ROLE OF SPIRITUALITY-AT-WORK AND HAPPINESS-AT-WORK ON UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR OF ORGANIZATIONAL EMPLOYEES

Saritha S R*   Dr. Ujjal Mukherjee**
* Research Scholar Commerce, Jain University, Bangalore.
**Associate Professor OB and HR Area CMS B School Jain University, Bangalore.

Abstract
This research aims to create a conceptual model that describes the impact of workplace spirituality and happiness on employees' unethical pro-organizational conduct. To construct the model, the authors looked at existing literature. The findings of the study reveal that the independent factors of spirituality and happiness are more likely to influence the dependent variable of unethical behavior than the dependent variable of unethical behavior. The association between the variables can be empirically tested in future study in this subject.

Keywords: Ethics, unethical behavior, workplace spirituality, happiness at workplace.

Introduction

Employees prioritizing profits over morals have become very frequent (Burnet, 2017). A study conducted in US revealed that 19% of employees agreed to lying for sake of the company to clients or vendors, cheating customers, suppliers or public(Gurchiek, 2006). The past survey in business ethics field has concentrated tremendously on UBS inspired by self-interest (Greenberg, 2002);(Thai et al., 2015),(Trevino W. &., 2006); (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010).The intentions and the process leading to Unto benefit organizations commonly known as unethical pro-organization behavior (UPOB) remains poorly understood. Our work contributes to understand the predictors of UPOB. In doing so, past surveys in spiritual field have examined the associationamongSPIRITUALITY AT WORK and ethical behavior, but numerous examiners are provided attention to associate it among unethical behaviors (Kortezi, 2008). A review on the literatures relating to the factors leading to UPOB and also the constructs of spirituality at work include three main influencers which are job satisfaction, work engagement and organizational commitment. A further analysis of this showed that these three constructs were related to HAW (Fisher, 2010) and hence the role of HAW influencing UPOB has been studied.

Unethical Behavior (UB) and Unethical Pro-organizational Behavior (UPOB)

It is well documented that organizational members at different levels steal the property of company, violate psychological contracts, cheat the government, and mislead customers (Wiener, 1996); representing that Unincorporated many minor to major violations. Survey has established many causes for why employees may engage in UBs: to profit themselves, to harm co-workers(Umphress et al., 2010).Whereas inspiring behaviors of organization-harm are addressed expansively in review(Bennett, 1995); (Sackett, 2002) the motivating behaviors of UPOB is underdeveloped region of survey(Cullinan et al., 2008). The UB will be frequently related with negative behavior; nevertheless, members of organizations might also engage in positive forms (Warren, 2003). These UPOBmight be observe as positive and/or desirable andsuchbehavior might advantage the organization even though in turn it might violate few overarching social norm (Warren, 2003), (Cullinan et al., 2008). Instances of benefiting misbehaviors incorporate expressively selling inferior product, deceiving a client to create a sale for company, or falsifying reports to create organization seem to be very economically viable than it truly is. Such behavior can be considered as valuable to organization. UPOB will be described as actions, which have been planned to promote effective organization functioning or its members (e.g., leaders), laws, standards, or mores of proper conduct (Umphress, 2011).The current study is an attempt to classify the antecedents of UPOB among employees.

Identifying the features contributing to UPOB is a subject of interest in numerous current surveys (Peterson, 2016). Previous studies have examined that UPOB is influenced by personal features (Affective commitment, Machiavellianism, psychological entitlement, organizational identification,) (Umphress et al., 2010); (Curtis F. Matherne, 2012); (Lee et al., 2019); (Chen, 2016); (Castille et al., 2018), workplace situational features (overall justice, positive social exchange, social exclusion, interpersonal justice, job insecurity, perceived organizational support, employee-organization relationship)(Judge, 2005); (Merritt, 2019);(Stefan Thau et al., 2015);(Ghosh, 2017); (T Wang et al., 2019),organizational features (high execution expectation, spirituality at work, high presentation work systems, idiosyncratic deals)(Ilie, 2012); (Lv, 2018); (Liang, 2017); (Yun Zhang et al., 2018), and leadership features (ethical, transformational leadership) (Effelsberg et al., 2014), (Q. Miao et al., 2013). There is need to survey the influence of different organizational and individual factor which influences UPOB(Al-Shbiel, 2016).This paper considers spirituality at work and happiness-at-work (HAW) as antecedents of UPOB.

