

THE SOUTH EAST ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT

April 2011 • Vol.V • No.1

**Productivity Spillovers from Foreign Direct Investment:
What If Productivity is No Longer a Black Box?**

Tran Toan Thang

**Government Financial Management, Strategy for
Preventing Corruption in Indonesia**

Haryono Umar

**Relationship between Organizational Justice Perception
and Engagement in Deviant Workplace Behavior**

Muhammad Irfan Syaebani and Riani Rachmawati Sobri

**Intellectual Capital: A Focus on Human Capital Reporting
Practices of Top Malaysian Listed Companies**

Norhayati Mat Husin, Norrmala Ahmad, and Raedah Sapongi

**The Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility Activity
toward Customer Loyalty through Improvement of Quality
of Life in Urban Area**

Tengku Ezni Balqiah, Hapsari Setyowardhani, and Khairani

SEAM

Vol. V

Issue 1

Pages
001 - 090

Depok
April 2011

ISSN
1978-1989

THE SOUTH EAST ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT

Editor in Chief

Sari Wahyuni, *Universitas Indonesia*

Vice Editor

Rofikoh Rokhim, *Universitas Indonesia and Bisnis Indonesia Intelligence Unit*

Managing Editor

Arief Wibisono Lubis

Layout and Typesetting

Shafruddin Nusantara

Administration

Angtyasti Jiwasiddi

REVIEWER

Preet S. Aulakh,

York University, Canada

Adith Cheosakul,

Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Luchien Karsten,

University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Felix Mavondo,

Monash University, Australia

Cornelius B. Pratt,

Temple University, United States

Vivien T. Supangco,

University of the Philippines

Ma. Gloria Talavera,

University of the Philippines

F.X. Bambang Wiharto,

Universitas Indonesia

Albert Wijaya,

Universitas Indonesia

Gunawan Alif,

Universitas Indonesia

Anees Jane Ali Hamid,

Universiti Sains Malaysia

Yanki Hartijasti,

Universitas Indonesia

Hanny Nasution,

Monash University, Australia

Handri Satriago,

Universitas Indonesia

Aryana Satrya,

Universitas Indonesia

Lily Sudhartio,

Universitas Indonesia

Anton Wachidin Widjaja,

Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya University

The South East Asian Journal of Management (ISSN 1978-1989) aims to present the latest thinking and research that test, extends, or builds management theory and contributes to management practice. All empirical methods -- including, but not limited to, qualitative, quantitative, field, laboratory, and combination methods -- are welcome.

Published twice a year (April and October) by:

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Indonesia, Depok 16424 Indonesia.

Phone: +62-21 7272425 ext 503

Fax : +62-21 7863556

The views expressed in SEAM are not necessarily those of the editorial staff nor the publisher. All articles in this journal, unless otherwise noted, have undergone a blind review process.

Copyright © 2011 Management Research Center, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Indonesia. All rights reserved.

Contents

Productivity Spillovers from Foreign Direct Investment: What If Productivity is No Longer a Black Box? <i>Tran Toan Thang</i> _____	1
Government Financial Management, Strategy for Preventing Corruption in Indonesia <i>Haryono Umar</i> _____	19
Relationship between Organizational Justice Perception and Engagement in Deviant Workplace Behavior <i>Muhammad Irfan Syaebani and Riani Rachmawati Sobri</i> _____	37
Intellectual Capital: A Focus on Human Capital Reporting Practices of Top Malaysian Listed Companies <i>Norhayati Mat Husin, Norrmala Ahmad, and Raedah Sapingi</i> _____	51
The Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility Activity toward Customer Loyalty through Improvement of Quality of Life in Urban Area <i>Tengku Ezni Balqiah, Hapsari Setyowardhani, and Khairani</i> _____	73

Editor's Note

Strengthening bilateral economic cooperation between two countries will provide significant benefits for them. For example, in the case of bilateral trade, the benefits enjoyed here are in accordance with the law of comparative advantage, which mentions that two countries will enjoy the benefits of trade between them if the relative costs of producing goods and/or services are different. In other words, since one country is more efficient in producing certain goods or services, the other country will be better off if it imports those goods and/or services from that country instead of producing them domestically.

In an effort to strengthen the bilateral economic cooperation between Indonesia and Turkey, Turkish President Abdullah Gul visited Indonesia on 4th-5th, April 2011. A year before, President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono paid a visit to Turkey.

In welcoming the visit of President Gul, the Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry held the Business Forum on 5th April, 2011 which invited Indonesian and Turkey's businessmen, experts and academics.

In his speech, President Gul said that there are some important economic cooperation between Turkey and Indonesia in terms of the bilateral trade and investment, as well as cooperation in education. Data shows that the bilateral trade value between Turkey and Indonesia increased USD1.7 billion in 2010, up from USD1.2 billion in 2009. Of the total USD1.7 billion, around USD1.4 billion was in favor of Indonesia. The two countries have set a target of bilateral trade value at around USD5 billion by 2014 and up to USD10 billion in the future, including by boosting investment cooperation. Turkey's investment in Indonesia has reached USD70 million, while Indonesian investment in Turkey is only USD600,000.

