The role of discrete negative emotions in predicting the behavior of misusing time and resources in business organization

Savitha. J.,

Indian Institute of Science, Department of Management Studies, India

savithaj@iisc.ac.in

Akhilesh, K.B.

Indian Institute of Science, Department of Management Studies, India

kba@iisc.ac.in

Abstract

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) are the deviant behaviors of employees that violate the organizational norms, and in turn harm the organization or its members. Misuse of time and resources, a form of CWB is of increasing concern to business organisations worldwide. Such behaviors are mainly aimed at organizations than the individuals, restricting productive time on the job and inappropriate or unauthorized use of organisational resources. Extant literature informs that these behaviors are caused by stressful work conditions mediated by negative emotions. However, the extant literature does not adequately consider multiple discrete emotions to study CWB. This study examines the influence of discrete negative emotions on CWB in the context of manufacturing and IT firms in India. It contributes to theory by linking individual emotions to the deviant behaviors relevant to misuse of time and resources. Finally, the managerial implications derived from the study helps to understand employees' emotional states and their possible consequences.

Key words: misuse of time and resources, counterproductive work behavior, time theft, time banditry, withdrawal

INTRODUCTION

If employees of an organisation are asked if they are 100% productive throughout the scheduled work hour, not many would affirm (Brock et al., 2013). This leads one to ponder how employees are using the organisation time and resources to contribute to the organisation during work hours. Time and resources of an organisation are its assets which have to be used by the employees to contribute to the organisation's productivity. Misuse of these prove to be costly for any organisation. An employee can exhibit these behaviors in many different ways. A few ways among them are coming late, leaving early, using internet for non-work related activities, taking longer lunch or coffee breaks, abandoning some task responsibilities to pursue self-interest. Many studies propose that employees require some off-task time to be motivated and productive.But in case if this off-task time is claimed beyond what is sanctioned by the organisations, it is misuse (Martin et al., 2010).Though these behaviors are very common and

hassignificant negative effects on organisations, they have been understudied(Henleet al., 2010; Brock et al., 2013). As these behaviors undermines the organisation's mission, morale, effectiveness and productivity, it is important to study these behaviors in today'sorganisational context. By strengthening the conceptualization and theoretical understanding of these behaviors in terms of their causes and consequences, attempts to identify, predict, intervene and ultimately minimize the occurrence of such acts could be more effective.

Over the last few decades, researchers have studied misuse of time and resources as one of the dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors (CWB). It has been recently introduced as a distinct construct of CWB (Baskin, et al., 2017). It has been termed differently by different authors like withdrawal (Spector et al., 2006), time theft (Henle et al., 2010), time banditry (Baskin et al., 2017).

In general, studies in the literature portray CWB which consists misuse of time and resources as one of its dimensions, as employee response to frustrating organisational situations (Royet al., 2012; Mattaet al., 2014). These frustrating organisational situations lead to negative emotions and these negative emotions leads to misuse of time and resources in organisations. Majority of the studies limits the conceptualization of negative emotions as a function of single variable. However, it consists of different individual emotions like anger, anxiety and depression, among others. Studies on individual emotions would yield more useful insights on how these discrete emotions influence employeebehavior. In this study we intend to examine the effect of discrete individual emotions on misuse of time and resources.

Furthermore, CWB literature has identified the influence of individual's perception of organisation control environment on their behavior (Fox and Spector, 1999; Spector and Fox, 2002). However, no substantial work has been carried out considering all possible factors that defines the perception of organisation control environment. The influence of these factors on misuse of time and resources has not been explicitly examined. This opens a gap for further research to empirically examine the influence of perception of organisation control environment on misuse of time and resources.With this back drop, the following are the two research objectives for the study.

