Unethical Behaviors: What Supervisors Need to Know

Johna G. Belardo

Assistant Professor, Benguet State University

Abstract

Unethical behaviors by supervisors in the workplace not only jeopardize the reputation of the affected organization but also have devastating effects on these organizations' ability to provide quality services to their customers and other stakeholders. This paper investigates unethical behavior in the workplace done by the supervisors, examining its impact, severity levels, and the actions taken to address such misbehavior. Data were collected from 69 employees of both public and private institutions using descriptive procedures. The results exposed a range of unethical behaviors perpetrated by supervisors. Supervisors that demonstrated unethical behavior included mistrust, disdain for rules and regulations, indecisiveness, making warranted demands, giving out too many tasks, not listening, and not owning up to mistakes.

It has also been discovered that these unethical behaviors hinder professional growth and development, reduce productivity, strain relationships, lower performance, increase employee turnover, and pose risks of legal accountability.

Moreover, undesirable behavior in the workplace is more common than what other participants think. Some employees try to correct those encountered undesirable behaviors on their own accord while others choose to ignore the issue. These actions taken by employees show that maintaining healthy work environment is their consideration and priority when at work. Such actions also show concern to the health of the organization.

Keywords: unethical behaviors, human resource management, professionalism, supervisor-employee relationship

Introduction

Supervisors or managers are the leaders in an organization. They make decisions, set goals, and oversee the team ensuring that tasks are on time. There are many literatures studying on how managers and supervisors handle their team members positively and abusively (Tepper, 2000). Supervisors' behavior may be constructive, tyrannical, derailed, supportive-disloyal, or laissez-faire (Aasland, et al, 2010).

Many of us believe that man is by nature good, but sometimes he does something that is unethical or morally wrong. This explains man's dual nature as posited by Stevenson (n.d.) when he said that "every single human being has good and evil within them". Such observation is manifested in the workplace.

Unethical behavior is defined as a violation from accepted norms (Kish-Gephart, 2012 as cited by Singh and Twalo, 2015). The individual impact of these relatively less common experiences can be immense (Ivcevic, et.al., 2020).

In the same study, workers reported unethical behavior that was either overtly ordered – for example, "*a senior supervisor in my organization asked me to provide him an identity card showing him as holding a*

position for which he was not qualified or appointed" or implicitly called for like "*breaking rules for state testing were pushed at us implicitly, but not explicitly*." These reports were frequently followed by a note about the underlying reason of the pressure which may have been an attempt to make the organization appear better. "*My supervisor asks me to cheat the system to make our store records look better than they actually are where there is no corporate supervisor present in the store*." Another is time pressure like "*was told to shortcut a project so it would show completed prior to a deadline*," or productivity goals like "*I have been asked to order merchandise for customers that they didn't need to achieve inflated sales goals*."

Being destructive is a common behavior among supervisors. Most subordinates might have experienced at least one during their working life. While destructive behavior can encompass a wider variety of harmful behavior which is not related to the supervisors' responsibility (Schyns, 2013). Although unethical behavior is prevalent among leaders, it brings serious effect to subordinates and the organization (Aasland, 2010).

Recent research in the international setting suggests that the increasing tension in corporations that has resulted from economic changes, increasing global competitiveness, and trends toward downsizing and restructuring has led to significant levels of misconduct (Lawrence & Robinson, 2007 as cited in Medina, 2015). These counterproductive or antisocial behaviors of workers in the workplace are paramount concerns of management. Top management, line managers, and supervisors do not only have to comprehend the root causes for exhibiting such behaviors, but it is also imperative for them to control these disruptive actions, to prevent the occurrence of bigger problems in the future that can affect the organization's performance, reputation, and sustainability.

In the national level, factors examined as precursors to deviant behavior include reactions to frustration, perceived threats and perceived injustice, personality traits and cues suggested by the social context (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998, as cited in Edralin, 2015). Organizational factors may include work experiences that are perceived as unfair, pressure to pursue established goals, an organization's control and reward systems, organizational culture, and the actions or inactions of leaders.

Unethical behaviors of employees in the workplace not only threaten the reputation of the affected organizations, but also have devastating effects on these organizations' ability to render quality services to its customers and other stakeholders. These undermine and harm human relations. Such kind of behavior can cause severe damage to organizations, the economy, and society (Sing & Twalo, 2015).