Spirituality at work
Provided many surveys on spirituality, a related work describes there is no broadly accepted meaning of spirituality at work (Plowman, 2005); (Neck, 2002) ;(Milliman et al., 2003);(Cunha, 2007). Nevertheless, many of these definitions acknowledge, which spirituality at work includes a sense of whole-nests and connectedness at work and ascribes deeper values (Noordin, 2017).Spirituality is described as common feeling of being associated with one's complete self, others and whole world (Guda, 2012), and includes connectedness, sense of wholeness at work and deep values(Charoensukmongkol et al., 2015). The spirituality at work is the desire to discover one's ultimate determination in life, improve solid association with either collaborators or others related with work, and predictable with one's values of their organization and core beliefs (Noordin, 2017).It includes a yearning for connectedness and completeness that must be showed when one is permitted to coordinate his/her internal existence with one's expert job in the assistance (Milliman et al., 2003).

Happiness-at-Work (HAW)
Scholars and social scientists have characterized happiness in many ways(Diner, 2008).The biggest separation is among hedonic perspectives on happiness as wonderful feelings and favorable decisions versus eudemonic perspectives of happiness including doing what is ethically right, virtuous, meaningful, consistent with one's self, and/or growth producing(Singer, 2008); (Deci, 2001).The hedonic methodology is exemplified by survey on subjective well-being. The subjective well-being is generally observed as having 2 connected parts: judgments of life satisfaction (evaluated worldwide and in particular areas like work, health, connections, and leisure), and influence balance, or having a prevalence of positive feelings(Schimmack, 2008);(Diner et al., 1999). Examination on structure of effect, emotions, and mood reliably discovers that very significant measurement in depicting people's affective experiences is pleasantness–unpleasantness or hedonic tone (Watson et al., 1999). The link between happiness and attitude towards work has been given importance in recent times. A measure for HAW included work itself (feelings at work and affective implication), job features (evaluative judgments of job features, like supervision, salary, career chances) and organization as a whole (Fisher, 2010). A shorter scale was developed to measure HAW (Alegre, 2018).

Developing the Theoretical Model
Spirituality at work and UPOB
The developing body of review on spirituality at work and business morals advocates, which improvement of spirituality in workplace might promote ethical behavior and control UB in the associations. Nonetheless, current high-profile occasions in open arena have highlighted the requirement for a more comprehension of various types of UBs: acts that look to profit organization, instead of cause harm, recognized as UPOB(Umpires et al., 2010).The workers who are enjoying spirituality at work might see UPOB, like ensuring the association by misleading to clients or customers, neglecting to give discounts to clients and customers, or selling a hazardous item, as an approach to respond positive social trade associations with their manager (Umphress, 2011).The workers might reciprocate positive exchange associations with their workers by engaging in UPOB.The

experimental survey on how employee's spirituality at work relates to their UPOB and process by thatassociationhappens remains poorly understood. This paper is an attempt to identify the influence of spirituality at work on UPOB.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relation between spirituality at work and UPOB.

HAW and Spirituality at work
The happiness consequences in organizations
There is proof that experience of happiness at individual, transient, and unit level has significant results in associations. The impacts of momentary states of happiness are generally positive. At day level, state positive mood is related with proactively and creativity on same time and calculates proactively and creativity the next day (Amabile, 2005); (Sonnentag, 2009). The positive state of mind also appears to improve collaborative negotiation results and to diminish interpersonal conflict (Baron et al., 1990). The day-level changes in mood in positive and job satisfaction calculate day by day fluctuation in workplace deviance and organizational citizenship at inside individual level(Ivies et al., 2006). The momentary positive mood might also impact how different parts of workplace are assessed, with prompted pleasant moods spreading to simultaneous evaluations of job features and job satisfaction (Brief et al., 1995)(Kraiger et al., 1989).People find happiness when they know about their tasks; they have friends in the organization and when they are able to connect to their organization.HAW does only mention to persons' intrinsic value, however, also includes other individual extrinsic values like association with other persons, organizational atmosphere(Isa et al., 2019). We can conclude that the dimensions of spirituality at work and HAW are closely related and the social exchange theory states that employees who are happy try to reciprocate and be devoted towards the organizations, a relationship between the two variables is considered. Spirituality contributes to the feeling of happiness at a workplace (Duchon, 2009).