1. To discern the influence of discrete negative emotions on misuse of time and resources.

2. To investigate the effects of perceived organisation control environment on misuse of time and resources.

For this study, data from employees in manufacturing and IT organisations in Bangalore was collected using a structured questionnaire. This study examines the influence of discrete negative emotions and perception of organisation control environment on misuse of time and resources. In that direction this study would further provide a deeper understanding as to when and why employees engage in these behaviors. This paper consists of six sections. Second section consists of literature review and development of hypothesis for the study.Section three describes the sample and methodology adopted in the study. Section four presents the data analysis and results of the study. Section five consists of the discussion followed by conclusion of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Misuse of Time

Several deviant behaviors have been identified in the literature as being harmful.These behaviors harm the organisations or its members or both. Misuse of time fall into the category of behaviors that harm the organisation. It has been recently identified as a distinct dimension of negatively deviant behavior or counterproductive behavior (Baskin et al., 2017). By definition, misuse of time resembles several other constructs like withdrawal, time theft, time banditry and the like. Spector et al. (2006) defined withdrawal as behaviors that restrict the amount of productive time in the organization.Henle et al., (2010) definedemployee's behaviors of wasting or spending time during work hours without contributing to the organisation as time theft. On the similar lines, time banditry constitutes employee behaviors of engaging in non-task activities during their scheduled work hours (Baskin et al., 2017). Further, these behaviors are exhibited during work hours for which the employees are compensated for, even though they are not contributing to the productivity of the organisation. Hence, these behaviors are unethical as it imply theft of time which rightfully belongs to the organisation. In short, employees will be working part time in exchange for full-time pay (Ketchen et al., 2008; Henle et al., 2010).

An online survey by AOL and salary.com collected response from 10,044 individuals and estimated that on an average each individual wastes around 2 hours per day that contribute to a loss of $759 billion annually (Malachowski, 2005).. A study in construction industry reports that 53 minutes per employee is wasted on a daily basis. Another study in retail setting found

that more than 60% of employees reported their misuse of time in working hours (Malachowski, 2005; Henle et al., 2010). In a study by Henle et al. (2010), over 84% respondents admitted their involvement in misuse of time at least once over a period of two months. In survey of HR professionals (Burke andEsen, 2005) 50% of respondents admitted that theystayed back late at least sometimes with not much work to do and 44% of respondents reported that they stayed late and were not productive.

In the next section we explain why misuse of time and misuse of resources is considered together as one construct in this study.

Misuse of Time and Resources

The behavior of using internet for personal reasons, organizations phone for personal calls not only represents misuse of time but also indicates misuse of resources. Here the phones, computers and internet facility are provided by anorganization to carry out the organization tasks. Using these during scheduled work hours for personal use represents misuse of resources along with misuse of time. On the similar lines, excessive socialization with coworkers also represents misuse of both time and resources considering coworkers who are unnecessarily dragged into conversations, who would have otherwise been productive during that time as organization resources. Thus misuse of time and misuse of resources go hand in hand and thus can be studied as a single construct. Therefore, in this study these concepts are considered to be one and used across thestudy as "misuse of time and resources".

Organizations have certain strategic objectives that need to be accomplished and some resources at their disposal to accomplish the set objectives. Any organizationstriving to be productive with minimum or optimum resources will be greatly affected by these kinds of behaviors. It is considered to be a major problem in any organization because of its frequency of occurrence and its associated financial cost. Apart from economic costs from these behaviors, organization will also have certain negative implications. For example, managers or supervisors may have to spend more time monitoring and disciplining their employees and rescheduling other employees to manage the lagging tasks of those employees who engage in such behaviors (Henle et al., 2010). And employees who has to work more to cover up these temporary production loss would be demotivated (Jamal, 1984). Hence employees who misuse time and resources might end up having a strained relationship with their supervisors and coworkers. This condition can be even more worst for organizations that work in teams as this

kind of behavior of one employee can affect the entire team (Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly, 1998; Henle et al., 2010).

In the following section we will look at the predictors that cause or influence these kind of behaviors.

Predictors of Misuse of Time and Resources

Prior literature provides conflicting views regarding the intent of these behaviors. Some studies state that these behaviors are neither exhibited to harm the organization or its members nor they are intentional (Spector et al., 2006; Brock et al., 2013).However, Henle et al. (2010) called misuse of time and resources as unethical and intentional,as employees are stealing time that rightfully belongs to theorganization and for which they arecompensated. Regardless of the underlying intentions, these behaviors are costly to the organizations (Kethchen et al., 2008).

