

Behavior of Employees in the Workplace

Tshilunga Kanyinda Patrick¹, Pungu Tshimwanga Matthieu²

Abstract: *Reactions in the employee to factors in the workplace, there are productive and counterproductive behaviors. The first ones flourish the employee and make the company perform well. The second, raised as part of this study by remuneration, present danger to the employee himself, his professional interactions and the organization. Given the harmful nature of these behaviors, this article suggests strategies for their modification.*

Keywords: productive behavior, counterproductive behavior.

1. Introduction

The fruit of both fortuitous external constraints and reinforcements brought about by education with the multiple social conditioning that will accompany it, the employee's behaviors in an organization result from the learned responses of the individual under the influence of various stimuli.

They are both productive and counterproductive. The first are, according to H.W. Bierhoff (2002), acts carried out with the aim of improving the situation of the person who is destined for help. In the same vein, P. Desrumaux (2007), speaking of pro-organizational behavior in place of productive behavior, considers that it helps to maintain organizational norms and works to maintain well-being of the members of the organization.

These definitions emphasize that productive behaviors are an integral part of human social relationships that involve a range of behaviors including helping, sharing, and considering others.

The second are, according to P.E. Spector and S. Fox (2005), voluntary acts intended to harm the organization and / or its stakeholders. PR Sackett (2002) argues that counterproductive behaviors are those of organizational members, intentional or otherwise, directed to the organization or individual, that may result in decreased performance and increased performance. Costs for organizations as well as, add C. Aubé et al. (2009), negative impacts on the psychological well-being and quality of work life of employees. SL Robinson and RJ Bennett (1995) define deviating employee behaviors as voluntary behaviors that violate meaningful organizational norms and, in doing so; threaten the well-being of the organization, of its members or two at the same time.

The analysis of these definitional aspects clearly points to the assertion that counterproductive behavior can manifest itself through retaliation, absenteeism, presenteeism, revenge, avoidance, disengagement at work, sabotage or theft, aggression or harassing behavior or doing nothing. These are harmful acts, inappropriate reactions, malicious actions to harm, intentional actions in the workplace and directed either towards the organization or to the members who are employed there. The purpose of these behaviors is to undermine the legitimate interests of the company, thereby intentionally or unintentionally violating the rules or procedures.

These behaviors are observed in the employee, the least skilled worker but also important, especially for work that requires a consistent physical effort. The employee is employed in the public service or in certain industrial or commercial enterprises.

Productive behaviors flourish the workers and make the company perform well. We focus on counterproductive behaviors related to the loss of professional drive, the development of non-citizenship at work and the spreading of a bad image of the company, raised, respectively, by the remuneration through the basic salary, the equivalent value of housing and family allowances. These so-called counterproductive behaviors prove to be dangerous, ineffective and produce, on the one hand, harmful effects that affect the smooth running of the company, and, on the other hand, accumulate demotivation and personal problems of the agent. For their analysis, here are the questions we ask: what are the obvious counterproductive behaviors from the above-mentioned headings of remuneration? What is the danger of these behaviors? What to do about this danger?

2. Counterproductive Behaviors

The behaviors of the employee called counterproductive do not allow him to live decently, him and his family: the basic salary, the amount of housing and the unfair family allowances are at the base of the dysfunction and the development of the behaviors which cause the wrong to the company or its members. These three headings constitute a remuneration which is intended to be fair, vital and which must, moreover, be a protection mechanism in order to guarantee at least the food, the housing and the education of the workers. If one is not guaranteed, remuneration is the basis for the installation and maintenance of a harmful workplace. It encourages, on the one hand, the development of attitudes that are contrary to the interests of the company and, on the other hand, the disappearance of the multiple behaviors that should, in principle, be apparent to the employee. Consequently, the company does not manage the staff humanely enough nor does it maintain a good social climate.

As a result of an insignificant basic salary, the employee loses his enthusiasm and feels that he is not an active and strong person. He neither deploys nor persists enthusiastically in the effort. He develops moral disgust with work and loses the notion of professional dedication. Clearly, it develops a discomfort felt and experienced almost

by all employees and a sense of humiliation and anguish. The agents are desperate and negligent because they are receiving unfair and unprotected basic wages.