Regarding the data, Indonesia has offered the special economic zone development project to Turkish businessmen. In terms of international trade and management, this special zone could create the advantages in trade and investment sector for the Indonesia-Turkey bilateral trade; so far it is also expected to also provide the countries in the ASEAN Community with the spillover of opportunity. However, Turkey could be the gate to the European Union markets, which means that this international cooperation will help Indonesia expand its export market in the European Union.

Gul revealed at a joint press conference with Yudhoyono that the two countries are expected to sign an agreement on free trade within the framework of comprehensive and strategic cooperation in the near future. Both Gul and Yudhoyono are optimistic that the bilateral trade value target could be achieved given the two countries' huge economic potential.

Rofikoh Rokhim

Vice Editor

The South East Asian Journal of Management

Relationship between Organizational Justice Perception and Engagement in Deviant Workplace Behavior

Muhammad Irfan Syaebani* and Riani Rachmawati Sobri**

Deviant workplace behavior is not something unusual and is prevalent in organizational dynamics. It is found in all types of organizations and in all levels of positions. This deviance is costly not only in financial, but also in social and psychological terms. This research aims to reveal whether there is any association between organizational justice perception and engagement in deviant workplace behavior since so many scholars argue that organizational injustice can serve as one of the causes to workplace deviance. Three forms of organizational justice are used in this research; they are: distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Additionally, two dimensions are used to classify deviant workplace behavior, which are severity and target. Putting these two dimensions into low-high continuum, it helps to develop a typology of deviant workplace behavior into four classifications: production, political, property, and personal aggression. Result findings show us that organizational justice perception play important role in the occurrence of deviant workplace behavior. However, it is not the sole predictor since only one deviant workplace behavior (out of twelve) which correlates significantly with one form of organizational justice.

Keywords: *Deviant workplace behavior, organizational justice, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, production deviance, political deviance, property deviance, personal aggression*

Introduction

Organizational behavior (OB) is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups and structure have on behavior within organization (Robbins and Judge, 2007, p. 9). Unfortunately, OB many researches only emphasize desirable behaviors and thus neglect un-

desirable or deviant behaviors such as abuse, exploitation, theft, sabotage, insult, manipulation and harassment (Vardi and Weitz, 2004). In fact, these deviant behaviors can be found in almost all organizations, as being argued by Vardi and Wiener (1996): *“Most of members of work organization, it appears, engage in some form of misbehavior that is related to*

*Muhammad Irfan Syaebani, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia, Kampus Baru UI Depok 16424, Email: irfan.irf4an@yahoo.co.id.

**Riani Rachmawati Sobri, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia, Kampus Baru UI Depok 16424.

their work... misbehavior is not restricted to certain employees. It has been recorded for both nonsupervisory and managerial members of different types of work organization."

These deviant workplace behaviors are both pervasive and costly not only in term of financial but also in social and psychological perspectives (Peterson, 2002). The (negative) consequences of these deviant behaviors to work organization are significant (Vardi and Winer, 1996); therefore, deviant behaviors within organization cannot be neglected anymore. This phenomenon should be investigated in order to minimize its effects for the sustainability of the organization.

The research concerning deviant workplace behaviors has attracted many scholars who currently give more attention to acknowledge various forms of deviant workplace behaviors which are prevalent (Vardi and Weitz, 2004). Furthermore, managers also want to understand the source of workplace deviance in order to avoid chaotic work environment (Robbins and Judge, 2007, p. 29).

There are several propositions that explain why those deviant workplace behaviors within organization do occur. DeMore et al. in Vardi and Wiener (1996) stated that those deviant workplace behaviors were related with the perception of inequity and mistreatment. Lim (2002) also stated that *"previous research has found empirical evidence which suggest that employees are more likely to engage*


in misconduct when they perceive their employers to have been unjust in their treatment." Therefore, unfair treatment of organization toward its members is predicted to have a strong association with deviant workplace behavior.

The above proposition has been supported by many empirical evidence which have shown that employees' perception on organizational justice (which is defined as the level of fairness of an organization toward its employees (Lim, 2002)) plays an important role to find out the root cause of deviant workplace behavior. Therefore, this research attempts to examine the correlation between perception of organizational justice and engagement of deviant workplace behavior. It can be argued that it is very important to find out and deal with the fundamental cause(s) rather than just trying to control the deviant behavior(s) which may lead to the occurrence of another problem (Robbins and Judge, 2007, p. 29).

The purpose of this study is to examine the correlation between Organizational Justice Perception- which is classified into three different forms of justice- with Deviant Workplace Behavior- which is classified into four categories based on target and severity dimension.

The model for this research is shown in figure 1. From figure 1, we could infer that organizational justice is divided into three forms, they are; distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. While deviant workplace behavior

Figure 1. Research model



is classified into four classifications, they are: production deviant, property deviant, political deviant and personal aggression.

Those three forms of organizational justice will be examined whether they have any correlation with four classifications of deviant workplace behavior, since so many researches have argued that organizational justice perception could be related to the occurrence of deviant workplace behavior.

Therefore, from the above explanations, the hypothesis of this study is:

H: There is association between organizational justice perception and deviant workplace behavior.