In many cases, misuse of time and resources is driven by laziness or self-interest(Ketchen et al., 2008; Martin et al., 2010).This shows that these behaviors are not necessarily exhibited with an intention to harm the organization or its members. However, literature also provides evidence to show that these behavior are intentional. In an organizational settings, an employee is not expected to demonstrate his frustration or any other negative emotions against the organization or his supervisor. In such cases he would not prefer to exhibit overt behaviors like aggression, abuse and sabotage, but rather respond covertly through behaviors like withdrawal, shrinking, production deviance which are kinds of misuse of time and resources. Hence these behaviors are used as a form of passive-aggressive retaliation in response to disappointment, frustration or underappreciation (Storm and Spector, 1987; Bennett and Robinson, 2000)

Studies in the literature shows that misuse of time and resources could be driven by certain situations: perception of injustice, lack of direction, boredom, lack of interest, lack of support, poorly defined tasks, job complexity, laziness,inappropriate allocation of personal time duringwork hours, frustration with work environment (Ketchen et al., 2008; Baskin et al., 2017). These situations lead to negative emotions that further influence employee behavior (Fox and Spector, 1999; Fida et al., 2015). Greater the extent to which an individual is frustrated in an organization setting, the more he/she will find ways to withdraw from that psychologically or deviate his/her attention to activities like cyber loafing, talking to coworkers or over phone. In other words, employees logically seek to avoid frustrating situations and

replace these with other rewarding tasks though it is a temporary reward (Ketchen et al.,2008; Martin et al., 2010).

In a study by Taylor and Walton (1971), organizational frustration was found to positively relate to withdrawal.Spector (1978) suggested, withdrawing psychologically from the situation as one among several responses to the perception of frustration. This psychological withdrawal would lead to detachment, absence, reduced effort or turnover. A field study by Storms and Spector (1987) exhibited an association between frustration and behaviors like demonstrating apathy towards the job, wasting time and materials, taking undeservedbreaks that represents misuse of time and resources. Here frustrations can be considered as emotional reactions to frustrating situations (Storm and Spector, 1987). These frustrating situations induce negative emotions in employees and these emotions influence employee behavior (Spector and Fox, 2002). Further, studies linking job stressors to CWB have considered negative emotions as a single composite variable or just limited toa few emotional reactions (Fox et al., 2001; Miles et al ., 2002; Bruk-Lee and Spector 2006; Dalal et al., 2009). But it consists of a wide range of different individual emotions namely, anger, anxiety, boredom, frustration, depression among others(Katwyk et al.,2000). Spector et al., (2006) studied the discrete emotion item within upset subscale and found withdrawal to be related to the emotions like anger and fury.Further, emotions such as fatigue, gloom and fury were related to production deviance. This explains that each emotion can be an underlying motivation for different behaviors.

Hence to understand how different emotions influence misuse of time and resources, there is a need to look more microscopically at these behaviors in relation to different discrete negative emotions.

Hypothesis 1: Discrete negative emotion influence the behavior of "misuse of time and resources".

Hypothesis1a: Anger will be positively related to misuse of time and resources

Hypothesis1b: Anxiety will be positively related to misuse of time and resources

Hypothesis1c: Boredom will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1d: Depression will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1e: Discouragement will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1f: Disgust will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1g: Fatigue will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1h: Fright will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1i: Fury will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis1j: Gloom will be positively related to misuse of time and resource

Effect of perceived organizationcontrol

The felt negative emotions trigger certain negative behaviors. But this does not happen in a reflexive manner with humans. At times, in case of strong emotions, individuals might act quite impulsively but typically emotions prepare a person to act depending upon certain other factors (Spectorand Fox, 2002). These behaviors are strongly influenced by the individual's perception of the likelihood of being caught and punished. According to Dollard et al. (1939) `the inhibition of any act of aggression varies directly with the strength of the punishment anticipated for the expression of that act' (p. 37). Thus the overt expression of CWB would be anticipated to be linked to the perception that one could slip away without being caught and punished (Fox and Spector, 1999; Spector and Fox, 2002).

