

INVESTIGATING THE DETECTION OF JOB BEHAVIOR OF EMPLOYEES' ANTI-PRODUCTIVITY AND ITS INDICATORS IN FOOD INDUSTRIES COMPANIES OF ALBORZ PROVINCE

Seyed Masoud Hosseini Shorshani¹, Mohammadreza Azoji², Hossein Eftekhari³, Mehdi Abedini, Ramin Bayat⁴, Yous of Soleimani⁵, and Hosseinali Hatami Gheshlaghi⁶

Abstract: This study has done for investigating the detection of Job Behavior of employees Anti-Productivity and its Indicators in Food Industries Companies of Alborz Province. Statistical population of this research consists of employees of Food Industries Companies in Alborz Province. The sample size has consisted of 467 employees of these agencies that have selected as stratified random sampling proportional to population size. This study is applied research in terms of method and descriptive-correlation research, in terms of purpose of this study. Accordingly, a questionnaire based on dimensions of anti-productivity employment practices was used to measure the basic concepts of research. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for mentioned variables was calculated to 0.87. Also test validity of two methods, content validity and construct validity was confirmed using exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory methods and KMO index. Research final findings shows results which indicate a significant difference between these variables among men and women workers also, there was a significant different between classes, age, education and work experience, organizational position and type of employment also, results indicate a good fit of this model.

Keywords: Job Behavior, Behavior of Employees' Anti-Productivity, Food Industries Companies, Deviancy, Violence, Reciprocity.

INTRODUCTION

In today's competitive world, productivity as a philosophy and an approach based on improve strategy makes the main target of organization that can cover activities of all sections of population such a chain. According to experts' vote, so far behaviors that increase the productivity of labor in organizations have analyzed. Recently, in organizational research studies developed Favorites has created about understanding working behaviors that lead to decreased work productivity (Taheri, 2014). There is no doubt that people's everyday life generally

¹⁻⁶ Applied Science and Technology University, Khane Kargar Branch (IKID), Karaj, Alborz, Iran

and organization's life particularly seeks to increase efficiency and productivity of employees and organization that several attempts are taken in order to achieve it. In recent years, there is countless interest among organizational researchers about anti-productivity job behaviors (CWB).

Research Problem and Need For Research

Nature of counter-productive work behavior refers to behavior that is going to make detrimental impact on organization and its members. These behaviors include obvious factors such as abuse, theft or hidden factors such as intentional defeat in following training or doing wrong jobs. Improvement and development productivity needs to comprehensive planning effort and it starts by application of various criteria of efficiency in action. In planning to improve productivity it is necessary to know causes of low productivity firms initially.

Counter Productive Work Behavior

Planning to improve efficiency including improving institutional confidence and create an atmosphere of joyful work and full of balanced opportunities of career and personal development, changes in employees motivating methods and improving working conditions, improvement systems and reduce anti productivity behaviors (Abtahi, 2015). Anti-productivity employment behaviors are considered in different ways and including organizational aggression (Newman Barron, 1998), counter-productive behavior (Greenberg, 1997), violation (Hogan, 1989) and deviance. Anti-productivity behaviors such as anger or anxiety are some reactions to occupational stressors at work that stimulate negative emotional factors.

Because of severe damage to an organization which is caused by anti-productivity operation, it is important that anti-productivity functions are not too concerned. Some decisions must be made to reduce the risk of potential losses resulting from productivity performance in the workplace.