This study is a preliminary study which is aimed to examine the association between organizational justice perception and all or some of the deviant workplace behavior, particularly in a workplace in Indonesia. Furthermore, the result of this study is useful for scholars in general and for managers in particular in order to find out the root cause of deviant workplace behavior since it is admitted as something costly and prevalent in almost all organization in all levels.

This paper is systematically structured as followed: (1) Introduction, (2) Literature Review: Organizational Justice and Deviant Workplace Behavior, (3) Methodology, (4) Result and Discussion, and (5) Conclusion.

Literature Review

Organizational justice

Justice perception in organization plays important roles. There are many studies which try to investigate the impact of justice perception on organizational outcome such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, productivity, and withdrawal behavior (Forret and Love, 2008). The results of the research have indicated that

justice in the workplace is important and necessary (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Viswesvaran and Ones, 2002, in Forret and Love, 2008).

The concept of organizational justice is based on fairness perception (Adams, 1965, in Forret and Love, 2008). Organizational justice can be defined as how fair an organization is towards its employees (Lim, 2002). Previous research has identified three different forms of organizational justice, which are (a) *Distributive Justice*; (b) *Procedural Justice*; and (c) *Interactional Justice* (Lim, 2002). These three different forms of organizational justice are the most commonly studied by many scholars and researchers (Forret and Sue, 2008).

Distributive justice is defined as the perceived fairness of outcomes received (Adams, 1965, in Forret and Love, 2008): while procedural justice is the fairness of a company's policies and procedures used to determine one's outcomes (Greenberg, 1990; Lind and Tyler, 1988 in Forret and Love 2008). Lastly, interactional justice refers to the quality on interpersonal processes and treatment of individuals (Bies and Moag, 1986, in Forret and Love, 2008).

Distributive justice is found significantly associated with counterproductive behaviors, such as conflict and negative emotion (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001, in Forret and Love, 2008). Recent meta-analysis studies have found that procedural justice can predict counterproductive behaviors (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001, in Forret and Love, 2008), cooperative conflict management behavior (Rahim et al., 2000, in Forret and Love, 2008), and aggression directed at one's supervisor (Greenberg and Barling, 1999, in Forret and Love, 2008). Additionally, Stecher and Rosse in Forret and Love (2008) concluded that interactional justice has a stronger impact on negative emotions, intent to leave, and intent to reduce work

effort. To conclude, organizational justice perception has correlation with deviant workplace behaviors, which also supported by the study of Aquino et al. in Lim (2002).

Deviant workplace behavior

There are several behaviors that are undesirable to be done by members of an organization. Previously, those behaviors, such as abuse, exploitation, theft, sabotage, insult, manipulation and harassment, are called interchangeably as undesirable behavior, counterproductive behavior, misbehavior, misconduct, and deviant workplace behavior.

Robinsons and Greenberg in Vardi and Weitz (2003) identified eight terms and definitions that relate to the phenomenon of employees behaving badly at work, which are: Noncompliant Behavior (Puffer, 1987), Organizational Misbehavior (Vardi and Wiener, 1992, 1996), Workplace Deviance (Robinson and Bennett, 1995), Workplace Aggression (Baron and Neuman, 1996), Organization-motivated Aggression (O’Leary-Kelly et al., 1996), Antisocial Behavior (Gicalone and Greenberg, 1997), Employee Vice (Moberg, 1997), and Organizational Retaliation Behaviors (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).


This paper focuses on the typology of deviant workplace behavior as defined by

Robinson and Bennett (1995), in Peterson (2002), which is arguably the most fully comprehensive model while also provides validated potential methods for measuring workplace deviance (Peterson, 2002).

Workplace deviance is defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and threatens the well being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson and Bennett, in Peterson, 2002). There are two dimensions of this deviant workplace behavior (Peterson, 2002). The first dimension is represented by the target of deviant behavior ranged from aimed at the organization to primarily directed to a member/members of the organization; the second dimension, on the other hand, represented the severity from minor form to serious form.

These two dimensions of deviant workplace behavior have created four classifications, as being argued by Robinson and Bennett (1995) in Peterson (2002): (1) *Production Deviance*, which is defined as a minor form of deviance directed at the organization such as intentionally work slower and work for a personal matter; (2) *Political Deviance*, which is defined as a minor form of deviance directed at members of the organization such as favoritism, gossiping, and blaming co-workers; (3) *Property Deviance*, which is defined as serious form

Figure 2. Model of deviant workplace behavior classification



Source: Developed from Robinson and Bennett (1995) in Peterson (2002)

of deviant directed to organization such as stealing and sabotage; and 4) *Personal Aggression*, which is defined as a serious form of deviance directed at members of organization, such as sexual harassment and physical intimidation.

Methodology

This study is descriptive (Istijanto, 2006) which tries to describe whether there is any correlation between organizational justice perception and employees engagement of deviant workplace behavior.

Data is gathered by a survey, using questionnaires. Questionnaire is expected to be the best method to gather data, considering that the issues to be examined are sensitive. Prior studies suggest that if respondent are assured of anonymity, it is possible to assess workplace behavior (Peterson, 2002). Questionnaire provides that anonymity which is critical for respondent to fill in open and honest way. Thus, if the respondents fill the questionnaire properly, it means that the data are valid to be processed. The validity

of data will lead to the high precision of the result.