The CWB literature identifiesvariables like perceived certainty of detection and perceived severity of punishmentto have an influence on the behavior of theft (Hollinger and Clark, 1983). Perceived certainty of detection refers to employee's perceived risk of being discovered after committing an act of CWB (Hollinger and Clark, 1983). This explains the general perception of detection risk –whether by management, co-workers or any other source.Perceived severity of punishment refers to a range of formal and informal sanctions imposed by management or coworkers(Hollinger and Clark, 1983). Formal sanctions operate via the regularized bureaucratic rules and corresponding sanctions established by those in power within the work organization. Verbal and written warnings, dismissal, demotion, and suspension are few examples for formally instituted sanctions.Informal sanctions deter the pervasiveness of CWBs in the organizations by creating a normative behavior in terms of rule breaking and other offenses (Fine et al., 2010).While the formal social controls are no doubt important in shaping employee work behaviors, research has shown that this phenomenon would be more effective along with the informal social controls or work group sanctions (Hollinger and Clark, 1982; Parilla et al., 1988). According to Fine et al., (2010), the type and the level of CWB in organizations show the normative behavior of fellow employees such that

the level of a particular CWB (e.g. theft, sabotage) will be high when that behavior is tolerated by their coworkers. Thus we propose perceived certainty of detection, perceived severity of punishment, and perceived informal work group sanctionsto be negatively associated with misuse of time and resource.

Hypothesis 2a: Perceived certainty of detection will be negatively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis 2b:Perceived severity of punishmentwill be negatively related to misuse of time and resource

Hypothesis 2c: Perceived Informal work group sanctionswill be negatively related to misuse of time and resource

METHOD

Participants

The respondents for the study were719employees working in Bangalore, among whom 621 were from manufacturing industry and the remaining 98 respondents were from IT industry. Out of 719, 301 respondents were shop floor employees and the remaining 418 respondents work in office. The sample comprised respondents whose age ranged from 18 to 58 years. The average age of the group is 31 years. Majority of the sample comprised male respondents (610=84%) than female respondents (109=15%). The distribution of respondents based on marital status was uniform with 365 married respondents (51 %) and 354 unmarriedrespondents (49%). The educational qualification of the respondents varies from 10th standard, Diploma, 12th standard, ITI, Graduation to Post Graduation. Work experience in current organization varied from 3 months to 35 years.

Measures

Misuse of time and resources: The measure consisted of 12 items relating to misuse of time and resources with a Cronbach alpha of 0.9. The items were drawn from theSpector et al. (2006) CWB scale's withdrawaldimensionsand Gruys and Sackett's (2003) CWB dimension of misuse of time and resources.

Negative emotions: The negative emotion subscale of the Job-related affective well-being scale was used (JAWS; Katwyket al., 2000) to measure negative emotions. Respondents were

asked to rate how often their present jobs made them feel each of 10 negative emotions. Each item was rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1=Never to 5 = very often.

Perceived organization control: This measure included three subscales to capture Perceived certainty of detection (alpha = 0.928), Perceived severity of formal punishment (alpha= 0.894), Perceived informal work group sanctions (alpha= 0.934). Perceived certainty of detection measures how certainly these behaviors will be detected if exhibited. Each item of all dimensions of CWB scalewas rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1=never detected to 5 = always detected. Perceived severity of formal punishment is measured by capturing the most common reaction of the person in authority to the participation in each of these behaviors. The possible response choice for each item of all dimensions of CWB scale included 1-ignore/ do nothing, 2-consult/ discuss, 3-warn/ reprimand, 4-minor punishment, 5-decision to discharge/ dismiss. Perceived informal work group sanction was measured by capturing the most common reaction of coworkers to their participation in each of these behaviors. Each item of all dimensions of CWB scale was rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1-encourage, 2-do nothing, 3-discourage, 4-avoid the person, 5-inform the person in authority.

Demographics: The survey measure was designed to captureonly basic demographic details like age, gender, marital status, education, tenurewhich would further help our analysis and interpretation of data. These are used as control variables.

