

WORK PRESSURE AND HIERARCHICAL LEVEL AS THE PREDICTOR OF INTENTION TO MISBEHAVE

Aderia Putri Prasanti^{1*}, Dewi Purwantiningsih²,
Bintang Gumilang¹, Thinni Nurul Rochmah¹

¹Department of Health Administration and Policy, Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Airlangga

²Rumah Sakit Mata Undaan, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: Aderia Putri Prasanti, aderia.prasanti@gmail.com, +6289676365550

ABSTRACT

Background: Intention to misbehave is a factor which mediates antecedents and organizational misbehavior manifestations (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). One of the forms of organizational misbehavior manifestations is withdrawal behavior which leads to tardiness and absence.

This research was conducted based on the employees of RSMU's high average of tardiness which exceeds the limit of tolerance in 2014-2016 with 21,75%. The purpose of the study is to analyze the influence of work pressure and hierarchical level towards the intention to misbehave.

Materials and Methods: As many as 70 employees of Rumah Sakit Mata Undaan Surabaya were involved in the research with cross sectional design. The primary data which consists of work pressure, hierarchical level, and intention to misbehave were collected by using questionnaire. Finding the influence between variables was carried out by using double linear regression test.

Result: The result of the study shows that work pressure and ($p=0,038$; $B=0,262$) and hierarchical level ($p=0,007$; $B=0,363$) affect the intention to misbehave simultaneously.

Conclusion: Rumah Sakit Mata Undaan needs to measure the work load to avoid excessive work pressure. In addition, intervention has to be implemented to particular groups of worker with high hierarchical level to lessen tendency of intention to misbehave.

Keywords: intention to misbehave, work pressure, hierarchical level

1.0 Introduction

Work discipline is a highly important element in achievement of objectives in an organization. An employee's discipline can affect the effectiveness and efficiency of his/her accomplishment. This will lead to a high level of performance by the employee and eventually will bring a good impact to the performance of the whole organization (Manullang, 2001).

Organizational misbehavior (OMB) is defined as every action which is committed by member of an organization deliberately and is based on motive, and violates the rules of organization or social norms (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). In contrary to work discipline, the higher the intensity of organizational misbehavior, the more negative the impact towards the performance of employees and organization. The manifestations of organizational behavior is based on some antecedents which influence the intention to misbehave. This kind of intention to misbehave is what later interpreted as organizational misbehavior manifestations.

One of the problems of OMB in Rumah Sakit Mata Undaan Surabaya is the high average of tardiness which exceeds the limit of tolerance in 2014-2016 with 21,75%. Public service organizations such as hospital itself is widely known for the high pressure in its working environment. This organization requires its employee to become the best representation of the company, as well as give the most optimum service. Thus, this research is aimed to analyze the effect of work pressure and hierarchical level towards the intention to misbehave.

2.0 Materials and Methods

The design of this research is cross sectional with 70 employees as the samples of study. The primary data collection was carried out by using questionnaire. Work pressure was measured based on employees' assessment to deadline and overtime work. Hierarchical level was measured based on the structural rank such as Head of Division, Head of Subdivision, or Head Unit. The variables of intention to misbehave were quantified based on the question about what employees suggest to do when they face certain condition which can lead to tardiness at work.

3.0 Result

3.1 The Impact of Work Pressure towards Intention to Misbehave

Table 1: Cross Tabulation of Work Pressure and Intention to Misbehave

Pressure	Intention to Misbehave				Total	
	Low		High		n	%
	n	%	n	%		
Low	1	100,0	0	0	1	100,0
Moderate	60	100,0	0	0	60	100,0
High	8	88,9	1	11,1	9	100,0
Total	69	98,6	1	1,4	70	100,0

Table 1 shows that the higher the work pressure, the higher the intention of the employees to misbehave. This linear proportion corresponds to the test result of the influence of work pressure towards intention to misbehave. The significance from the test result of the impact of work pressure towards intention to misbehave is 0,038, or less than α (0,05). It means there is definitely influence between work pressure and intention to misbehave. Value B from the test result of both variables is 0,026 in which the positive value shows the linear relation as shown in the cross tabulation result above.

3.2 The Impact of Hierarchical Level towards the Intention to Misbehave

Table 2: Cross Tabulation of Hierarchical Level and Intention to Misbehave

Hierarchical Level	Intention to Misbehave				Total	
	Low		High		n	%
	n	%	n	%		
Low	49	100,0	0	0	49	100,0
High	20	95,2	1	4,8	21	100,0
Total	69	98,6	1	1,4	70	100,0

Table 2 shows that the higher the hierarchical level of the employee, the higher the intention to misbehave. The result of the influence of hierarchical level towards the intention to misbehave indicates significance with 0,007, or less than α (0,05). This result denotes that hierarchical level affects intention to misbehave. In addition, value B resulted from statistic test is 0,094 which points to the linear relation between hierarchical level and intention to misbehave as illustrated by the analysis of the cross tabulation above.