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Economics of the University of Indonesia where the populations are the employees. In this institution, employees are defined as those other than teaching and research staff; they work in supporting divisions such as in HR division, Finance division, Academic Bureau, Library, etc.

In this research, 33 employees have agreed to take part. Since this study aims to measure a sensitive topic, it is important to make sure that the respondents are voluntarily agree to join and in return their confidentiality will be protected to further comply with the ethical issue of academic research.

Statistically, data from 33 respondents are sufficient to be further analyzed. As Gay argued that for correlation research, 30 subjects would be adequate (Sevilla et al., 1993). Those 33 respondents then become the sample in this study. The samples do not follow the probability random; it means that our samples are drawn by using convenience sampling method and ignoring

Table 1. Organizational justice perception questionnaire

<i>Distributive Justice</i>	
How fairly has the organization been rewarding you	
1.	For the amount of effort you have put in?
2.	For the responsibilities you have?
3.	For the work that you have done well?
4.	For the stresses and strains of your job?
5.	For the amount of education and training you received?
<i>Procedural Justice</i>	
How fairly are the organization's procedures designed to	
1.	Provide useful feedback regarding an organization's decision and its implementation?
2.	Hear the concerns of everyone affected by an organization's decision?
3.	Allow for request for clarification or additional information about an organization's decision?
4.	Have all parties affected by a decision included in the decision making process?
5.	Help you to collect accurate information for decision making?
6.	Generate standards so that decisions can be made with consistency?
7.	Provide opportunities to appeal against or challenge an organization's decision?
<i>Interactional Justice</i>	
My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee	
1.	My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration
2.	My supervisor take steps to deal with me in a truthful manner
3.	My supervisor is able to suppress personal bias
4.	My supervisor considers my viewpoint
5.	My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about decisions and their implications

the sampling size method. Therefore, the result of this research may not represent the organization as a whole in high precision. However, the result of this research could be beneficial to show whether deviant workplace behavior is something prevalent in organizational dynamics and whether organizational justice perception correlates significantly with deviant workplace engagement.

The questionnaire used to measure organizational justice perception is that developed by Moorman in Lim (2002). Distributive justice is acknowledged by using five items to measure individual perception of the extent to which they have been fairly rewarded by their organization. Every item was scored using Likert-Scale, 1 (very unfair) to 4 (very fair). Procedural justice is measured using seven items to examine individual perception regarding the fairness of organizational procedure. Every item was scored using Likert-Scale, 1 (very unfair) to 4 (very fair). Interactional justice is measured using six items to see whether organizational procedures were enacted properly and fairly by supervisor. Every item was scored using Likert-Scale, 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

Questionnaire for deviant workplace behavior is measured using self-report questionnaire that developed by Bennett and Robinson in Peterson (2002). The

respondents were asked how often they engaged in deviant workplace behaviors. Measurement is using four scale 0 (never) to 3 (very often). Those deviant workplace behaviors are those within the classification of deviant workplace behaviors based on target and severity dimension.

The analysis for this study used product moment correlation. Correlation analysis is a tool to measure association or relationships between two variables or more (Uyanto, 2006).

Result and Discussion

Subject characteristics

Data are gathered by sending questionnaire to employees. As many as 33 employees agreed to fill in the questionnaire. From 33 samples, 18 or 54.5% are male, 12 or 36.4% are female and three people or 9.1% refused to fill in this section.

Age is ranged from 19 to 55 with mean 34.10 and standard deviation 8.368. They also ranged in tenure period from three months to 28 years with mean 10.62 years in service and standard deviation 7.801.

As many as nine or 27.3% employees are not married, 21 or 63.6% are married, and three or 9.1% refused to fill in this section. Education background varied from junior high school to university graduate.

Table 2. Deviance workplace behavior questionnaire

<i>Production Deviance</i>	
1.	Worked on a personal matter instead of worked for your employer
2.	Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your place of work
3.	Intentionally worked slower that you could have worked
<i>Political Deviance</i>	
4.	Showed favoritism for a fellow employee or subordinate employee
5.	Blamed someone else or let someone else take the blame for your mistake
6.	Repeated gossip about a co worker
<i>Property Deviance</i>	
7.	Padded an expense account to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses
8.	Accepted a gift/favor in exchange for professional treatment
9.	Taken property from work without permission
<i>Personal Aggression</i>	
10.	Cursed at someone at work
11.	Made an ethnic or sexually harassing remark or joke at work
12.	Made someone feel physically intimidated either through threats or carelessness at work

As many as one or 3.0% is graduated from junior high school, 13 or 39.4% are graduated from senior high school, three or 9.1% are diploma graduate, 15 or 45.5% are bachelor graduate and one or 3% employee refused to fill in this section.

Organizational justice perception measurement

To measure organizational justice perception, we use questionnaire developed by Moorman in Lim (2002) consist of five items to measure distributive justice, seven items to measure procedural justice, and five items to measure interactional justice.