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relation between HAW and spirituality at work.

HAW and UPOB
The happiness associated constructslikejob satisfaction, work engagement, and organizational commitment(Fisher, 2010)related to HAW may influence UPOB.The job satisfaction will be positive emotional state resulting from an appraisal of job or experience of job (Locke, 1976)The organizational commitment will be 2nd most usually measured in family of constructs associated to HAW. Hence, by analyzing these factors relating to HAW, an association can be studied between HAW and UPOB.On the basis of social exchange theory (Mitchell, 2005), the reciprocity principle (Blau, 1964); (Rice, 2003);(Boulder, 1960) and social identity theory (Tajfel, 1974), workers regulate their behavior to satisfy their membership and positive association with their organization (Hogg et al., 1995). Consequently, happy employees might view UPOB.
Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relation between HAW and UPOB.

Theoretical Model

Consequences of UPOB
The current survey has exposed that UPOB not just antagonistically influences external partners (customers, clients, partners), however conceivably might result in various negative results for the association (Umphress et

al., 2010); (Umphress, 2011).For example, publicized acts of UPOB have prompted compromised damaged reputations, public trust, and lawsuits (Graham, 2015).The person-situation interactions method recommends that unethical employee behavior is impacted by a grouping of features of organizational or situational and individual components(Trevino, 1986).

Implications

The theoretical implication of this study is for understanding the emotions and cognitions of employees at engaging in UPOB and also whether unethical acts become business decisions without any ethical dilemmas. This study has not focused on organizational outcomes or societal effects of UPOB, though it is important for an organization to consider the possible consequences of unethical act.

References

1. Alegre, S.-V. &. (2018). Happiness at work: Developing a shorter measure. *Journal of Management and Organization*.
2. Al-Shbiel, S. O. (2016). An Examination the Factors Influence on Unethical Behaviour among Jordanian external auditors: Job Satisfaction as a mediator. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*.
3. Amabile. (2005). Affect and Creativity at Work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
4. Baron et al. (1990). REDUCING ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT: THE ROLE OF SOCIALLY-INDUCED POSITIVE AFFECT. *International Journal of Conflict Management*.
5. Bennett, S. L. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *The Academy of Management Journal*.
6. Blau. (1964). Justice in Social Exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*.
7. Brief et al. (1995). Cookies, Disposition, and Job Attitudes: The Effects of Positive Mood-Inducing Events and Negative Affectivity on Job Satisfaction in a Field Experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.
8. Burnet, E. A. (2017). Bad Behavior with Good Intentions: The Role of Organizational Climate in Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior. *TigerPrints, Clemson University*.
9. Castille et al. (2018). Prosocial Citizens Without a Moral Compass? Examining the Relationship Between Machiavellianism and Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
10. Charoensukmongkol et al. (2015). The Contribution of Workplace Spirituality on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Advances in Business Research*.
11. Chen, M. C. (2016). Relaxing moral reasoning to win: How organizational identification relates to unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
12. Cullinan et al. (2008). Organisation-harm vs Organisation-gain ethical issues: An exploratory examination of the effects of organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
13. Cunha, R. &. (2007). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*.
14. Diener et al. (1999). Subjective Well-Being: Three Decades of Progress. *Psychological Bulletin*.
15. Diener, K. &. (2008). In Pursuit of Happiness: Empirical Answers to Philosophical Questions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.
16. Duchon, P. &. (2009). Measuring workplace spirituality in an Asian context. *Human Resource Development International*.
17. Effelsberg et al. (2014). Transformational Leadership and Follower's Unethical Behavior for the Benefit of the Company: A Two-Study Investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
18. Fisher. (2010). Happiness at Work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*.
19. Ghosh, S. K. (2017). The direct and interactive effects of job insecurity and job embeddedness on unethical pro-organizational behavior: An empirical examination. *Emerald*.