"Moral" and "ethical" are terms usually used interchangeably, although knowing their difference is important. While morality involves an individual's personal belief system, ethics are more so comprised of society's expectations of acceptable behavior. Norms of acceptable ethical behavior are naturally formed in social environments including work situations. In these certain environments, individuals tend to adhere to these set standards of conduct and act in a similar way to their surrounding population.

Undesirable practices can take multiple forms and have multiple targets. From minor to severe forms, everyone can behave undesirably, hurting societies, organizations, colleagues, and even the self in the process. Many studies show that undesirable workplace behavior is not only prevalent in most organizations throughout the world.

Different definitions of undesirable practices are used interchangeably with unethical behavior.

First, undesirable practices in the workplace and illegal behavior overlap, but only to a certain extent. For instance, the laws and regulations being enforced that are no longer a reflection of our current moral

standards. Often, laws and regulations tend to follow the evolving moral beliefs of a community, but frequently with a delay (Ratsula, 2019).

Second, undesirable workplace practices can be intentional and unintentional, (Gino, 2015). In intentional undesirable practices, people know that they are crossing an ethical boundary and they act purposely. When people chose to behave undesirably, they can do it for selfish reasons, but also as the result of situations in which all available options have ethical costs.

In contrast, people sometimes behave undesirably because they are not aware that they are transgressing moral standards. These unintentional undesirable practices can be due to, for example, failure to notice important information while deciding, inability to identify the ethical ramifications of a decision.

Third, undesirable workplace behavior is anchored socially. Organizations set moral rules as boundary to prevent selfish behaviors among the employees which can in turn damage the organization. (Ellemers, 2019). As social animals, we tend to internalize the moral standards of our communities, and we end up influencing others morally in the same direction (Gächter, S., and Schulz, J. F.,2016 and Moore, C., and Gino, F.,2013).

Many workplace behaviors are not ethical or unethical per se; the context and the reasoning behind those behaviors largely define their ethicality.

It is along these literatures that Human Resource professionals and educators alike need to consider this issue, because it may be that they are in a better position to help the formal managers to address this concern more objectively. Moreover, organizational misbehavior is one of the most critical issues and an emergent concern in most organizations (Aasland, et al, 2010).

This study therefore aims to identify how employees take actions to address unethical behaviors done by supervisors in the workplace. The result of this study benefits the entire organization as it provides the managers, Human Resource professionals, and educational leaders knowledge on the disruptive behaviors at work, and how to strategize possible solutions. Employee morale, productivity and customer service levels are at their highest when employees work effectively as a team and practice basic tenets of civility and respect for each other (Klein, et al, 2020).

Methodology

This study used the mixed-method sequential design, consisting of two distinct phases. The first phase described the numeric data on the specific problems namely the unethical behavior patterns of the supervisors, the level of severity of the unethical behaviors of the supervisors, and how the workplace addresses the mentioned issues. These data were collected using a web-based survey. The second phase, a qualitative multiple case study approach made use of the focus group discussion to collect text data.

Comprising the population of this study are 69 employees of private or public schools and other private institution and government agency. Respondents were generated through purposeful and convenience sampling techniques from all over the Cordillera Administrative Region, parts of Ilocos Region, and other parts of Luzon.

The weighted mean average was used to answer problems one and two which dealt with the level or extent of severity of the undesirable practices of superiors and subordinates, respectively. The formula is as follows:

$$Wtd. Mean\ Average\ = \frac{\sum Wtd\ Mean}{No.\ of\ items}$$

Descriptive statistics was used to interpret the effect of the undesirable practices done by superiors and employees. Table 1 was used to interpret the means of the answers of the respondents.

Table 1: Interpretation of the means of the extent of undesirable practices in the workplace

Rating	Scale	Range	Percentage
4	Severely annoying/disturbing	3.28-4.00	76% – 100% - The respondents strongly agree that the practice is severely annoying/disturbing
3	Moderately annoying/disturbing	2.52-3.27	51% - 75% - The respondents agree that the practice is moderately annoying/disturbing
2	Minimally annoying/disturbing	1.76-2.51	26% - 50% - The respondents agree that the practice is minimally annoying/disturbing
1	A bit annoying/disturbing	1.00-1.75	0% - 25% - The respondents agree that the practice is a bit annoying/disturbing

