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Abstract

The overall purpose of this research is to identify those factors influencing the organizational misbehavior and its relationship with job burnout in staff departments of Kurdistan Agriculture Organization in Iran. The current study is an applied and survey research using a self-constructed and standard mixed questionnaire. The statistical population consists of 185 managers and staffs. The sample equals to 118 according to the Morgan’s table among which 81 questionnaires were returned to be considered for final analysis. The research tool reliability measuring by Cronbach Alpha was equal to 0.77 which is more than the acceptable threshold. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used by applying SPSS and Lisrel software packages. Findings showed that misbehaviors of three personality types of S, D, and O affect the job burnout. Also, based on the respondents’ views, inconsistency between the employees’ incomes and expenses and inefficient economic structure is the most influential factor contributing to the organizational misbehavior. Disregarding the employees’ welfare, frequent frustrations and stresses and inappropriate management system in the organization in different dimensions are the most influential factors affecting the job burnout.
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Introduction

Understanding the organizational behavior requires studying the organizational misbehavior. Emergence of problems in organizations is not a new issue and all members of an organization will be faced with organizational misbehavior factors with varying degrees of intensity. Undoubtedly, organizational misbehavior involves many costs for organizations. It consists of the actions and reactions occurring in the workplace which violate the rules of conduct in the work. Perceiving the behavior in workplace and organizational performances thoroughly, it is required to investigate the positive and negative aspects of work life. By identifying the flaws and violations, they have to be considered as wrong and inappropriate behaviors. According to the definition, organizational misbehavior or deviant behavior is regarded as any type of behavior violating the inter-organizational rules, regulations, customs and traditions with the purpose of harming the organization and its employees (Golparvar, Nayeri, & Mehdad, 2009). Job burnout is also the reduction of individual’s adaptation power with stressful factors and a syndrome composed of physical and emotional exhaustion contributing to negative self-concept and attitude and lack of feeling for making relationship with clients in work. Misbehavior, stress and its effects in business environment are some factors resulting in job burnout. Job stress, as one of the main sources of stress in many individuals’ lives, can cause reactions such as anxiety, restlessness, aversion to work, and sickness which are observed regularly against the stress. Thus, it can be concluded that individuals suffering from the organizational misbehavior are often not able to show a favorable performance.

During a comprehensive study about the causes and solutions for deviant behaviors and positive and negative norms, such as creativity and innovation, some organizations and organizational conditions have been identified that low performance, poor decision making, high level of job dissatisfaction and stress in employees due to high workload are their specifications. Until a few decades ago, organizational behavior researchers were studying the positive aspects of behavior. Work orientations, motivation, production and leadership were identified as the main fields of research in organizational behavior. In these situations, work in stressful environments contributes to interruption in human relationships and communications, work mistakes and repeated struggles with colleagues and superiors. Its continuance leads to job burnout acceleration and finally leaving job. For this reason, researchers were always trying to find a model justifying thoroughly the emergence of this phenomenon, organizational misbehavior, and its effects on the individual. So far, many theories and models were provided by researchers even introducing some criteria capable of predicting job burnout. This syndrome is defined as inability to cope with emotional stresses in workplace or extensive use of energy and resources contributing to frustration feeling and burnout. Although, depression and job burnout affect all aspects of individual life; but its signs occur only in workplace and cause reduction in health and well-being feeling (Poncet, Touillic, Papazian, & Kentish-Barnes, 2007).
Therefore, investigation of organizational misbehavior and its effects on job burnout is considered as a strategic process. Quality and efficiency of management and organization is a vital determinant in achievement of development and welfare plans in the organization and society. With regard to the existence of organizational abnormality in most of the organizations and its lack of study in a coherent way by management scholars and employees’ lack of knowledge about the organizational misbehavior factors make it necessary to conduct a research in this field. This study aims to identify and rank the organizational misbehavior factors and investigate its relationship with the job burnout.