20. Gouldner. (1960). THE NORM OF RECIPROCITY: A Preliminary Statement. *American sociological review*.

21. Graham. (2015). The Effect of Leadership Style, Framing, and Promotion Regulatory Focus on Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

22. Greenberg. (2002). Who stole the money, and when? Individual and situational determinants of employee theft. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.

23. Guda, C. &. (2012). Workplace Spirituality as a Precursor to Relationship-Oriented Selling Characteristics. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

24. Gurchiek, K. (2006). U.S. workers unlikely to report misconduct. *HR Magazine*.

25. Hogg et al. (1995). A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*.

26. Ilie, A. (2012). Unethical Pro-Organizational Behaviors: Antecedents and Boundary Conditions. *University of South Florida- Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.

27. Isa et al. (2019). Domains That Lead To Happiness At Workplace . *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology* .

28. Judge, R. I. (2005). Goal regulation across time: the effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

29. Kish-Gephart et al. (2010). Bad Apples, Bad Cases, and Bad Barrels: Meta-Analytic Evidence About Sources of Unethical Decisions at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

30. Kortezi, G. &. (2008). Philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality: A critical approach. *Journal of business ethics*.

31. Kraiger et al. (1989). The Influence of Positive Affective States on Task Perceptions and Satisfaction. *ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND HUMAN DECISION PROCESSES*.

32. Lee et al. (2019). Investigating When and Why Psychological Entitlement Predicts Unethical ProOrganizational Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics* .

33. Liang, M. C. (2017). High performance expectation and unethical pro-organizational behavior: Social cognitive perspective. *Journal of Psychology*.

34. Lv, T. X. (2018). HPWS and unethical pro-organizational behavior: a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

35. Merritt, W. B. (2019). Unethical pro-organizational behavior and positive leader-employee relationships. *Journal of Business Ethics*.

36. Milliman et al. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of organizational psychology*.

37. Mitchell, C. &. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*.

38. Neck, K. &. (2002). The "what", "why" and "how" of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

39. Noordin, D. &. (2017). The impact of workplace spirituality on organizational commitment: A case study of Takaful agents in Malaysia. *Emerald Insight*.

40. Peterson, Q. T. (2016). The effects of ethical pressure and power distance orientation on unethical pro-organizational behavior: the case of earnings management. *Business Ethics: A European Review*.

41. Plowman, D. D. (2005, October). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

42. Q. Miao et al. (2013). The Relationship Between Ethical Leadership and Unethical Pro-Organizational Behavior: Linear or Curvilinear Effects? *Journal of Business Ethics*.

43. Rice, C. &. (2003). Social Exchange Theory. *Handbook of Social Psychology*.

44. Sackett, P. R. (2002). Counterproductive behaviors at work. *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology. Sage Publications* .

45. Schimmack. (2008). The Structure of Subjective Wellbeing. *The science of subjective well-being*.
46. Singer, R. &. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: a eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*.
47. Sonnentag, F. &. (2009). Antecedents of Day-Level Proactive Behavior: A look at job stressors and positive affect during the workday. *Journal of Management*.
48. Stefan Thau et al. (2015). Unethical for the sake of the group: Risk of social exclusion and pro-group unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
49. T Wang et al. (2019). A Social Exchange Perspective of Employee–Organization Relationships and Employee Unethical Pro-organizational Behavior: The Moderating Role of Individual Moral Identity. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
50. Tajfel. (1974). Social Identity and Intergroup Behavior. *Sage Journal*.
51. Thau et al. (2015). Unethical for the sake of the group: Risk of social exclusion and pro-group unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
52. Trevino. (1986). Ethical Decision Making in Organizations: A Person-Situation Interactionist Model. *The Academy of Management Review*.
53. Umphress et al. (2010). Unethical Behavior in the Name of the Company: The Moderating Effect of Organizational Identification and Positive Reciprocity Beliefs on Unethical Pro-Organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
54. Umphress, B. &. (2011). When Employees Do Bad Things for Good Reasons: Examining Unethical Pro-
55. Warren, D. E. (2003). CONSTRUCTIVE AND DESTRUCTIVE Deviance in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*.
56. Watson et al. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.