In answering SOP 3 and SOP 4, descriptive qualitative approach was used. Responses from the survey questionnaire were treated using Collaizi's descriptive method. The researcher identified significant statements from the survey responses by making themselves familiar with all the responses in the survey questionnaire. Significant statements from the responses of the participants in the focus group discussion were also determined from the transcript. These significant statements directly pertain to the consequences or impacts as well as action taken in the experience of undesirable practices in the workplace. Meanings of these significant statements were formulated through aggregation. Constructs were identified, coded, and categorized. Statements conveying the same meaning were clustered. From these clustered statements, themes were formulated. The same process or steps were employed in the treatment of the responses in the focus group discussion. Exhaustive description of the phenomenon was conducted to come up with the fundamental structure of data gathered. To validate the responses in the survey questionnaire, focus group discussion was conducted.

Results
Observed unethical behaviors in the workplace.

Table 2: Observed undesirable practices done by superiors.

Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Descriptive Equivalent	Ranks
Favoritism	2.83	1.150	MoA	10
Indecisive	3.25	.957	MoA	3
Not listening	3.00	1.155	MoA	6.5
Unappreciative	2.78	1.093	MoA	11
Demanding	3.20	1.014	MoA	4
Unfair	2.88	1.246	MoA	8
Giving to many tasks	3.06	1.029	MoA	5
Untrusting	3.80	.447	SA	1
Disregarding policies and guidelines	3.29	.951	SA	2

Late/tardy	2.50	1.291	MiA	12
Not admitting mistakes	3.00	1.155	MoA	6.5
Moody	2.86	1.069	MoA	9
OVERALL MEAN	3.04		MoA	

Statistical Limit:	Descriptive Equivalent:
1.00-1.75	A bit annoying/disturbing (AA)
1.76-2.51	Minimally annoying/disturbing (MiA)
2.52-3.27	Moderately annoying/disturbing (MoA)
3.28-4.00	Severely annoying/disturbing (SA)

Presented in Table 3 are the means and standard deviation of the undesirable practices done by superiors. Most of the respondents agree that the disturbing undesirable practices exhibited by superiors are favoritism, giving too many tasks or requirements, not listening to subordinates, demanding, unappreciative, unfair, disregarding policies, guidelines, and protocols, not admitting mistakes, moody, inability to trust subordinates, indecisive and tardiness. Overall, the respondents view the unethical practices exhibited by superiors as moderately annoying. This means that the behavior affects the individual but is somehow bearable and does not come up to a highly toxic culture. Distrust (M=3.80, SD=0.447) and disregarding policies and guidelines (M=3.29, SD=0.951) are deemed as severely annoying/disturbing. Indecisiveness (M=3.25, SD=0.957), favoritism (M=2.83, SD=1.150), unappreciative (M=2.78, SD=1.093) are viewed as moderately annoying/disturbing while tardiness (M=2.50, 1.291) is deemed as minimally annoying/disturbing.

Impact of the Unethical Behavior of Supervisors to the Workplace

Table 3: Impact of undesirable practices in the workplace

Impact	Significant Statements
Impact to workmates	
Discontentment and less participation	• losses interest in work • plan to leave the workplace • inability to work with enthusiasm • no unity and harmony in the workplace
Questioned credibility	• losses respect from subordinates • poor management • unable to manage the team • indifference to personnel • challenged by subordinates
Injustice and disturbance	• more workload but paid unequally • felt cheated because of doing the works while others are not • causes stress, anxiety and trauma • work overload • feeling of awkwardness • a lot of requirements with insufficient time to complete

Fear	• avoidance of mingling with groups
	• desire to resign
	• passiveness at work
	• hindrance to speak up
	• inability to work efficiently
Misjudgment	• center of gossip
	• bullied by superiors
Impact to the organization	
Legal risk	• closure of organization
	• financial loss
	• expected linkages are down casted
Employee turnover	• becomes easily shaken
	• high staff turnover rates
	• attrition of employees
	• creates tension between and among employees
Negative Impression	• hasty generalizations about the team or the institution
	• toxic environment
	• distrust to institution services
	• disappointment from clients
	• dissatisfaction of stakeholders
	• harmful and risky
Low Performance	• unattained targets
	• low budget utilization
	• no improvement
	• goals are not met
	• plans of the organization may not all work out as desired
	• delay of deliverables

The identified undesirable practices had created a negative impact to co-workers, and to the organization itself.

Colleagues who are acting like superiors are more arrogant. But their productivity does not improve. They are more into bragging about nothing. Arrogant workers tend to undermine or belittle their colleagues.