Theoretical Foundations and Research Background

Counter-productive Job behavior include intentional actions that tends to harm organization and other organizations' personnel, such as customers, partners and sponsors which is considered in different ways that including organizational aggression (Newman Barron, 1998, Specter and Fox 1999), anti-social behavior (Greenberg, 1997), deviancy (Holinger 1986, Robinson 1995). (CWB) is defined anti-productivity employment behavior as intentional actions which damage organizations or people in organizations (Specter and Fox 2005). According to Specter et al CWB (2006) can be divided to 5 dimensions including abuse and rape, behavioral digression, sabotage, theft and subversion. This operation can be in various forms such as aggression, behavioral digression, retaliation and revenge

(Saket & Diver, 2010, Specter and Fox, 2015, Verdi & wise, 2004) that this represents force of CWB in different rates. Some terminologies are used for CWB such as sabotage in workplace (Robinson & Benet, 1995), personnel's sabotage (Varen, 2003), organizational misuse (Varen, 2013) and violence in workplace (Kortina, 2014). Robinson and Benet have offered CWB can be different base on its goal and goal of CWB goal is organizational (CWB-O) or individual (CWB-I). CWB-O can be divided into production CWB and property CWB (Mikolay et al., 2011). While CWB-I can be considered as negative impact of performance on organization and individuals as Dalal (2015) and Rotondo & Saket (2012) have pointed to it.

The main feature of anti-efficiency job behaviors is that action should be targeted (deliberately and not accidentally). This is the reason of such behavior which employee decides to do and this behaviors tendency to injure basically or its damage is of action

Counter Productive Work Behavior

Poor performance is not a trend (employee attempts but doesn't have enough skills to influence); it is not counter-productive behavior because aim is not working properly. If the person did not attempt to run the target and did not hurt organization, this is not anti- productivity. Actions are considered to be part of the anti- productivity that employee deliberately avoided equipment or secure procedures thus behavior must be such that damage to the person and also damaging be unwanted.

Dimension of Anti-productivity Jobs Behavior

1. **Violence:** It is a term that refers to forms of aggression including acts of physical violence as well as rape, robbery and pushes that to be classified as a crime. Robbery may be violent but it is not as aggressive. Because victims is damaged physically in more burglary but it is located merely about the threat. Also, shoot down with a gun is as a violent act Even if victims are not harm physically. Aggressive is among behaviors that cause serious damage to the organization's goals and Specter was the first person that defined aggressive as anti-productivity behavior.
2. **Reciprocity (Reprise):** It is a behavior in response to organizational injustice which is going to flog part or parts that are cause of it. Sometimes positive social function is used as an adjunct to set interpersonal behavior but the threat of revenge can prevent anti- productivity employment behavior and other negative behaviors directly to the people. Revenge with the conduct of anti-productivity jobs cover anti-productivity behaviors but can take other actions that may be harmful to people or organizations.

3. **Deviancy:** It is a voluntary behavior that includes affront to norms of organization and damaging agents to organization or its employees. Our norm is defined by prominent organizations management and our standard and rule are determined by formal and informal policies. Deviancy separate of aggression, retaliation and revenge so there is no motivation measure for behavior. For example cause of damaging (aggression and retaliation).
4. **Rude behavior:** is a behavior of mild forms interpersonal behavior with an important intention for harming in terms of communication. This includes heartless and rude behaviors but it is not purely verbal (linguistic) that can be traumatic. Anderson and Pearson 1999 recognize incivility clearly of related buildings. They have pointed to a mild violence and don't related discourtesy to the motives of perpetrator or norms (Marison, 2013).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research from the perspective of method is of descriptive studies from correlation; from the perspective of the purpose is applied research, in terms of data collection methods is survey.

Statistical Population

The research included 467 individuals from official personnel in Food Industries Companies of Alborz Province who have diploma or higher certificate. The used sampling method is simple random sampling that every member of the community for being selected as a subject has equal and determined chance. The statistical sample size on the basis of the following formula has been estimated for about 139 people that sample number was increased to 250 people to remove the effects of missing and incomplete questionnaire and unanswered response case by respondent to research's results that after distribution, 215 questionnaires were collected for analysis.

$$N = \frac{NZ_{\alpha/2}^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{(N-1) \cdot \epsilon^2 + Z_{\alpha/2}^2 \cdot p \cdot q} = \frac{467 \times 1.96^2 (0.5)(0.5)}{(467-1)(0.070)^2 + (1.96)^2 (0.5)(0.5)} = 139$$

Data Collection Instrument and its Validity and Reliability

In this study, the main instrument of assessment is questionnaire which includes two general questions and specific questions that form its sex, education and work experience, organizational posts, type of employment, age and general questions. Second section consists of 21 questions that assessment of violence, aggression, barbarous and rude deals.