Procedure

Datawas collected via questionnaires that were administered and completed during company time and returned in sealed envelopes.The respondents were explained about the procedure to complete the questionnaire and also they were made aware that there is no right or wrong answers and they should only choose among the given options according to their perception. The respondents were assured of confidentiality and informed that the information would be used for research purpose only. In order to maintain anonymity and due to the sensitive nature of questions relating to CWB, we followed the recommendations of Spector et al., (2006) and limited our collection of demographic data. On an average the respondents took 20-25 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

To begin with, as a part of preliminary data analysis, independent sample t test is carried out to determine whether the behaviors of misusing time and resources vary with respect to demographic variables (which are the control variables in further statistical analysis). Further,

the respondents are groupedinto 3 categories based on tenure and one-way ANOVA is used to check the significant differences in these behaviors across tenure. This is followed by multiple regression analysis that focuses on the stated objectives of the study. The results of these analysis are discussed below.

There is no significant statistical differences in the groups in the context of misuse of time and resource across age, gender and marital status. A significant difference is observed between respondents who are below graduation and respondents with graduation and above at 1% significance level. Further, it implies that respondents with graduation and above, misuse time and resources more than the respondents who are below graduation.

Table 1: Independent sample t test of misuse of time and resources with respect to demographic variables.

Demographic variables	Categories	N	Mean	SD	P-Value
Age	18-30	437	1.88	0.70	0.366
	Above 30	280	1.84	0.69	
Gender	Male	610	1.87	0.70	0.536
	Female	109	1.83	0.68	
Marital Status	Single	354	1.89	0.73	0.387
	Married	365	1.84	0.67	
Education	Below Graduation	321	1.69	0.64	0.000**
	Graduation and Above	398	2.00	0.71	
Industry	Manufacturing	621	1.77	0.65	0.000**
	IT	98	2.43	0.71	
Domain	Shop-floor	301	1.67	0.64	0.000**
	Office	418	2.01	0.70	

Misuse of time and resources shows a significant difference between manufacturing and IT industry at 1% significance level. The mean values indicate that respondents from IT industry misuse time and resources more than the respondents from manufacturing industry.These behaviors varies with the domain of work. The mean values for respondents who work in office are significantly higher than that of those who work on shop floor. Thus it can be inferred that the respondents who work in office misuse time and resources more than those who work on shop floor.

ANOVA of different dimensions of CWB with respect to Tenure

ANOVA is used to verify if misuse of time and resources varies with tenure of the respondent. In this study, the respondents are grouped under 3 categories based on tenure. First category consists of respondents with less than one year of experience in the current organization and this category represents new hires of the organizations. Second category consists of respondents with experience between 1 to 5 years in the current organization and represents employees with moderate experience. The last category consists of respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the current organization and represents employees with a longer tenure in the current organization. The results of ANOVA are shown below.

Table 2 Results of ANOVA – Misuse of time and resources and Tenure

Dimensions of CWB	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Square	Observed F	P-Value
Misuse of Time and Resources	Between Groups	4.638	2	2.319	4.754	.009
	Within Groups	349.221	716	.488		
	Total	353.858	718			

Table2 shows that misuse of time and resources significantly varies with tenure. To further understand the pair wise difference in means,the Tukey's multiple comparison testis used. The results are as follows.

Table 3 Tukey's results – Tenure and CWB dimensions

Dimensions of CWB	(I) Tenure	(J) Tenure	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Observed F / Lower Bound	P-Value / Upper Bound
Misuse of Time and Resources	<1Year	1-5 years	-.10204	.07150	.327	-.2700	.0659
		Above 5 years	.07759	.07083	.517	-.0888	.2439
	1-5 years	<1Year	.10204	.07150	.327	-.0659	.2700
		Above 5 years	.17963	.05832	.006**	.0427	.3166
	Above 5 years	<1Year	-.07759	.07083	.517	-.2439	.0888
		1-5 years	-.17963	.05832	.006**	-.3166	-.0427

The Tukey's post-hoc comparison (Table 3) of the dimension misuse of time and resources across different categories based on tenure revealed that the respondents with moderate tenure (1-5 years) significantly differ from the respondents with longer tenure (>5 years). The mean difference indicates that respondents with moderate tenure misuse time and resources than compared to longer tenure respondents. However, there is no significant difference in this CWB dimension between new hires (<1 year) and respondents with moderate tenure (1-5 years) and also between new hires and respondents with longer tenure (above 5 years).