Those who enjoy their lives drinking coffee for hours or playing basketball for hours become dependent on their colleagues. These types of workers procrastinate, and such attitude yields to late submittals of deliverables, low quality of output or even inability to be team players. Another impact of such behaviors is the inability to accomplish the task given due to such counterproductive behavior.

Actions Done to Address Unethical Behaviors

Table 4: Actions taken to correct undesirable behaviors.

Themes	Significant Statements
Actions taken by the participants	
Affirmative Response	• continuing doing what is right

	• increase tolerance and avoided the agent
	• ignore the agent and action to avoid conflict communicate constructively with person to maintain relationship
	• shrug most of the time
	• tried to be emphatic
Negative Response	• confronted the person in a drastic manner
	• aggressive reactions
	• burst out
	• disrespected the agent
Administrative actions	• reported to proper authorities
	• direct the issue to the grievance committee
Negative Response	• talk about the doer behind his back
	• indifference towards the doer and the action
	• demand letter was executed
Administrative action	• report to higher authorities and the grievance committee
Actions taken by the organization	
Affirmative Response	• quickly addresses the issue by conducting conferences
	• provide verbal and written reprimand
	• conducted constant monitoring and evaluation
	• provide incentives and rewards to avoid undesirable practices
	• reinforce trainings and capacity buildings
	• eliminate the employee
Negative Response	• ignore the issue

Table 5: Actions Taken by Participants

Coded Responses	Frequency	Rank
Continue doing the right thing	15	1st
Communicate with the agent/doer	13	2nd
Ignore the agent and the action	12	3rd
Reported to proper authorities	11	4th
Constant reminder	6	5th
Stone walling	5	6th
Avoidance	3	7th
Amicable settlement	2	8th
Quit and resign	1	9th
TOTAL	**68**	

Table 6: Actions taken by Others

Coded Responses	Frequency	Rank
Ignore the agent and the action	13	1st
Reported to proper authorities	12	2nd

Communicate with the agent/doer (constructive dialogue)	11	3rd
Avoid the agent/doer and increase tolerance	9	4th
Continue doing the right thing	7	5th
Confrontations	6	6th
Given reminders	3	7th
Quit and resign	2	8th
TOTAL	**63**	

Table 7: Actions Taken by the Organization

Coded Responses	Frequency	Rank
Give reprimand	14	1st
Give reminders	10	2nd
Held conferences with concerned people	9	3rd
Reinforce trainings	7	4th
Update guidelines and policies	5	5th
Endorsed to higher authorities for administrative procedures	4	6th
Ignore the issue	3	7th
Termination of contract	2	8th
TOTAL	**62**	

Discussion

The respondents view the unethical practices exhibited by superiors as moderately annoying. This means that the behavior affects the individual but is somehow bearable and does not come up to a highly toxic culture. Distrust and disregarding policies and guidelines are deemed as severely annoying/disturbing. Indecisiveness, favoritism, unappreciative are viewed as moderately annoying/disturbing while tardiness is deemed as minimally annoying/disturbing. Unethical behavior is not easily observable and is often morally blurred (Klien, 2020).

The lack of trust of the superior towards his employees greatly aggravates most of the respondents. Trust is needed for harmonious leader-subordinate relationship (Kutsyuruba and Walker, 2016). This research show that comments and continuous scrutiny would cause uneasiness on their part and diminish their confidence.

Disregarding policies and guidelines frustrate the respondents because superiors are expected to uphold every protocol, policies and guidelines although human judgment is greatly affected by subjective elaboration (Klein, 2020). These set of rules keeps the institution in order therefore, it is of outmost importance that it is well-implemented by the administrator. There are instances when these policies are not carried out because of some biases of the school head towards some employees. The guidelines would be overlooked for employees who are allies of the administrator but severely implemented on detractors as noted by one of the respondents from the focused group discussion. Respondents in the FGD added more policies broken by leaders, such as "*bringing home of school supplies, breaking of confidentiality, falsification of documents, and ignoring requests*."

Another behavior that annoys the employees is indecisiveness. Another respondent from the FGD said, "*the head teachers are deciding on behalf of the school head.*" Some leaders do not have a backbone when it comes to important decisions that should be done in the institution. They would often rely on the Master

Teacher or Head Teacher. As a result, the subordinates would not regard the school head because orders and decisions already come from the Master Teacher.