This base salary, considered as malice, does not allow the employee to observe a steady pace of work and to remain perseverant. As a result, worried about his professional future, the employee displays attitudes of dissatisfaction at work. This leads to pessimism and feelings of uncertainty. He feels himself attained in his dignity as a man because the basic salary, instead of solving the life problems of the employee, multiplies them. He becomes anxious because his expectations are not met. As a family, he ends up experiencing shocking experiences. He doubts himself, dispossesses himself and experiences constant tension. He is anxious from time to time and endangers his well-being and that of his family.

The employee, because the amount of housing is not enough, is not attracted by others and does not feel, either, feelings of consideration towards the latter. He seeks neither harmony nor the development of good human social relations. The unfair and unprotected housing costs that companies give to their agents do not develop friendly relations. They make business relations difficult and destroy them. They discredit and denigrate the professional reputation and depreciate the employee's knowledge, efforts and skills. They incite, to hostile behaviors, the people with whom the agent is interacting.

In the workplace, instead of employees remaining respectful and caring, instead of keeping their morale high, the unfair amount of housing develops rude and disrespectful professional relationships, humiliating relationships that the employee manifests passively, of on the one hand, and of which he speaks very softly, on the other hand. In the first case, the employee has no regard for the leader by performing, for example, obscene gestures, using projectively a radical language. In the second case, the employee, in the back of the chief, utters threats and insults. He imitates the chief's approach, his voice, his gestures; he maintains the hurtful words as to judge the chief on his origins, to ask him to go for treatment.

The worker does not contribute with positive values through participation and cooperation to maintain and support the structures and rules of the company. It does not spread a good image of the latter, since the amount of family allowances is not enough. In other words, companies do not actually recognize the contribution of employees. They fail to fulfill their mission of protection and socialization towards their agents and do not know how to meet their various needs. In response, there is, on the part of the employee, deterioration and deterioration of the image of the company and installation of a real social malaise testifying a real bad life at work.

Employees, because of the unfair amount of family allowances, do not want to validly represent the company outside of it or recommend it around them. They lack interest in the business. They take a distance and find excuses to stop work or reduce effort. Sometimes they adopt irritating behaviors and display attitudes that mark a break in

belonging to the social system of the company. They believe that the company appears to be failing and unfair. She is not friendly and their distress is not heard because they fail to define themselves in relation to the profession, to situate themselves socially and to build themselves personally. They discourage, therefore, those who have made the decision to stay or join the company.

3. Danger of counterproductive behavior

3.1. Compared to the employee himself

The agent builds a kind of defense to offset the basic salary he receives. This practice adversely affects professional benefits. It becomes a destructive feeling, thus endangering the mental, physical and even psycho-socio-professional health of the agent. The employee suffers a series of humiliation, degradation, mortification and profanation of his personality.

From the mental point of view, the work in the factory develops with the employee an acute awareness of psychological alienation. The agent feels marginalized, distant from others. It disposes of what really makes the charm of existence. It diminishes the value of its autonomy. He has difficulty concentrating and is caught up in low self-esteem and anxiety. It accumulates tension and anxiety, which have harmful effects on the mood and the sleep cycle. He develops moral disgust, withdraws into himself and self-destructs by taking refuge in alcohol and tobacco. The basic salary paid generates a feeling of fragility and insecurity. As a result of all the above, the professional tasks to be performed become inappropriate and undesirable.

From the physical point of view, the basic salary received increases the risk of burnout. The employee is living with ailments that can affect his health at any time. Movements formerly carried out with ease become slow, lazy and even feeble. The inertia invades, the voice becomes without brilliance. He loses manual dexterity, motor skill and visual integration.

At the psycho-socio-professional level, working hours are less fun. Bad days become more numerous than good ones. The agent's relationships are disrupted. Social affluence, one of the aspects of the construction of one's social identity, breaks up. He feels so deprived of his identity and his professional spirit. He loses the taste of life and repeatedly feels the feeling of social failure, feeling himself devalued, crushed and despised.

3.2. In relation to its interactions

The amount that is not enough creates tension in the company and, at times, a devastating situation. It is at the base of relational clumsiness. It disrupts professional relationships, which constantly create negative, harmful attitudes in the workplace and underlie misguided words against the boss. This amount hurts the enthusiasm and makes the agent react by indifference, denigration, isolation and even threats. The atmosphere and the working climate are degraded, become tense and lead to violence.