4.0 Discussion

Research results point out that work pressure variable affects intention to misbehave significantly. Both indicate a linear relation as the higher the pressure, the higher employee's intention to misbehave. This result corresponds to the study by Roxana (2013) which mentioned that work stress, as an effect of work pressure, influences employee's misbehavior and counterproductive performance. Another study by Ugwu et. al (2017) also denoted that emotional exhaustion and depersonalization which are the impact of work pressure, positively correlate with the intention to perform counterproductive work behavior.

Public service organization such as hospital is widely known as one of the working environments with high level of pressure. This organization requires its employees to cater the customers with certain service quality that they have to fulfill. This happens because, in most cases, its service is delegated to individual or group who play the role as boundary spanner. Boundary spanner represents an organization's relation with its external clients or customers. Boundary spanner is characterized by their ability to build a relationship with other party and spread the effective relational and interpersonal competence (Williams, 2002).

The main problem of a boundary spanner is meeting the customer and company's expectations, the relative isolation where contact happens, and the duality between serving

customers when representing company, and working in a bureaucracy system, such as public social welfare agent (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). Thus, it is not surprising when employees in this sector often feel pressured, suffer from stress, and have higher level of burnout. Furthermore, to deliver a good service as what they have been trained; some of them tend to be involved in some incidents related to organizational misbehaviour.

In hi-tech sector and public service organization, the higher the stress level employees felt in working environment, the higher the burnout they experienced, also the higher the possibility of employees' tendency to commit OMB type S and D. This intention can manifest in misbehaviour intra and interpersonally, property, and production (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). This explanation fits the research result which stated the high pressure that in this case can lead to stress on employees, will escalate the intention to misbehave.

The results also show that hierarchical level affects the intention to misbehave. The relation between hierarchical level and intention to misbehave is linear. This means the higher the hierarchical level, the higher the intention to misbehave that they have.

An employee with higher hierarchical level usually has higher work pressure. In the previous discussion, it was claimed that the intensity of pressure is equal to the intention to misbehave that is experienced by employee. This eventually fits the research result to some other studies which connect the work pressure of employees with structural position who are more likely to have intention to misbehave as it was stated in the research by Vardi and Weitz (2004).

The high tendency of having intention to misbehave in employees with high level of hierarchy or managerial level can be explained by two different points of view from Trevino & Youngblood (1990) which are the bad apples and the bad barrel. The bad apples approach declares that unethical behaviour from managers is committed by those who typically have lower score in the development of moral, value, and pride, high Machiavellianism, personal interest, and blind faith. Meanwhile, the bad barrel approach assumes that unethical behaviour from managers is the effect of the situation where they work, unfair competition, irrational pressure to achieve target at work, limited sources, and poor role model from the superior, and many others.

Assuredly, managers join an organization with certain level of moral development. As the time goes by and the experiences add up, they might run into moral development continuously. Moreover, characteristics and process of organization such as technology and culture, also affect moral justification. In many chances, decision (or behavior performed by managers) is not only a function of characteristic (like locus control or the strength of ego) and other personal specific condition, but also interaction with situational attribute such as normative structural character and authority from organizational culture. Decision or behavior which are considered unethical and intentional and choice with certain motive or goal can be explained through consideration to bring personal benefit (OMB type S), bring organizational benefit (OMB type O), or appeal to ruin (OMB type D) (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). Thus, it can be concluded that the increasing tendency of intention to misbehave in employees with structural position is not only a function of individual factor, but also a normative encouragement from the organization.

5.0 Conclusion and recommendation

The recommendation which can be given based on this study is the intervention towards certain group which is employees with high hierarchical level to reduce the intention to misbehave. Other than that, the measurement of work load needs to be carried out to prevent excessive work pressure and encourage the intention to misbehave.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Rumah Sakit Mata Undaan Surabaya who has given me the opportunity to conduct this research and let me publish the result of this study.

Declaration

Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding publication of this article.

Authors contribution

Author 1: information gathering and preparation

Author 2: data analysis

Author 4: review and editing of manuscript

Author 3: review of manuscript

References

- Manullang, M. (2001). *Manajemen Personalia*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Roxana, A.-C. (2013). Antecedents and Mediators of Employees' Counterproductive Work Behavior and Intentions to Quit. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* , 219-224.
- Ugwu, L. I., Enwereuzor, I. K., Fimber, U. S., & Ugwu, D. I. (2017). Nurses' burnout and counterproductive work behavior in a Nigerian sample: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences* , 106-113.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehaviour in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in Organizations: A Motivational Framework. *Organization Science, Vol. 7, No.2* , 151-165.
- Williams, P. (2002). The Competent Boundary Spanner. *Public Administration Vol. 80 No. 1* , 103-124.