On the other end, participants acknowledged that although it is least observed, favoritism still exists, and it bothers the respondents; *seasoned employees are given more slots in seminars, and they get promoted easily*. This act would discourage employees because their promotion is overlooked despite the hard work that they have given to the institution.

A school head who is unappreciative of the tasks done lowers the morale of the employees. With the bulk of tasks given to employees, a simple appreciation is needed to uplift their spirits and keep doing their task. It was also observed by some respondents in the FGD that their administrators would habitually come in late and leave early. The common excuse given by this superior is that he must attend to some matters in the region, or he has family responsibilities. The subordinates feel that tardiness shows unprofessionalism and disrespect. Additionally, it affects the overall productivity of the workplace and distracts the others around them.

Impact of the Unethical Behavior

Deviant behavior is a disturbing yet unavoidable workplace reality. Based on previous studies, among the most prominent terms that are synonymous to deviant behavior are antisocial behavior, counterproductive behavior, dysfunctional behavior, and organizational misbehavior, and workplace incivility (Ahmad and Omar, 2014). Deviance is often recognized as a reaction to frustrating organizational stressors, such as financial, social, and working conditions (Robinsons and Bennett, 1997, as cited by Ahmad and Omar, 2014). When the behavior of the work force regardless of position goes outside the norms of the organization, its consequences are far-reaching and affect all levels of the organization like decision-making, productivity and financial cost.

The identified undesirable practices had created a negative impact not only to the perpetrators but even to co-workers, to the work output and even to the organization itself.

Colleagues who are acting like superiors are more arrogant. But their productivity does not improve. They are more into bragging about nothing. Arrogant workers tend to undermine or belittle their colleagues.

Those who enjoy their lives drinking coffee for hours or playing basketball for hours become dependent on their colleagues. These types of workers procrastinate, and such attitude yields to late submittals of deliverables, low quality of output or even inability to be team players. Another impact of such behaviors is the inability to accomplish the task given due to such counterproductive behavior.

Arrogant behavior of an employee demonstrates their superiority over others, and they do not see anything wrong with the way they act. (Das, 2015). Such kind of workmate is uneasy to be with and to work with because he thinks highly of himself (Johnson, 2007 as cited by Das 2015).

There are also employees who decline additional tasks related to their works like coaching a learner in preparation for quiz bee also manifest a counterproductive behavior. This will lead to lesser quality of output. Training a participant or representative in any event or organization requires dedication and commitment. When assigned a task of doing such, full effort is expected. Likewise, the expertise is needed. However, when the expected capable employee declines due to undesirable behavior, for the sake of having a coach, this task might be assigned to an employee who is not expert in such responsibility of coaching.

Employees who do unethical behaviors are not given extra task because of frequent tardiness because it compromised the output. The participant finds it favorable on the part of the perpetrator, however, the

participant noticed a bias on this. This claim of the participant who mentioned such consequence of the behavior is supported by the study of Alex Saez (2018) stating that employees who show up to work regularly and on time feel frustrated that a chronically late or absent employee is giving them an increased workload by forcing them to fill in. Such action may also be perceived as laziness.

There are also counterproductive behaviors that creates negative impact to entire organization. Counterproductive behavior is intentional behavior that is harmful to the legitimate interest of an organization. (Dalal Gossiping with co-workers, spreading rumors about co-workers and superiors, disrespectfulness to co-workers and superiors are also intentional behaviors that harms not only the interest of the organization but even the work environment which include the workers the work outputs. Absenteeism and tardiness lead to incomplete output, low quality output and submitting for the sake of compliance. Eventually it affects the performance of the perpetrator and even the groups assigned to the same task (Gordon, 2020).

Gossiping or spreading rumor is tantamount to bullying. The effects do not only manifest to the bullied worker but even to the organization and the work output. It impacts the morale of the person which leads to absenteeism. The person feels unwanted and disregard. The person feels uncomfortable in the workplace leading to low quality of output. Such practice also creates impression of other workers to that person. Thus, creating an unhealthy working environment. Detrimental effects of workplace bullying reduce productivity, create hostile work environment, promote absenteeism, and even result to possible legal issues. Most bullies in the workplace are the seniors. Although, gossip is considered more of implicit unethical behavior than explicit which needs an immediate consequence (Gordon, 2020).