Questionnaire to measure distributive justice perception has 0.828 of Cronbach's Alpha score, but item number five is excluded from the computation since its Cronbach's Alpha if this item is deleted is higher than 0.828. Questionnaire to measure procedural justice has 0.944 of Cronbach's Alpha score. Questionnaire to measure interactional justice has 0.910 of Cronbach's Alpha score, but because of Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted is higher than 0.910, therefore item number 5 is excluded from computation.

Table 3 presents the mean and standard deviation of employee justice perception. From that table we can see that employees in FEUI response that interactional justice placed the highest position followed by distributive justice and procedural justice. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of employees feel that quality of interpersonal processes and treatment of individuals are better than those others two justice. Employees feel that procedural

justice which measure the fairness of a company's policies and procedures used to determine one's outcomes is the worst compare to others two kind of justice.

Table 3 also shows that employees perceive organizational justice moderately. In four scale of measurement of all those three kind of justice, employees tend to score between 2 or 3.

Deviant workplace behavior measurement

To measure engagement in deviant workplace behavior we use questionnaire developed by Bennett and Robinson in Peterson (2002). This questionnaire is developed to measure 12 deviant workplace behaviors. These 12 deviant workplace behaviors are divided into four categories. They are: production deviance, political deviance, property deviance, and personal aggression. This classification is built based on Robinson and Bennett's theory (1995) in Peterson (2002) who classified deviant workplace behavior into two dimensions; Target and Severity.

Table 4 presents the frequencies of engagement of deviant workplace behavior. It shows that employees have ever engaged in all kind of deviant workplace behavior. Therefore, it supports the proposition that deviant workplace behavior can be found in all kind of organization in all levels of position (Vardi and Wiener, 1996) and is something prevalent and undeniable in organizational dynamics. It occurs in every organization although it varies in severity from minor to serious and in target from targeted to individual to target to organization.

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation of employee justice perception

Organizational Justice	Mean	Standard Deviation
Distributive Justice	2.8333	.51791
Procedural Justice	2.3779	.63946
Interactional Justice	2.8984	.55307

Table 4 also revealed that worked on personal matter is done by three fourth of employees. As many as 25 employees or 75.8% reported that they ever worked for personal interest during working hours. This deviance has the highest score as the deviance that many employees ever engaged.

As many as 10 employees or 30.3% have ever accepted gift/favor for their professional treatment. Also seven employees or 21.2% have ever done mark-up. This is one form of bribery and corruption. As many as six employees or 18.2% have ever done workplace harassment and two employees or 6.1% have ever done physical aggression.

Peterson (2002) published his work on Journal of Business and Psychology concerning about deviant workplace behavior and organization ethical climate. On that paper, Peterson reveals that almost all of his respondents reported their engagement in workplace deviant. The percentage of the engagement on Peterson's research is likely similar with this research findings. Peterson reported 52% of his respondent reported ever engage in taking longer break than is acceptable compared to our finding of 66.7%. Work slower on

purpose reported by Peterson as many as 32% compared to our finding 30.3%. Gossiping is reported as many as 61.7% compared to our finding 72.4%. Accepted a gift/favor in exchange for professional treatment is reported as many as 40% compared to our finding 30.3% and cursed someone at work is reported as many as 25.4% compared to our finding 24.2%.

These similarities indicated that the data gathered in this study have same characteristics of Peterson's data while also suggest that deviant workplace behavior is not unusual in modern workplace (Peterson, 2002). Furthermore, the Peterson's data also similar, for the most part, to the result reported by Bennett and Robinson (2000) in Peterson (2002).

Analysis: relationship between organizational justice and workplace deviance

As previously stated, the aim of this study is to examine the association between organizational justice perception and deviant workplace behavior. The result findings have proved that deviant workplace behavior is something undeniable and prevalent in organizational dynamics and gives huge effect to the organization well being. It

Table 4. Frequency of deviant workplace behavior engagement

Deviant Workplace Behavior	Frequency	Percent
<i>Production Deviance:</i>		
1. Worked on a personal matter instead of worked for your employer	25	75.8
2. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your place of work	22	66.7
3. Intentionally worked slower that you could have work	10	30.3
<i>Political Deviance:</i>		
4. Showed favoritism for a fellow employee or subordinate employee	7	21.3
5. Blamed someone else or let someone else take the blame for your mistake	5	15.2
6. Repeated gossip about a co worker	24	72.4
<i>Property Deviance:</i>		
7. Padded an expense account to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses	7	21.2
8. Accepted a gift/favor in exchange for professional treatment	10	30.3
9. Taken property from work without permission	6	18.2
<i>Personal Aggression:</i>		
10. Cursed at someone at work	8	24.2
11. Made an ethnic or sexually harassing remark or joke at work	6	18.2
12. Made someone feel physically intimidated either through threats or carelessness at work	2	6.1


supported the proposition that is stated by Vardi and Weitz (2004). Therefore the fundamental cause(s) of this phenomenon should be identified and carefully handled. Moreover many organizations have reported that deviant workplace behavior caused so much damages and is costly not only in financial but also in term of social and psychological—makes it paramount for managers to give attention on the causes (Peterson, 2002).