Reliability and Validity of the Questionnaire

The reliability coefficient of questionnaire was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient that is equal to 0.87. University professors and professionals idea was used in order to test the questionnaire content validity and make sure that questionnaire analysis the desired characteristics of research.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Investigating differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on demographic data

Investigating differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on sex

H₀: Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on sex are equal

H₁: Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on sex aren’t equal

Table 1
t test of dependent samples to investigate differences in the perceptions of employees based on sex in association with anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>T Statistics</i>	<i>Freedom Degree</i>	<i>Significant Level (Sig)</i>																																																				
Counter-productive work behaviors	Man	168	1.193	0.291	0.022	-0.097	213	0.923																																																				
	Woman	47	1.198	0.333	0.049				Violence	Man	168	1.405	0.519	0.04	-0.364	213	0.716	Woman	47	1.436	0.538	0.078	Aggression	Man	168	1.119	0.277	0.021	-0.002	213	0.998	Woman	47	1.119	0.319	0.047	Incivility	Man	168	1.166	0.365	0.028	-0.18	213	0.857	Woman	47	1.177	0.473	0.069	Rude behavior	Man	168	1.14	0.304	0.023	0.326	213	0.745	Woman
Violence	Man	168	1.405	0.519	0.04	-0.364	213	0.716																																																				
	Woman	47	1.436	0.538	0.078				Aggression	Man	168	1.119	0.277	0.021	-0.002	213	0.998	Woman	47	1.119	0.319	0.047	Incivility	Man	168	1.166	0.365	0.028	-0.18	213	0.857	Woman	47	1.177	0.473	0.069	Rude behavior	Man	168	1.14	0.304	0.023	0.326	213	0.745	Woman	47	1.124	0.249	0.036										
Aggression	Man	168	1.119	0.277	0.021	-0.002	213	0.998																																																				
	Woman	47	1.119	0.319	0.047				Incivility	Man	168	1.166	0.365	0.028	-0.18	213	0.857	Woman	47	1.177	0.473	0.069	Rude behavior	Man	168	1.14	0.304	0.023	0.326	213	0.745	Woman	47	1.124	0.249	0.036																								
Incivility	Man	168	1.166	0.365	0.028	-0.18	213	0.857																																																				
	Woman	47	1.177	0.473	0.069				Rude behavior	Man	168	1.14	0.304	0.023	0.326	213	0.745	Woman	47	1.124	0.249	0.036																																						
Rude behavior	Man	168	1.14	0.304	0.023	0.326	213	0.745																																																				
	Woman	47	1.124	0.249	0.036																																																							

Based on listed results in Table (1) and test results, it can be seen that according to Sig>α=0.05 to evaluate the efficiency of anti-productivity job behavior and its dimensions there was no significant difference between those based on gender, in other words men and women perspective has been same in relation to the suitability of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions.

Investigate differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on age

H_0 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on age are equal

H_1 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on age aren't equal

Table 2
Variance analysis of to investigate differences in the perceptions of employees based on age in association with anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions

Variable	Changes	Mean square	F-Statistic	Sig
Counter-productive Work behaviors	Between-group	0.052	0.571	0.635
	Within the group	0.09		
	Total			
Violence	Between-group	0.21	0.767	0.514
	Within group	0.273		
	Total			
Aggression	Between-group	0.04	0.48	0.697
	Within the group	0.082		
	Total			
Incivility	Between-group	0.086	0.564	0.640
	Within the group	0.153		
	Total			
Rude behavior	Between-group	0.047	0.551	0.648
	Within the group	0.086		
	Total			

Results according to $Sig > \alpha = 0.05$ shows there was no significant difference between the views of employees according to age. In other words employee's views are same regarding the appropriate amount of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions.