The perceived amount of housing complicates and makes collaboration difficult and relationships unsatisfactory. The employee is not happy. He believes the leader has gone beyond the limits. He loses the confidence he had in him before. He is disappointed and irritated at all times. He despises himself, remains rebellious and lives in despair. He feels humiliated, withdraws into himself, realizes internal recriminations, becomes aggressive and opts for defensive attitudes. He cares little for others, reinforces avoidance behavior and withdrawal from others, and becomes sullen, dissatisfied and ineffective member of the group.

3.3. In relation to the organization

The amount paid undermines job satisfaction, well-being and multiplies counterproductive behaviors that have a direct impact on the operation of the company. It compromises the health of the employee, lowers his morale, intensifies his intentions to leave the company and develops absenteeism, the spirit of sabotage of the equipment of work and theft.

The employee is less concerned about achieving the objectives assigned to the company. He feels that she has rejected him and despises him. It causes the loss of productivity. It decreases the professional performance. Inadequate remuneration is at the root of social tensions, affects the education of the employee's children and endangers the life of the couple. It accentuates the loss of professional interest and identity at work, and inhibits the competitive climate.

By way of conclusion on this paragraph relating to the danger of counterproductive behavior, we return to the remarks of P. Poitou (2007) which states that the employee, deprived of protection, at the mercy of his employer, will become the slave of modern times; poorly paid, disposable at any moment, subject to the arbitrariness and moods of his chiefs; with flexible working hours and without legal limit, without right of expression, subject to silence, forced to obedience, submission and servility; otherwise, he will be deprived of employment.

There is reason to be concerned, since the employee, instead of being, as EJ-P Mwenze Wa Kyungu (2016) puts it, the man producing for the individual and collective benefit, a helpful, integrated and integrative man, spending difficult days at work because of his basic salary, housing costs and family allowances that are not enough. Employees would leave the company. In the absence of an excess labor market in job demand, they feel like prisoners and choose to regain some freedom by engaging in counterproductive acts, often of greater intensity. The professional environment becomes, for them, negative and unpleasant. It harms their enthusiasm and creativity. The employee feels discouraged and unhappy. Remuneration demoralizes, makes it pessimistic, creates a negative climate of work and becomes an occasion for hostilities.

4. Strategies for modifying counterproductive behaviors

We suggest strategies to make changes in counterproductive behavior in light of the danger faced by the company of the Democratic Republic of Congo and the employee who brings his benefits. These strategies are based on the idea we borrowed from E.J.-P. Mwenze Wa Kyungu (2016) that it is time to revisit the social morality of citizens to make it compatible with the demands of human dignity in the face of the imperatives of collective well-being and the fundamental aspirations of all mankind .

It is important to take concrete, pedagogical, punctual or even ongoing actions to ensure fairness and consistency in employee compensation practices. These actions must emphasize the development of a roadmap that puts at ease all the partners related to the remuneration. They must take particular account of the growth of the employee, given his fragility and weakness in working relationships, and strive to improve his living conditions by giving him a fair remuneration so that he can demonstrate more, behaviors that develop the business. Behavior modification strategies are addressed to the Congolese State, the labor inspectorate, the employer, the employee, the union and the scientist.

4.1. Strategies addressed to the Congolese State

The State encourages the establishment of a permanent framework of dialogue and thus provides information to the employee and the company. It ensures that the exchanges between the two partners, namely the employee and the employer, are a permanent movement. The talks to which the unions will have to be associated will certainly enable the employees to cope with the difficulties experienced in terms of remuneration and, eventually, to move towards the solutions that are perfectly adequate, those which consist in granting a basic salary, fair value of housing and State-protected family allowances that arouse and prolong productive behavior.

4.2. Strategies for the labor inspectorate

By virtue of the prerogatives and the mission devolved to it, the labor inspectorate remains an empathic intervener. It must be available and engaged in such a way that the employee enjoys more and more protection, dignity, respect and human considerations at work.

4.3. Strategies for the employer

The employer is a successful entrepreneur who is also interested in what needs to be done to achieve the objectives assigned to the company by dealing, inter alia, with the delivery of equitable remuneration. This is why he must, on the one hand, develop attentive listening and, on the other hand, focus on the needs of the employee.

The employer emphasizes proximity. He is listening to expectations to restore the relationship of trust. In this case, he may personalize meetings and contacts with the employee from time to time to create stronger ties of attachment to ensure stability.