Table 5 shows that deviance number 11 (made an ethnic or sexually harassing remark or joke at work) has significant negative correlation with distributive justice. This result is supported by the proposition of DeMore et al. in Vardi and Wiener (1996) that deviant workplace behaviors were related with the perception of inequity and mistreatment. It reveals us that organization has a role in determining the behavior of its employees. Perception of justice of the organization is proved having association with deviant workplace behavior.

Table 5 also shows us that deviant workplace behavior is something more complex than action-reaction relationships. Deviant workplace behavior cannot be explained alone by the organizational justice perception. Since not all deviant workplace behaviors have correlation with organizational justice perception.

Toward this phenomenon, Kennedy et al. (2004) provide some explanations. On their research concerning perception of injustice and workplace aggression, they found that perception of injustice and workplace aggression has insignificant correlation. They argue that support for workplace aggression was more a personality variable, or a trait rather than to response to a particular situations. Thus, it can be concluded that no correlation between several deviant workplace behavior and organizational justice was more because of personality or trait factor rather than perception of organizational justice. Employees engage in some form of workplace deviance not because they feel

Figure 3: Vardi and Wiener model of organizational misbehavior



Source: Vardi and Winer (1996)

that their organization is injustice. It is not a form of response to organizational justice; instead it is a form of deviance that caused by individual factor level.

Vardi and Wiener (1996) stated that there are two core antecedents of deviant behavior: Individual Factor and Organizational Factor. Vardi and Wiener (1996) developed a model of deviant workplace behavior that is based on Fishbein and Ajzen's behavioral intentions theory. On that model they argue that we cannot solely focus only on one antecedent factor and ignored other antecedent factor. Vardi and Wiener (1996) developed an integrated model where one factor is related to another factors.

Vardi and Weitz also proposed an integrated model of workplace deviance. They stated that there are four antecedents of workplace behavior: individual level, position/task level, group level, and organizational level.

From individual level there are several factors that can be the source of a person engage in deviant workplace behavior. There are personality, values, attitudes, affect and emotion, and stress. From position/task level there are: job design, job characteristic, and job type. From group level there are: norms, cohesiveness, group's dynamics, and leadership. From organizational level there are: organization type, goals, culture, climate, control system, organizational socialization, and organizational ethics (Vardi and Weitz, 2004).

Those theories would help explaining why not all deviant workplace behavior correlated with organizational justice perception.

From this study we can find out that organizational justice perception plays important role to the occurrence of deviant workplace behavior that is engaged by its employees. But it is not only the factor. Deviant workplace behavior may still

occur despite of how fair the organization treats its employees. Organization factor cannot be justified as the only fundamental cause(s) of deviant workplace behavior. The engagement in workplace behavior is not merely a reaction to a particular situation but it can be an action that is done without the existence of any particular trigger, since so many factors contribute to the occurrence of these behaviors.

To deal with this deviant workplace behavior issues, organization should include all the factors that can be source in one integrated solution model. Because the fundamental cause(s) of deviant workplace behavior may arise from organization factor such as organizational justice, as well as from individual factor such as personality or both.

Caveat and suggestions for further study

Since the deviant workplace behavior is a sensitive topic, anonymity and confidentiality of the respondent should be highly reserved. Therefore the researcher should pay more attention to research ethics such as protected the anonymity of respondent and that the respondents have agreed to fill in prior questionnaire is given.

Samples of this study are drawn by convenience sampling method without concerning the method to determine the sample size. Therefore, result of this study may not represent the real condition of the organization as a whole in high precisions.

In this study 33 people are agreed to voluntarily fill in the questionnaire. But still, many of them refused to fill some of the demographic section in our questionnaire as they seemed afraid that if they fill in the demographic section their identity can be traced using Human Resource Information System. It can be risky to their job security, particularly if they confessed that they ever engaged in deviant workplace behavior that is unacceptable by the organization.

So that the design for questionnaire for future research should be manipulated in order to make the respondents feel more comfortable.

This is a preliminary study that should be developed in the future research to give us more comprehensive understanding especially in Indonesian context since it is still little research concerning this issue conducted in Indonesia.

Conclusion

Deviant workplace behavior is not something unusual and is prevalent in organizational dynamics. This study shows

us that it is also happen in organization that become focus of our study.

The result finding shows us that organizational justice perception plays important role in the occurrence of deviant workplace behavior of its employees. But, it is not only the one factor since from among the twelve deviant workplace behaviors only one which correlates significantly with one form of organizational justice.

Deviant workplace behavior is more complex than action-reaction relationship. To deal with this phenomenon organization should include all the factors that can be source in one integrated solution model.