Investigate differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on education

H_0 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on education are equal

H_1 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on education aren't equal

Table 3
Variance analysis of investigating differences in the perceptions of employees based on education in association with anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Changes</i>	<i>Mean square</i>	<i>F-Statistic</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Counter-productive Work behaviors	Between-group	0.083	0.927	0.449
	Within the group	0.09		
	Total			
Violence	Between-group	0.889	3.41	0.01
	Within group	0.261		
	Total			
Aggression	Between-group	0.042	0.513	0.726
	Within the group	0.83		
	Total			
Incivility	Between-group	0.057	0.373	0.828
	Within the group	0.154		
	Total			
Rude behavior	Between-group	0.026	0.298	0.879
	Within the group	0.087		
	Total			

Results according Sig< α =0.05 to (except violence) show there was no significant difference between the views of employees according to education and in the table below violence rating based education has been shown.

Table 4
Comparison violence base on education

<i>Education</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Violence</i>	
		<i>Average</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Under Diploma	9	1.167	1
Diploma	24	1.646	2
Associate degree	43	1.314	5
License	108	1.366	4
Master's degree or higher	31	3.597	3
Total	215	1.412	

According to Table (4) to compare violence under diploma grade has the heights rank with an average of (1.1667) and associate's degree grade has the lowest rank with an average of (1.3140).

Investigate differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on employment type

H_0 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on employment type are equal

H_1 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on employment type aren't equal

Table 5
Variance analysis of investigating differences in the perceptions of employees based on employment type in association with anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Changes</i>	<i>Mean square</i>	<i>F Statistic</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Counter-productive Work behaviors	Between-group	0.082	0.914	0.435
	Within the group	0.09		
	Total			
Violence	Between-group	0.105	0.382	0.766
	Within group	0.275		
	Total			
Aggression	Between-group	0.136	1.675	0.174
	Within the group	0.081		
	Total			
Incivility	Between-group	0.166	1.092	0.353
	Within the group	0.152		
	Total			
Rude behavior	Between-group	0.083	0.976	0.405
	Within the group	0.085		
	Total			

Results according to to $Sig > \alpha = 0.05$ show there was no significant difference between the views of employees according to employment type. In other words employee's views are same regarding the appropriate amount of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions.

Investigate differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on years of service:

H₀: Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on years of service are equal

H₁: Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on years of service aren't equal

Table 6
Variance analysis of investigating differences in the perceptions of employees based on years of service in association with anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Changes</i>	<i>Mean square</i>	<i>F-Statistic</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Counter-productive Work behaviors	Between-group	0.154	1.726	0.163
	Within the group	0.089		
	Total			
Violence	Between-group	0.451	1.672	0.174
	Within group	0.27		
	Total			
Aggression	Between-group	0.116	1.423	0.237
	Within the group	0.081		
	Total			
Incivility	Between-group	0.172	1.13	0.338
	Within the group	0.152		
	Total			
Rude behavior	Between-group	0.223	2.672	0.048
	Within the group	0.083		
	Total			

Results according to Sig$\alpha=0.05$ (except rude behavior) show there was no significant difference between the views of employees according to years of service and in the table below rude behavior rating based on years of service have been shown.

Table 7
Comparison rude behavior based on years of service

<i>Years of service</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Under 5 years	57	1.137	2
5 to 15 years	126	1.122	3
15 to 25 years	22	1.28	1
25 to 30 years	10	1	4
Total	215	1.136	–

According to Table 7 to compare rude behavior, 15 to 25 years of service has the heights rank with an average of (1.2803) and 25 to 30 years of service has the lowest rank with an average of (1).