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 4: Influence of negative emotions and perceived organizational control environment on Misuse of time and resources: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

	Stardardized Model Coefficients	P-Value	VIF
(Constant)		.000***	
Industry	.189	.000***	1.338
Domain	.113	.032**	2.586
Age	.060	.303	3.114
Gender	-.047	.180	1.130
Marital status	-.083	.062*	1.845
Edu2	.019	.720	2.614
OrgExp	-.020	.699	2.376
Angry	-.005	.901	1.329
Anxiety	.006	.882	1.449
Boredom	.009	.820	1.467
Depression	-.027	.507	1.519
Discouragement	.165	.000***	1.570
Disgust	.011	.773	1.435
Fatigue	.072	.043**	1.190
Fright	-.036	.337	1.330
Fury	.086	.027**	1.412
Gloom	.022	.563	1.384
Certainty of detection	.021	.539	1.075
Perceived severity of punishment	-.038	.330	1.404
Perceived work group sanction	-.227	.000***	1.440
Model Statistics			
Number of observations	719		
R Square	0.253		
Adjusted R Square	0.231		
F Statistics	11.763		
P- Value	0.000***		

*: Significance at 0.1 (90 %), **: significance at 0.05(95%), ***: significance at 0.01(99%)

It can be observed (Table 4) that the obtained F value of 11.763 is significant (pvalue=0.000). This shows that the model is useful in explaining misuse of time and resources using negative emotions and perceived organizational control environment as predictor variables. The obtained R square value of 0.253 shows the goodness of fit. The model explains 25.3% of variance of the dimension "misuse of time and resources" being explained by all the factors. This model yields seven significant beta coefficients. Significant negative emotions in the model are discouragement, fatigue and fury. These emotions show a positive correlation with misuse of time and resources. The beta coefficients of these three negative emotions indicate that the emotion discouragement has more influence on these behaviors than compared to fatigue and fury. Discouragement has got standardized beta value of 0.165 and p value of 0.000 which is significant at a significance level of 1%.The standardized beta coefficient of fatigue is 0.072 and p value of 0.043 which is significant at a significance level of 5%. Fury has a beta value of 0.086 and p value of 0.027 which is significant at a significance level of 5%. This indicates that emotions like discouragement, fatigue and fury encourage misuse of time and resources in an organization. In this model perceived informal workgroup sanctions has a highest beta coefficient of 0.227 among all the significant coefficients. It shows a significant negative correlation with misuse of time and resources at 0.01 degrees of significance. It demonstrates that behaviors pertaining to misuse of time and resources at work reduces to the extent it is disapproved by the fellow employees.

DISCUSSION

This study was intended to investigate the extent to which negative emotions influences the behavior of misusing time and resources in organizations. Prior studies have termed all the negative emotions collectively as frustration. In this study we have made an attempt to look microscopically at the effects of discrete negative emotions and perception of the organization control environment on these behaviors. The results of the study present several interesting insights.

First, the t-test results reveal that shop floor employees demonstrate less of misuse of time and resources than compared to employees who work in office environment. Shop floor is an area of an organization where people work on machines. Due to the nature of work and the visibility of the work progress, shop floor employees may not get much opportunity to exhibit these

behaviors. Education level of majority of the shop floor employees will be below graduation and almost 50% of respondents from manufacturing industry work on shop floor. Hence the category of respondents whose education level is below graduation and the category of respondents who work in manufacturing industry also show less of these behaviors than their counterparts.