**Literature review**

Research in organizational misbehavior has been increased in recent decades and has resulted in more perception of its outcomes and dimensions. Ferguson (2007) emphasized the individual misbehavior more than the social misbehavior. He used a longitudinal research to collect information about the respondents’ evaluations of organizational misbehavior in the first step and its negative effects in the second one. Misbehavior was observed in this study among the respondents. Organizational misbehavior states were classified in three groups involving intrapersonal abnormalities (violence, rape and deviant behavior), extra-personal abnormality (drug abuse) and political abnormality (tricks and discrimination).

Ackroyd, Batt, Thompson, & Tolber, (2012) defines organizational misbehavior more comprehensively as actions which must not occur in the workplace according to the administrative structures, culture and organizational rules and involves a partial challenge in dominant performances and tendencies in the organization.

(Salmani & Radmand, 2009) investigated the role of organization and management in deviant work behavior. Results showed that poor culture, injustice in rules and inappropriate structure of compensation system are the major factors in tendency to deviant behaviors.

(Golparvar & Nadi, 2011) studied the mediating role of organizational commitment in relationship between work ethics and organizational misbehavior in the workplace. Findings indicated that Islamic work ethics, firstly, causes the organizational commitment and then organizational commitment weakens misbehavior in the workplace.

(Asadi, Nosrati, Ghorbani, & Dousti, 2009) studied the effectiveness of group logo-therapy on job burnout. The covariance results showed that logo-therapy sessions have significantly decreased job burnout and it seems that logo-therapy is a favorable method to reduce it.

(Ghahramani, Arasteh Nazar, & Memar, 2011) investigated the locus of control in job burnout in fellowship training females of Literacy Movement in Tehran. Their findings indicated that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and job burnout factors. It was also found that none of the demographic factors affect the job burnout.
Madadian Pak (2004) found a negative relationship between job burnout and job satisfaction among nurses in governmental hospitals in Karaj.

Fahim Nia, Mousakhani, & Azargoun (2011) showed that there is a significant relationship between seven dimensions of learning organization and emotional burnout in National Library and Archives of Iran. Investigation of the relationship between dimensions of learning organizations and depersonalization showed that there are only a negative and significant relationship between depersonalization and two dimensions of “embedded systems for learning acquisition and sharing” and “strategic leadership for learning”.

Molk Ara (2010) presented that there is a significant relationship between time management and job burnout in Tax Organization Office of West Azarbaijan.

Hannani, Kashani, & Gilasi (2011) concluded that the repetition of emotional burnout in bank cashiers in public banks in Kashan is more than the other job burnout dimensions. It was recommended to reform workplace conditions and reduce the work stress for these employees.

Arches, (1991) came to this conclusion that lack of autonomy feeling has a negative effect on the reduction of job burnout; and vice versa existence of sources of financing has a positive effect on it.

Biron (2010) has also investigated the topics such as overall definitions of organizational misbehavior, its types and the reason of why it has been considered in contemporary organizational studies.

**Research hypotheses**

H1: Type S’s misbehavior affects the organizational misbehavior.

H2: Type O’s misbehavior affects the organizational misbehavior.

H3: Type D’s misbehavior affects the organizational misbehavior.

H4: There is a significant relationship between factors affecting organizational misbehavior.

H5: There is a significant relationship between factors affecting job burnout.

H6: There is a significant relationship between misbehavior and job burnout factors.

**Research methodology**

The current study is an applied and survey research using a self-constructed and standard mixed questionnaire. The statistical population consists of 185 managers and staffs in departments of Kurdistan Agriculture Organization in Iran. The sample equals to 118 according to the Morgan’s table among which 81 questionnaires were returned to be considered for final analysis. The research tool reliability measuring by Cronbach
Alpha was equal to 0.77 which is more than the acceptable threshold. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used by applying SPSS and Lisrel software packages. Friedman Test and Regression Analysis were used to calculate the importance coefficient of organizational misbehavior factors and their effects on job burnout.

Research variables

Organizational misbehavior dimensions (Vardi & Weitz, 2004)

Type S's misbehaviors

They are misbehaviors which are in favor of the individual himself rather than other members in the organization. These kinds of behaviors are often internal and they are under the influence of individuals’ beliefs. So, they threaten the organization and its members.