References

- Appelbaum, S.H. and Shapiro, B.T. (2006), Diagnosis and Remedies for Deviant Workplace Behavior, *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 9(2), 14-20.
- Appelbaum, S.H. et al. (2007), Positive and Negative Deviance Workplace Behaviors: Causes, Impacts, and Solutions, *Corporate Governance*, 7(5), 586-596.
- Appelbaum, S.H. et al. (2005), The Relationship of Ethical Climate to Deviant Workplace Behavior, *Corporate Governance*, 5(4), 43-55.
- Bolin, A. and Heatherly, L. (2001), Predictors of Employee Deviance: The Relationship between Bad Attitudes and Bad Source, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 405-418.
- Bryne, Z.S. (2005), Fairness Reduces the Negative Effects of Organizational Politics on Turnover Intentions, Citizenship Behavior and Job Performance, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 175-200.
- De Lara, P.Z.M. (2006), Fear in Organizations: Does Intimidation by Formal Punishment Mediate the Relationship between Interactional Justice and Workplace Internet Deviance, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(6), 580-592.
- De Lara, P.Z.M. and Verano-Tacoronte, D. (2007), Investigating the Effect of Procedural Justice on Workplace Deviance: Do Employees' Perception of Conflicting Guidance Call the Tune?, *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(8), 715-729.
- Everton, W.J. et al. (2007), Be Nice and Fair or Else: Understanding Reason for Employees' Deviant Behaviors, *Journal of Management Development*, 26(2), 117-131.
- Forret, M. and Love, M.S. (2008), Employee Justice Perception and Coworker Relationship, *Leaderships & Organization Development Journal*, 29(3), 248-260.
- Husted, B.W. (1998), Organizational Justice and the Management of Stakeholder Relations, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(6), 643-651.
- Istijanto, (2006), *Riset Sumber Daya Manusia*, Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kantur, D. (2010), Emotional Motives and Attitudinal Reflections of Workplace Deviant Behavior, *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 14(2), 70-77.

- Kennedy, D.B., Homant, R.J., and Homant, M.R. (2004), Perception of Injustice as a Predictor of Support for Workplace Aggression, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(3), 323-336.
- Lam, S.S.K., Schaubroeck, J., and Aryee, S. (2002), Relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Work Outcomes: A Cross National Study, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 1-18.
- Lee, C. and Farh, J.L. (1999), The Effects of Gender in Organizational Justice Perception, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 133-143.
- Lim, V.K.G. (2002), The IT Way of Loafing on the Job: Cyberloafing, Neutralizing, and Organizational Justice, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(5), 675-694.
- McClurg, L.A. and Butler, D.S. (2006), Workplace Theft: A Proposed Model and Research Agenda, *Southern Business Review*, 31(2), 25-34.
- Messer, B.A.E. and White, F.A. (2006), Employees' Mood, Perceptions of Fairness, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(1), 65-82.
- Peterson, D.K. (2002), Deviant Workplace Behavior and the Organization's Ethical Climate, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 47-61.
- Rae, K. and Subramaniam, N. (2008), Quality of Internal Control Procedures: Antecedents and Moderating Effect on Organizational Justice and Employee Fraud, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 23(2), 104-124.
- Robbins, S. and Judge, T.A. (2007), *Organizational Behavior*, 12th Ed., New Jersey: Person Education, Inc.
- Robinson, S.L. and Bennett, R.J. (1995), A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Sevilla et al. (1993), *Pengantar Metode Penelitian*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Trevino, L.K. and Weaver, G.R. (2001), Organizational Justice and Ethics Program "Follow-Through": Influences on Employees' Harmful and Helpful Behavior, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(4), 651-671.
- Uyanto, S.S. (2006), *Pedoman Analisis Data dengan SPSS*, Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Vardi, Y. and Wiener, Y. (1996), Misbehavior in Organization: A Motivational Framework. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 151-165.
- Vardi, Y. and Weitz, Y. (2004), *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Chen, Y.J. et al. (2008), Association of Organizational Justice and Ingratiation with Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Beneficiary Perspective, *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36(3), 289-301.
- Yilmaz, K. (2010), Secondary Public School Teachers' Perceptions about Organizational Justice, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 10(1), 603-616.

Instructions to Contributors

Aim and Scope

The South East Asian Journal of Management (SEAM) aims to present the latest thinking and research that test, extends, or builds management theory and contributes to management practice.

Contents of the Journal will be of interest to management teachers, student and researchers as well as to practicing managers and material will be analytical rather than descriptive.

Whilst a major focus of the journal is on the Asian countries and management issues connected with it, increasingly, global concerns and conceptual topics will be covered. The Journal does not take a narrow view of business and management and will publish in other disciplines if they contribute significantly to problems considered by managers and researchers.

To be published in SEAM, a manuscript must make strong empirical and theoretical contributions and highlight the significance of those contributions to the management field. Thus, preference is given to submissions that test, extend, or build strong theoretical frameworks while empirically examining issues with high importance for management theory and practice.

Manuscripts

Manuscripts must be double-spaced on 8 1/2 x 11". Manuscript length should be reasonable for the contribution offered.

Soft copy of the article should be sent to:

Dr. Sari Wahyuni
Editor in Chief
The South East Asian Journal of Management
Departement of Management
Faculty of Economics
Universitas Indonesia
Departement of Management Building,
Kampus Baru UI,
West Java, Indonesia
Phone : +62-21-7272425 ext 503
Fax : +62-21-7863556
Email: seam@ ui.ac.id

Manuscripts are reviewed by the editor, members of the SEAM Editorial Review Board, and occasional reviewers. The author's name and affiliation are removed before reviewing in order to ensure objectivity. Please do not identify the author(s) in the body of the paper either directly or by citation.

