors may finally damage both individual and organization, but the fact that which group receives more damage is the base of this division. As can be seen the behaviors related to outside of organizations are not included in this division. Also, the separating lines of this division are not clear; for example, some behaviors such as unsafe working acts may be included in more than one group. Workplace aggression- In the current literature, aggression in the workplace, considering individuals attempt to damage the others, is defined in a vast continuum of diverse and surprising behaviors (Baron and Richardson, 1994). Baron introduces aggression in the workplace three

stages: (1) non-cooperation, dissemination of rumours, ill-speaking, continuation of struggle, and using insulting and abusive words; (2) serious argument with supervisors, colleagues, and clients, sabotage, threatening, and hurting other people's feelings; (3) showing anger through threatening to suicide, fighting, destroying belongings, using weapon, murder, raping, and inflaming (Baron, 1994). Other terms that likewise describe negative behaviors are: "retaliation" as a revengeful behavior with damaging consequences (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997), "Revenge" as a kind of behavior with permanent and long-term damage for the interests of others (Bies et al., 1997); "noncompliant behavior" as a kind of behavior that leads to violation of existing norms and regulations (Puffer, 1987); "workplace incivility behavior" as a kind of deviant behavior with vague intention and a little force for harming others (e.g. impoliteness and showing indifference towards others) (Andersson and Pearson, 1999) Many job attitude aspects can be traced from the social exchange, conservation of resources (COR), and affective events theory. The interaction between employee, supervisor, and organization consists of the exchange process. Homans (Homans, G.C. (1958).) argued that the interaction between person includes the exchange of goods, whether material or non-materials. While Emerson (Emerson, R.M. (1976).) confirmed that social exchange as an action that contingent on rewarding reactions from others. When one person felt gaining benefit from what they do, they will repeat the action. The more employees feel that they satisfied with their job the more likely they are committed and perform better. They are even willing to do more than they asked because they feel like doing it. It can be said, when the organization showed a positive action, such action can drive employees to reciprocate in mutual ways (Organ, D.W., Ryan, K. (1995).). Many job attitude aspects can be traced from the social exchange, conservation of resources (COR), and affective events theory. The interaction between employee, supervisor, and organization consists of the exchange process. Homans (Homans, G.C. (1958)) argued that the interaction between person includes the exchange of goods, whether material or non-materials. While Emerson (Emerson, R.M. (1976).) confirmed that social exchange as an action that contingent on rewarding reactions from others. When one person felt gaining benefit from what they do, they will repeat the action. The more employees feel that they satisfied with their job the more likely they are committed and perform better. They are even willing to do more than they asked because they feel like doing it. It can be said, when the organization showed a positive action, such action can drive employees to reciprocate in mutual ways (Organ, D.W., Ryan, K. (1995).). The theory of COR from Hobfoll (Hobfoll, S.E. (1989) viewed that people strive to collect, protect, and develop resources. The loss of potential loss of the resources considered threatening. The application of COR theory in work attitudes and performance is very clear. Individual needs to gain resources (money, self-esteem) and in the meantime, they sacrifice the other resources (time, energy). And usually, both cannot meet the ideal conditions where they can achieve balance. Employees should juggle between the effort to gain resources and the effort to protect the loss of resources. COR can explain why employees become satisfied and more committed and willing to do more. To understand the model, we continue this literature review by providing basic explanation about job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB. We use

the definition of job satisfaction from Uhl-Bien et al (Richard N. (2014).) which explained as an attitude that reflects the individual positive and negative feelings towards their job. It is clear that the definition reflects what employees perceive about their job. As for the organizational commitment, hold on to definition from Schermerhorn et al (Hunt, J.G. (2012).) which defined commitment as the degree of loyalty from individual toward the organization. Organizational commitment is a continuous employee's attitude towards the organization. Schermerhorn et al(Hunt, J.G. (2012).) also emphasized that highly committed employees will likely identify themselves with the organization. Robbins & Judge (Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2013).) explained the OCB as the discretionary behavior which is not part of their formal job description. The explanation clearly shows the relation between OCB and the employee's internal motivation.