The employer focuses his efforts on the expectations and on the needs of the employee as well as the interests in order to improve the living conditions of the agent and to reinforce the increase of the factors of protection. By giving the employee a fair remuneration, the employee will have responded optimally to the following three issues: attracting, motivating and retaining, dictated by A. Gavand (2002). The author says that to attract is to enter the closed club of employers of choice, to arouse the interest of talents for the company, in general, and for its employer offer, in particular. Motivation means welcoming and integrating new entrants, creating favorable conditions for personal motivation and encouraging buy-in. And retaining is re-recruiting talent for the company and projects.

4.4. Strategies for the employee

The remuneration received by the worker gives rise to counterproductive behavior. It is at the base of the decline in self-esteem and self-control. She develops disharmony in the employee's interactions with the workplace. The employee must then express, openly, personally or through his representation, the concerns without appearing hostile in order to harmonize the views and thus allow its development by discharging twisted thoughts.

4.5. Strategies for unions

The union, a privileged stakeholder and hopeful for the employee, discusses frankly and seriously with the employer regarding the situation of the basic salary, housing and family allowances after having listened attentively to the employee. This listening consists of knowing more closely the demands of the agent, to develop between the employee and his representative the relationship of trust and strengthen the assets. The union must make the necessary information available to the union member. And both must form a network with a common vision, one that supports collaboration.

4.6. Strategies addressed to the scientist

Basic salary, housing and family allowances that are not enough are one of the sources of counterproductive behavior at work. The scientist can initiate reflections to explain and describe how each partner should go about it, in a constructive way, not only to safeguard the ideals and objectives of the company but also to initiate and establish an open space that deals with the exchanges between the partners concerned by the remuneration.

5. Conclusion

The amount of non-equitable remuneration leads to counterproductive behaviors which are respectively the loss of the professional drive, the development of non-citizenship at work and the lack of dissemination of a good image of the company.

In principle, when one works, one must, on the one hand, give the best of oneself so that the professional performance is favorable and, on the other hand, gain, in return, his life by being treated with equity. Work must allow the employee

to free himself from dependence and aspire to happiness. It must create a social link and remain an essential factor in the development of the company and the development of the worker. The organization in which an individual works plays an important role in the well-being of the individual. It is a place that must preserve human capital and promotes self-realization, positive social relations. Through fairness, it encourages the employee, not only to invest more in his professional activities and to fulfill his responsibilities, but also, to give back to the work its central place and to value the human capital.

Compensation is not very attractive and, on the other hand, does not allow one to expect a good professional performance. The organization becomes, then, a propitious witness of the emergence of the counterproductive behaviors, the answer to a prejudice. They go against established standards and threaten the welfare of the individual and the organization. Not paying fair and state-protected remuneration means not valuing and lacking recognition for the work done by the employee, requiring the employee not to trust the company and to leave the quality of work and employment relationships degrade.

References

- [1] Aubé, C. et al. (2009), « Counterproductive behaviors and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence », In *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 24, n°3, pp.351-362
- [2] Bierhoff, H.-W. (2002), *Prosocial Behaviour*. Hove, Psychology Press, S.L
- [3] Desrumaux, P. (2007), *Juger la valeur professionnelle et les conduites des personnes : effets des normes et des stéréotypes sur les jugements dans les organisations*, (Habilitation à diriger des recherches), Document non publié, Université de Lille 3
- [4] Gavand, A. (2002), *Le recrutement dans tous ses états*, Edition LPM, Paris
- [5] Mwenze Wa Kyungu E. J.-P. (2016), *Philosophie de l'éducation. L'idéal pour l'école et le développement social du Congo démocratique*, Editions universitaires, Lubumbashi
- [6] Poitou, P. (2007), *Le livre noir du travail*, L'Harmattan, Paris
- [7] Robinson, S.L. et Bennett, R.J. (1995), « A typology of deviant workplace behaviors : A multi-dimensional scaling study », In *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.38, n°2, pp.555-572
- [8] Sackett, P.R. (2002), « The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance », In *International Journal of Selection et Assessment*, Vol.10, n°2, pp.5-11
- [9] Spector, P.E. et Fox, S. (2005), « A model of Counterproductive work behavior : investigations of actors and targets », In *A.P.A Washington D.C, S. Vol.*, S.n°, pp.151-174