Further, it was found that not all negative emotions have an effect on misuse of time and resources. Discouragement, fatigue and fury were the emotions that were positively relating to these behaviors. It shows that the organizational events that reduce the employee's confidence with the organization and discourage them might motivate them to misuse organization time and resource. These kinds of events may trigger employee to psychologically withdraw from the organizational situation. A study conducted by Spector (1978) also suggests that psychological withdrawal results in detachment, absence or reduced effort. Further, the results show fatigue to be influencing misuse of time and resources. Fatigue which is a subjective feeling of tiredness which can have both physical and mental causes for it can encourage these behaviors. Some organizational situations like lack of proper direction to perform the task or lack of required support systems to execute the job which makes an employee feel he needs to overexert to complete a job can induce a feeling of fatigue.In addition, some characteristics of the task/job like being monotonous, leading to physical strain (e.g. Work by standing for too long) may also encourage the employees to exhibit these behaviors quite often than required. Furthermore, the study results also show that the emotion fury influences misuse of time and resources. Prior literature relates frustration with acts of aggression, abuse and sabotage (Fox & Spector, 1999).These studies further insist that employees rarely exhibit these acts directly or overtly. Instead they display their frustration through covert acts like wasting of time and materials, the dirtying or defacing of the work environment, and the withholding of output. The relationship between fury and misuse of time and resources can be thus justified as passive-aggressive retaliation towards the organization.

The results show that perceived informal workgroup sanctionsto be significantly correlating with misuse of time and resources. Whereas, both certainty of detection and perceived severity of punishment were not found to be significant in relation with these behaviors.This ascertains the importance of informal sanctions in an organization. Though the formal sanctions like verbal and written warnings, dismissal, and demotion are important in defining employee behavior at work, informal social sanctions are much more important as they shape the normative behavior of employees in an organization. This result is in line with prior studies

that emphasizes the importance of informal social sanctions by claiming that formal sanctions work more effectively along with informal social sanctions (Parilla et al., 1988; Fine et al., 2010).This finding presents an interesting practical implication of creating a pro-organizational social environment where in any behavior that harms the organization or its members by an employee is not tolerated by the fellow workers. This would be an effective way in which any deviant behavior can be reduced in organizations.

CONCLUSION

This study identified 3 discrete negative emotions namely discouragement, fury and fatigue as major influencing factors of the behavior of misusing time and resources in any organization. Further the study has also ascertained the importance of perceived informal workgroup sanctions in shaping normative behavior of employees in an organization.

The extant literature demonstrates the influence of negative emotions on misuse of time and resources. However, majority of the studies show them as mediating factor between organizational situation and behavior. Further the conceptualization of these negative emotions are limited as a function of single variable though it consists of different individual emotions like anger, anxiety and depression and the like.

In addition, literature has identified the influence of individual's perception of organization control environment on their behavior (Fox and Spector, 1999; Spector and Fox, 2002). However, no substantial work has been carried out considering all possible factors that defines the perception of organization control environment. At most studies have considered the influence of the perception of likelihood of being caught and punished. In this study we have considered certainty of detection, perceived severity of formal punishment, and perceived workgroup sanctions to define perceived organizational control environment.

The results of this study highlight emotions such as discouragement, fury and fatigue, and perceived work group sanction as vital influencing factors that affects the behavior of misusing organizational time and resources. This understanding further helps the practitioners to develop effective interventions to reduce these behaviors in organizations.

The study uses job-related affective well-being scale to measure negative emotions that may not represent the entire range of negative emotions at work. This study was based on the self-report survey method. Though much care was taken during the survey, the response could suffer little effects of social desirability factor.

This study can be further extended to trace back these discrete emotions to their causal factors in organizational context. Thus identifying what causes these emotions in the organization can further help to develop suitable interventions to reduce these behaviors.

Reference:

Baskin, M. E., McKeel, V., and Buckley, M. R. (2017),*Time Banditry and Impression Management Behavior: Prediction and Profiling of Time Bandit Types*, Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies.

Bennett, R. J. and Robinson,S. L.(2000), *The Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance*, Journal of Applied Psychology.

Brock, M.E., Martin, L. E., and Buckley, M. R. (2013),*Time Theft in Organizations:The development of the Time Banditry Questionnaire,* International Journal of Selection and Assessment.