Investigate differences in anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on organizational posts

H_0 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on organizational posts are equal

H_1 : Average rates of anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions based on organizational posts aren't equal

Table 8
Variance analysis of investigating differences in the perceptions of employees based on organizational posts in association with anti-productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Changes</i>	<i>Mean square</i>	<i>F Statistic</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Counter-productive Work behaviors	Between-group	0.114	10276	0.27
	Within the group	0.089		
	Total			
Violence	Between-group	0.095	1.083	0.373
	Within group	0.272		
	Total			
Aggression	Between-group	0.162	2.041	0.062
	Within the group	0.08		
	Total			

Incivility	Between-group	0.0161	1.06	0.388
	Within the group	0.152		
	Total			
Rude behavior	Between-group	0.124	1.469	0.190
	Within the group	0.084		
	Total			

Results according to $\text{Sig} > \alpha = 0.05$ show there was no significant difference between the views of employees according to organizational posts. In other words employees views according to organizational posts are same regarding the appropriate amount of anti- productivity jobs behavior and its dimensions.

CONCLUSION

Test results showed that there is no significant different between average of anti-productivity behavior between male and female and age and type of employment and organizational posts and significant different was seen in education and work experience of each after counter- productive behavior. According to the results that were obtained after violence (Table 5) violence in diploma educational level has the highest rank and in associate's degree has the lowest rank also, rude behavior (Table 8) in 15-25 years of service has the highest rank and in 25-30 years of service has the lowest rank. Since most anti-productivity functions are hidden from view calculate impact of these strategies in organization is a difficult work. Although some differences in the absence of work, customer complaints and allegations of theft in some areas may be considered, employment people with a conscience reduce vacation possibility and their absence at work. If workers have had less anti-productive performance it is more likely that customers receive better quality services and this in turn leads to a reduction in customer complaints. Also, if the account number and store does not increase, theft is possibly. Nowadays, integrity tests and non-structural calculations are always done and their use is simple and inexpensive. Using various methods of recruitment will increase possibility of people who willing to perform the functions of anti- productivity. Effect of these employment methods will be seen in the quality of personnel employed. When evaluating these strategies, profit and loss should be account, in other words more damage will occur if there is no action for prevent anti-productivity performance relative to the implementing cost of any changes. Since the test of integrity aren't suitable job performance and anti-productivity performance. Use these suggestions is helpful for selecting applicants quality.

References

- Abtahi, S. H. (2015). *Human Resource Management*. Management Education and Research Institute, Third Edition.
- Anitsal, I. (2010), "Technology-Based Self-Service: From customer productivity toward Customer value", Doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Anselmsson, J. (2014), Customer perceived service quality and technology-based Self-service, Doctoral dissertation, Lund University, Lund Business Press.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3): 349-360. Doi: 1037/0021-9010.85.3.349.
- Dabholkar, P.A., Bobbitt, L.M., and Lee, E.J., (2013), "Understanding Consumer Motivation and Behavior Related to Self-Scanning in Retailing: Implications for Strategy and Research on Technology-Based Self-Service," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 14(1); 59-95.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2014). A model of work frustration aggression. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 20(1): 915-931.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. & Miles, D. (2015). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: some mediator and moderators tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 59(2): 291-309.
- Holinger, H. (1999). Workplace bullying. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chichester, UK : John Wiley.
- Kelley, S.W., Donnelly J, J.H., Skinner, S.J. (2012), "Customer participation in service production and delivery", *Journal of Retailing* 66(3): 315-35.
- Marison, D. (2013). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Hournal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 444-453.
- 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(1): 391-419.
- Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors : A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1): 100-108.
- Sackett, P. R., & Gross, C. J. (2011). Counterproductive behavior at work. Handbook of industrial. *Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 1(2): 145-164.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2015). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds). *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets*, Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association : 157-174.
- Taheri, Shahnam (2014), *Productivity and its analysis in organizations*, Hastan Publishing, Tehran.
- Warren, R., & Plunkett, M., & Raymon, F.A. (1997). *Management oho*: South-western College Publishing, 2(1): 20-26.