Labeling a person with another title because of initiatives of leading the group, a certain cluster or a unit of an organization create negative comments the real designation of the person. Consequently, the employee isolated herself from the rest of the workers. Other colleagues imitate the behavior towards her. The label or brand created for her was contagious. Because of such labeling act and branding act of colleagues to their co-workers or co-teachers, the person had less friends. Moreover, this undesirable practice also leads to loss of integrity of the person. The work environment becomes uncomfortable. The credibility as a person was doubted. It also leads to awkwardness and inability to be team players. The sincerity of joining the team is also questioned.

There are also employees who love to complain, disrespect colleagues and superiors, judgmental to others and to situations, does not know to cooperate and even bring personal issues/ problems to the workplace. As witnessed by workmates, they tend to loss motivation to accomplish the task assigned to them. Such practice implies that they have the option not to follow. With such attitude also, it affects the performance of the school for those working in educational institutions. Such attitude declines the productivity or results to poor quality of services rendered. Lack of cooperation from subordinates and coworkers will cause delay in expected outputs or in achieving organizational goals. Lack of cooperation also leads to resentment. Deteriorating work culture leading to resentment of workers can be caused by lack of cooperation (Mcquerrey, 2018).

Some workers also bring their personal problems at. These workers become moody at work and do not have the focus on the task assigned to them. They become easily annoyed even without justifiable reason making the work environment awkward for others. This practice may also influence communication with colleagues, superiors and even stakeholders.

There are also workers who do not follow or do not accomplish the task assigned by the immediate superior. This practice is unhealthy and shows disrespect to authority.

Undesirable practices perpetrated by the superiors. Some of these include favoritism, unfairness, and biases which lead to resentment of employees. Discretionary effort will be weakened. Employees are less likely to be inspired in doing their responsibilities. Favored employees maybe prioritized for promotion but this will create a distrust of the merit-based processes for promotion among employees. Distrust to other processes can also be result of such undesirable behavior by superiors. Ethical issues and arguments, favoritism is giving preferential treatment to selected employees (Fr. Damianus Abun, 2014). He further stated that management may assign responsibility or gives promotion based on favoritism.

There are superiors who do not call the attention of subordinates for tardiness or absences. These employees become lax in their responsibilities knowing that the superior is at their side. Whenever there are conflicts among the subordinates, the favorite employee is supported. The decision is based on one-sided statement. Denial to fair judgment is executed. This will again lead to distrust of fair justice in the organization among employees.

While other superiors do not trust their employees in terms of quality of output, some superiors overload their subordinates. With it creates stress and anxiety to the employees. It may also lead to health issues. Giving additional task to employees with minimal period to accomplish is also a health hazard. Because the task was entrusted by the superior, the usual routine could be disrupted. This additional task also causes missing meals, staying late at night and more likely increases stress level. Employees accepts additional because they want to prove themselves to their superiors. This willingness of subordinates is being abused by superiors resulting to designating most of the superior's responsibilities to the employees. This is tantamount to management.

Actions Taken to Address Unethical Behaviors

Undesirable behavior in the workplace is more common than what another participant thinks. Some employees try to correct those encountered undesirable behaviors on their own accord while others choose to ignore the issue. They choose to ignore to avoid conflicts. They choose to ignore to keep a stress-free working environment. Others tried to correct these undesirable behaviors by communicating with the doer to clear misunderstandings. Others also has the intention to help the doer of the undesirable behavior by giving advice. Constructive dialogue is the strategy of other employees. These actions taken by employees shows that maintaining healthy work environment is the consideration and priority of most employees when at work. Such actions also show concern to the health of the organization and to prevent onset of those practices again.

Avoiding colleagues who are arrogant and thinks that they are more superior than others is a manifestation of tolerance. Other employees detached themselves from groups of perpetrators of undesirable behavior especially gossipers. Avoidance and detachment are the easiest actions to be taken because they do not create additional issues like wise, they do not aggravate the situation. However, misunderstandings and misjudgment might occur among employees that are not involved. On the other hand, others engage in a serious talk with the person or group of persons to clarify things. This action is executed by employees to prevent the same issue in the future.

The actions taken by employees depends on the kind of undesirable behavior had been observed from workmates or from superiors. Bullying for instance is executed in different ways. Bullying in the workplace had been the focus of international studies as it does not only affect the health of workers but affects the interest of the organization. Workplace bullying must be handled appropriately and with appropriate and immediate response of the organization.