Bruk-Lee and Spector (2006),*The Social Stressors–Counterproductive Work Behaviors Link: Are Conflicts With Supervisors and Coworkers the Same?* Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.

Burke, M. E., and Esen, E. (2005),*Workplace productivity*. United States of America, Alexandria:Society of the Human Research Management.

Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., and Hulin, C. L., (2009).*A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance.*Academy of Management Journal.

Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tramontano, C., Fontaine, R. G., Barbaranelli, C., Farnese, M.L. (2015), *An Integrative Approach to Understanding Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Roles of Stressors, Negative Emotions, and Moral Disengagement*. Journal of business ethics.

Fox, S. and Spector, P. E. (1999),*A model of work frustration- aggression.* Journal of Organizational Behavior

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., and Miles, D. E. (2001),*Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) In Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions*. Journal of Vocational Behavior.

Fine, S.,Horowitz, I., Weigler, H., and Basis, L. (2010),*Is Good Character Good Enough? The Effects of Situational Variables on the Relationship between Integrity and Counterproductive Work Behaviors*, Human Resource Management Review.

Gruys, M. L., and Sackett, P. R. (2003),*Investigating the Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behavior,* International Journal of Selection and Assessment.

Henle, C. A., Reeve, C. L., and Pitts, V. E. (2010), *Stealing time at work: Attitudes, social pressure, and perceived control as predictors of time theft,* Journal of Business Ethics.

Hollinger, R. C. and Clark, J. P. (1982),*Formal and informal Social Controls of Employee Deviance.*The Sociological Quarterly.

Hollinger, R. C. and Clark, J. P. (1983),*Deterrence in the Workplace: Perceived Certainty, Perceived Severity and Employee Theft.* Social Forces.

Jamal, M. (1984), *Job Stress and Job Performance Controversy: An Empirical Assessment*, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance.

Katwyk, P. T. V., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., and Kelloway, E. K. (2000),*Using the job related affective well-being scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors,* Journal of occupational health psychology.

Roy, J. L., Bastounis, M., Minibas-Poussard, J. (2012).*Interactional justice and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of negative emotions*. Social Behavior and Personality.

Ketchen, D. J., Craighead, C. W., and Buckley, M. R., (2008),*Time bandits: How they are created, why they are tolerated, and what can be done about them*,Business Horizons.

Malachowski, D. (2005). *Wasted time at work costing companiesbillions*. Retrieved from http://www.bxgi.com/content/wasted-time-at-work.pdf

Martin, L. E., Brock, M. E, Buckley, M. R., and Ketchen, D. J., (2010),*Time banditry: Examining the purloining of time in organizations,* Human Resource Management Review.

Matta, F.K., Erol-Korkmaz, H.T., Johnson, R.E., Biçaksiz, P. (2014),*Significant work events and counterproductive work behavior: The role of fairness, emotions, and emotion regulation*, Journal of Organizational Behavior.

Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., and Fox, S. (2002),*Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors- A comparison of CWB with OCB*. International journal of selection and assessment.

Parilla, P. F., Hollinger, R. C., and Clark, J. P., (1988). *Organizational Control of Deviant Behavior: The Case of Employee Theft.*Social Science Quarterly.

Robinson, S. L. and O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998),*Monkey See, Monkey Do: The Influence of Work Groups on the Antisocial Behavior of Employees,*Academy of Management journal.

Spector, P. E., (1978). Organizational frustration: A model and review of the literature. *Personnel Psychology.*

Spector, P. E., and Fox, S. (2002),*An Emotion-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior: Some Parallels between Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).*Human Resource Management Review.

Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L.M., Bruursema, and Kessler, S. (2006),*The Dimensionality Of Counterproductivity: Are All Counterproductive Behaviors Created Equal?,*Journal of Vocational Behavior.

Storms, P. L., and Spector, P. E., (1987),*Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioural reactions: The moderating effect of locus of control*, Journal of Occupational Psychology.

Taylor, L., and Walton, P., (1971), "*Industrial sabotage: Motives and meanings,*" in Cohen, S. (Ed.),*Images of Deviance.* London, Penguin.

Technology & Operations and Service Management