Type O's misbehavior

They are misbehaviors which are in favor of the members in an organization, as a whole, such as wrong and false reports to win a tender in favor of an organization.

Type D's misbehavior

These are misbehaviors which are basically harmful and destructive. The purpose of these behaviors is both internal and external. Despite of the two previous misbehaviors types which satisfy the benefits of individual or organization, Type’s D misbehaviors are even harmful for others and the organization, such as sabotage of equipments or machineries.

Job burnout dimensions (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001)

Emotional burnout

Individuals suffering emotional job burnout are often perfectionists and they are extremely involved in their jobs. They sometimes imagine unreal goals and, simply, these individuals do not feel that their attempts are perceived by their superiors.

Personal performance

It means that employee feels he is not doing a beneficial activity and he can not use all his physical and mental potentials in the work.

Depersonalization

It indicates the behaviors which are far from the individual’s real personality in the past. In the other words, organization leads him to a behavior which is not consistent with his value system and the individual himself and his relatives feel that they are suffering behaviors which are different with their past and their values and it is mainly negative.
Involvement

It relates to the extreme job involvement and unreal expectations about the individual’s ability to work.

Research findings

Binomial Test for the first, second and third hypotheses indicated that significance level is less than 0.05 (Sig=0.000). So, the research hypotheses, claiming the effects of misbehavior types on organizational misbehavior, were supported. One sample Test was also used to investigate the significant difference in organizational misbehaviors variables showing that there is a significant relationship among them. Results also indicated that data had a normal distribution. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 One sample Test for organizational misbehavior variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>Confidence level (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type S’s misbehavior</td>
<td>74.463</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>3.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type O’s misbehavior</td>
<td>37.088</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.996</td>
<td>2.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D’s misbehavior</td>
<td>44.752</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>2.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test results for the fifth research hypothesis showed that there is a significant difference among the job burnout variables with a significance level less than 0.5 and the data distribution is normal. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 One sample Test for job burnout variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>Confidence level (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional burnout</td>
<td>29.957</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>2.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal performance</td>
<td>51.120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>2.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>27.890</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>2.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>53.552</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>3.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Test was used to test the sixth research hypothesis. According to the results shown in the Table 3, there is a significant relationship among organizational misbehavior dimensions and job burnout determinants except the emotional burnout and Type O’s misbehavior.
Table 3 Pearson Correlation Test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Type S’ s misbehavior</th>
<th>Type O’ s misbehavior</th>
<th>Type D’ s misbehavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional burnout</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal performance</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking the organizational misbehavior variables

For ranking the organizational misbehavior variables Friedman test was used. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Friedman test result for ranking the organizational misbehavior variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Type S’s misbehavior</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type O’s misbehavior</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type D’s misbehavior</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking the job burnout variables

For ranking the job burnout variables, Friedman test was used. The results are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5 Friedman test result for ranking the job burnout variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emotional burnout</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal performance</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking the factors affecting the organizational misbehavior

The Friedman test result showed that all ranks are significantly different and the inconsistency between employees’ income and expenses, inefficient economic structure and centralization have the first, second and third ranks respectively.

Ranking the factors affecting the job burnout

The Friedman test result also demonstrated that all ranks are significantly different and disregarding the employees’ welfare, frequent frustrations and stresses and
inappropriate management system in the organization in different dimensions have the first, second and third ranks respectively.

Conclusions and recommendations

The research findings indicated that the first, second and the third hypotheses, illustrating the effect of misbehavior type on organizational misbehavior in the Kurdistan Agriculture Organization, were supported. Additionally, testing the fourth and the fifth hypotheses pointed out that there is a significant difference between organizational misbehavior and job burnout factors. Also, evaluation of the sixth hypothesis revealed that there is a significant relationship among the organizational misbehavior and job burnout dimensions, except the emotional burnout and Type O’s misbehavior, which is consistent with (Golparvar, Nayeri, & Mehdad, 2009)’ findings. It is recommended to test the relationship between the job burnout and life style factors such as residence area, exercise and so on in addition to the relationship between job burnout and organizational behavior among male and female employees in the future researches.
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