With the submission of a manuscript, the following three items should be included:

Cover page showing title, each author's name, affiliation, complete address, telephone and fax number, and the category of the article. Select one category from the following: Finance, Capital Market, Policy, Accounting, Marketing, Human Resource, Innovation, Strategic, and Organization.

1. Abstract of up to 150 words.
2. Keywords.

Mathematical Notation

Notations should be clearly explained within the text. Equations should be centered on the page. If equations are numbered, type the number in parentheses flush with the right margin. Unusual symbols and Greek letters should be identified. For equations that may be too wide to fit in a single column, indicate appropriate breaks.

Table and Figures

Indicate table placements within text. Camera-ready tables should be typed flush with the left-hand margin and have proper labelling of sources, column headings, and other notations. Once the manuscript has been accepted for publication, complex tables and figures (diagrams, charts, graphs, etc.) should be prepared professionally for camera-ready reproduction.

References

Reference citations within the text should consist of the author's last name and date of publication, without punctuation, enclosed within parentheses, and should be inserted before punctuation and/or at a logical break in the sentence. If several citations are needed, separate them with semicolons, and list alphabetically. If two or more works by an author have the same year, distinguish them by placing a, b, etc. after the year.

References should be double-spaced and attached on a separate page. Works by single author, list chronologically; two authors, alphabetically and then chronologically; three authors, the same; four or more, *list chronologically*. References should be in the following:

Books:

Bagozzy, R.P. (1980), *Causal Models in Marketing*, New York: Wiley.

Journals:

Singh, J. (1991), Understanding the Structure of Consumers' Satisfaction Evaluations of Service Delivery, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19 (Summer), 223-244.

Three or More Authors:

Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., and Parasuraman, A. (1993), The Nature and Determinants of Customers Experiences of Service, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21 (Winter), 1-12.

Article in a Book Edited by another Author:

Levitt, T. (1988), The Globalization of Markets, in *Multinational Marketing Management*, Robert, D.B., and Quelch, J.A. (Eds.), Reading, MA, Addison Weley, 186-205.

Unpublished Dissertations:

Paterson, K.S. (1985), The Effects of Bilingual Labels in Buyer Behaviour, *Dissertation*, University of California at Irvine.

A copy of the SEAM Journal style sheet is available from the editor on request.

For further information, please visit our website <http://seam.pasafe.ui.ac.id>



About MRC

The Management Research Center (MRC) laboratory was created in March 2006 due to the particular reason of relative weakness on management research in Indonesia. MRC is national research center dedicated to contribute the theoretical, empirical, and practical research in recent management issues.

The intention is not only to stimulate research and discussion within scholarly circles, but also to enhance business community and public awareness to stimulate thinking on and exploring solutions in management issues.

The MRC is placed to assist local, regional and international scholar and other researcher that provides a congenial and stimulating intellectual environment, encouraging the fullest interaction and exchange ideas.

To achieve these aims, the MRC conducts a range of research programs; holds public lecturers, seminars, workshops, and conferences; publishes research journals and books, support research facilities, including data, financial subsidy and library collections.

Research

Research within MRC covers the fields of interest in:

- Business Policy & Strategy
- Entrepreneurship
- Finance and Banking
- Gender and Diversity in Organizations
- International Management
- Management Education & Development
- Operations Management
- Organization Development & Change
- Organization & Management Theory
- Organizational Behavior
- Research Methods in Management
- Social Issues in Management
- Technology & Innovation Management

Activities

MRC has a program of public lecturers, seminars, workshops, and conferences, organized independently or in collaboration with other

research organization and also with private sectors. The field of these activities from informal discussion group to major international events.

Especially for the public lecturer, MRC invites and opens the opportunity for distinguish professor, leaders and CEO of the companies to share their know ledges and their experiences.

Publications

To facilitate timely dissemination of research and commentaries on recent and current developments, MRC produce monographs under the Working Paper Series.

MRC also publishes academic journals which is called The South East Asian Journal of Management (SEAM), Indonesia Capital Market Review (ICMR) and Asean Marketing Journal (AMJ).

Library

The MRC library collaborates with the Graduate School of Management, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia. This library has many excellent collections of management studies in Bahasa Indonesia and English, in print and multimedia formats.

Contact us

MANAGEMENT RESEARCH CENTER (MRC)

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
FACULTY OF ECONOMICS,
UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA

Department of Management Building 2nd floor.
Kampus Baru UI Depok,
West Java, Indonesia 16424
Phone : 021- 7272425 ext 503
Fax : 021- 7863556
E-mail : mrc@ui.ac.id

<http://pascafe.ui.ac.id>

<http://seam.pascafe.ui.ac.id>

The South East Asian Journal of Management

Faculty of Economics

Universitas Indonesia

Departement of Management Building, Depok Campus, West Java

Phone : +62-21-7272425 ext 503

Fax : +62-21-7863556

E-mail: seam@ui.ac.id

<http://seam.pascafe.ui.ac.id/>

ISSN 1978-1989



9 771978 198006