V. METHODOLOGY

Participants and Measurement

The survey was conducted . We used 200 employees , we used five-point Likert scale which ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) was used. Procedures we used the SPSS program

VI. HYPOTHESES

Conceptual framework and hypotheses

In Weiner's (1982) model, a commitment was viewed as the totality of these internalized beliefs and was responsible for behaviors that; (a) reflect personal sacrifice made for the sake of the organization, (b) do not depend primarily on reinforcements or punishments, and (c) indicate a personal preoccupation with the organization. Because these are characteristics that could be used to describe OCB, additional support is provided for commitment being an antecedent of OCB. The first component, AC, refers to the employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Many studies proved that there is a positive correlation between AC and intra-role performance (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). AC was also regarded as an important factor for predicting extra-role behaviors, such as OCB (Scholl, 1981; Wiener, 1982). O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) found that AC could significantly predict OCBO. Both Steer (1977) and Angle and Perry (1981) found similar results. From the empirical cases, McFarlane and Wayne (1993) also found that there was a significant correlation between AC and OCB. However, some studies attained different research results; e.g. Williams and Anderson (1991) found that there was no relationship between OC (including AC and NC) and OCB. In addition, Shore and Wayne (1993) indicated that there was a correlation between AC and OCB, but it was insignificant. Although past studies did not have consistent conclusions with respect to the relationship between AC and IRB, OCBI, and OCBO, most of the studies still believed that AC has a positive influence on these three dimensions. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H0 : There is a positive relationship between Antisocial Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

H1: There is no relationship between Antisocial Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

VII. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data collected and entered the SPSS program were analyzed using statistical measures such as descriptive statistics, factors analysis, reliability analysis and regression analysis as shown in the tables below

VIII. TABLE OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The simple regression analysis shows that there is a statistically significant effect at the level of ($p \leq 0.05$) independent variable. If the value of T (3.437) is denoted at the level of significance .000 the value of R is considered to be a strong relationship between the variable $R = 0.237$ and the independent variable is explained 64.4 % of the variation in the level of positive satisfaction based on the value of 2 and thus reject the hypothesis as nihilistic

model	B	beta	T	sig	R	R2
Constant						
X	.506	.237	3.437	.001	.237	.052

ANOVA

The results of Table 1 show that the value of F (15.589) and the level of significance of .000 Since the level of significance is less than the level of significance used ($P \leq 0.05$) it shows this on the validity of the form to test

model	Sum square	DF	Mean square	F	sig
Regression	11.345	3	3.782	15.589	.000
Residual	47.547	196	.243		
Total	58.893	199			

The table shows the majority of the survey are married 69% and male 69% and for the age are from 46 and over 41% Education graduate is the majority 45% the Specialized Employee is the majority 77% while year of experience from 11 to 14 is the majority 26.5% the Years of work in this field from 15 and over 35.5%

Items		frequency	Percentage %
Marital -status	Married	138	69
	Single	62	31
Gender	Man	138	69
	Women	62	31
Age	25 and less	10	5
	26 to35	48	24
	36 to45	60	30
	46 and over	82	41
Education	Master	0	0
	Secondary school	0	0

Impact the Antisocial Behaviors on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

	High school	2	1	problems and worries					
	College	45	22						
	Faculty	45	22						
	Graduate	90	45						
	Doctors	63	31						
Specialized	Administrator	46	23	5- Goes out of way to help new employees	.319				
	Employees	154	77	6- Takes a personal interest in other employees	.237				
Years of experience	From 0 to 3	1	0.5	7- Passes along information to co-workers	.171				
	From 4 to 6	42	21						
	From 7 to 10	52	26						
	From 11 to 14	53	26.5						
	From 15 and over	52	26						
Years of work in this field	From 0 to 3	9	4.5	F2. behaviors directed at an organization					
	From 4 to 6	29	14.5						
	From 7 to 10	48	24						
	From 11-14	43	21.5						
	From 15 and over	71	35.5						

The results of factor analysis showed the effect of anti-social behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors, behaviors directed at specific individuals, behaviors directed at an organization, Employee in-role behaviors (IRB), Antisocial Behaviors.

Other Factors Affecting Institutional Decision	Factor Loads	Core Values	Cronbach's Alpha	KMO value	Variance Open Or (%)						
F1. behaviors directed at specific individuals			.737								
1. Helps others who have been absent	3.265	3.265		.765	73.072	1. Attendance at work is above the norm	3.027	3.027	.675	.751	74.732
2- Helps others who have heavy work loads	1.850	1.850				2. Gives advance notice when unable to come to work	1.176	1.176	1.176		
3. Assists supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)	.683					3- Takes undeserved work breaks (R)	1.029	1.029	1.029		
4. Takes time to listen to co-workers'	.475					4- Great deal of time spent with personal conversations (R)	.712	.712	.712		
						5- Complains about insignificant things at work (R)	.483	.483	.483		
			6- Conserves and protects organizational property	.311	.311	.311					
			7- Adheres to informal rules devised to maintain	.262	.262	.262					

order					
F4. Employee in-role behaviors (IRB).					
1. Adequately completes assigned duties	4.718	4.718	.864	.871	67.407
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description	.980				
3. Performs tasks that are expected of him/her	.501				
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job	.272				
5- Engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance	.220				
6- Neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform (R)	.187				
7- Fails to perform essential duties (R)	.121				

F5 Antisocial Behaviors					
1- Damaged property belonging to my employer	5.163	5.163	.860	.895	69.079
2- Said or did something to purposely hurt someone at work	1.054	1.054			
3- Did work badly, incorrectly, or slowly on purpose	.917				

4- Gripped with co-workers	.601				
5- Deliberately bent or broke a rule(s)	.365				
6- Criticized people at work	.301				
7- Did something that harmed my employer or boss	.233				
8-Started an argument with someone at work	.196				
9- Said rude things about my supervisor or organization	.170				

According to the test results, the KMO values of the factors were .765, .751, .871 and .895 It was found. Thus, the results of the factor analysis to be applied to the will be available. Factor load greater than 0.5 and an eigenvalue greater than 1 indicating that the expressions are suitable for use in the analysis. Cronbach alpha coefficient for each factor was found to be (0.737, 0.675, 0.864 and 0.860) . The variance explanation ratio for each factor is (73.072 % 74.732%, 67.407%, and 69.79).

CONCLUSION

The results of the regression analysis showed that there is a statistically significant effect of the behavior of the variables that are directed to the behavior of the organization and the employee in the behavior on the anti-social behaviors. This indicates that whenever the employees's works are good and the staff's morals are excellent, the work will be succeed

REFERENCES

- [1] Andersson, L.M. & C.M. Pearson (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 452-471.
- [2] Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K. & Sims Jr., H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(2), 299.
- [3] Baron, R. A. (1994). The physical environment of work settings: Effects on task performance, interpersonal relations, and job satisfaction. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 16, (pp.1-46). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- [4] Baron, R. A. & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human aggression* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum.
- [5] Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M. & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations*, (pp. 18–36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [6] Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H. and Bloodgood, J.M. (2002), Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 5-522.
- [7] Brown, T. J., Mowen, J.C., Donavan, T. & Licata, J.W. (2002). The customer orientation of service
- [8] Crosby, L. A., Evans, K. R. & Cowles, D. (1990). Relationship quality in services selling: An interpersonal influence perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(3), 68.
- [9] Clarkeburn, H. 2002. A test for ethical sensitivity in science. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(4): 439-453.
- [10] Emerson, R.M. (1976). "Social Exchange Theory". *Annual Review of Sociology* 2: pp.335–362.
- [11] Fox, S., Spector, P. E. & Miles, D. (1999). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: the moderator effect of autonomy and emotion traits. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta (April-May).
- [12] Giacalone, R. A. & Greenberg, J. (Eds.) (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Vol. 2, No. 4 *International Business Research* 84
- [13] Griffin, R.W., A. O'Leary-Kelly. & J. Collins. (1998). Dysfunctional work behavior in organizations. In C.L. Cooper and D.M. Rousseau (Eds.) *Trends in organizational behavior*. Vol 5. John Wiley & Sons.
- [14] Hogan, J. & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 273–279.
- [15] Hunt SD, Wood VR, Chonko LB (1989). Corporate ethical values and organizational commitment in marketing. *J. Mark.*, 53: 79-90.
- [16] Homans, G.C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 63, No. 6, pp.597-606.
- [17] Hobfoll, S.E. (1989). Conservation of Resources: A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp.513-524.
- [18] MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance, *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 87.
- [19] Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets, *Journal of Management*, 24, 391–419.
- [20] Organ, D.W., Ryan, K. (1995). A Meta-Analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organization Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, pp.775-802
- [21] Pearce, C. L. & Giacalone, R.A. (2003). Teams Behaving Badly: Factors Associated With Anti-
- [22] Citizenship Behavior in Teams, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(1), 58-75.
- [23] Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555–572.
- [24] Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*, 15th edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- [25] Skarlicki, D. P. & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434.