Some employees report the issue to proper authorities. Reporting bullying issues requires the involvement of higher personnel. This may lead to legal procedures especially if the perpetrator is the superior. However, reporting the bully superior requires courage. But this action shows the gravity of the situation in which it needs to be addressed by ethics committee or grievance committee or any administrative committee assigned for such concerns. It shows that the action is not tolerable anymore. Reporting the bully workmate or the bully superior to proper authorities entails trust to the organization's system of handling ethical issues. The ability of the organization to address such issues shows a strong formal system of ethical considerations in the workplace.

There are different actions taken by employees depending on the type and the gravity of the undesirable behavior. These are summarized on the succeeding tables.

Table 5 presents actions taken by the participants when undesirable behavior was encountered. Encounters of undesirable behavior varies in every situation. Employees who had experienced being victims of unpleasant rumor, mistreatment by superiors and misjudged by others believed that exemplifying positivism and enthusiasm is the best thing to do. The counteract of this experienced undesirable behavior from the agents is continue exemplifying the right attitude. Letting the issue and or the situation go as if nothing happens was the innate response of the participants. This simply that working in a healthy and stress-free workplace or working environment is the concern of most workers. There is undesirable behavior that can be tolerated. Thus, less attention or no attention at it at all was the immediate reaction from employees.

Issues brought about the undesirable behavior should also be confronted and resolved. Thus, constructive dialogues between the concerned employees are also considered. This action taken is appropriate when the interest of the organization and the health of workers are at risk. This imply, that the undesirable practice or behavior should be contended. Immediate action is to remind the doer. However, persistence of the undesirable behavior requires higher order mitigating action. Thus, reporting to proper authorities is a way to resolve issues brought about by the undesirable behavior. This is most appropriate if the health of the organization is implicated.

Table 6 presents the summary of findings of actions taken by other workers as observed and witnessed by the participants. The top 4 answers show that employees choose to provide positive response to the doer and the action itself by keeping themselves abreast with the right attitude of ignoring the issues, avoiding the doer, communicate constructively to the perpetrator and report to proper authorities when necessary. These are healthy steps to address issues on unethical behaviors. Avoiding the bully or ignoring the situations shows that bully does implicate oneself or does not impact. Actions convey a message to the bully that no matter what he does, your work attitude is not affected. With such unethical behavior, the doer fails on victimizing coworker (Kane, 2020).

The counterproductive behaviors of workmates like absenteeism and tardiness are also disturbing and annoying. Others who display closeness to the perpetrator reminds the latter of his/her undesirable behavior. Perpetrators who keep on exemplifying such behavior do not know how to reflect on his actions. In terms of gossiping and spreading rumor, Open forum and having a serious talk is considered by some participants who experienced such undesirable practice. Confrontation is believed to resolve the issue of gossiping. Others try to ignore but others choose to leave the organization especially those who were falsely accused of sensitive issues.

Table 7 summarizes the actions taken by the organization. Various organizations have ways on addressing undesirable practices in the workplace. Such actions shared by the participants in the survey and in the focus group discussion is summarized in the table below.

The first observed action by the organization is giving reprimand both in verbal and written forms. Also, constant reminders through memos, meetings and communications to stakeholders is one of the priority steps of most organizations. These actions by the organizations shows that analysis of the situation first is important before bringing up the matter to higher authorities for administrative procedures. This shows the empathy side of the organization believe in the capacity of its workers to improve.

For workers who are frequently tardy or absent, memos are being issued to them by their superiors. This offense is common to most organizations. This is a written reprimand that serves as warning to the perpetrator. When received, this may either result to improvement in the attendance or retaliation. If such undesirable behavior is not addressed by the superior or by the organization, it will influence other workers and it becomes contagious.

Facilitating conference with the doer of the undesirable behavior is a manifestation of the organizations protocol of giving the employee the benefit of the doubt and conducting due process. Fairness in this way is instilled in the procedure because the perpetuator is given chance to speak and realize his/ger undesirable behavior before the situation gets worst. Strengthening trainings and constantly reviewing and updating guidelines show that the organization reflects on the cause of the undesirable behavior. Thus, with such strategy, repetitiveness of the act is avoided.

Also, ethical infrastructures must be created to immediate response to inappropriate act of workers. Einarsen (et.al., 2017) defines ethical infrastructure as the organizational response to the challenges that most organizations face when coping with corporate wrongdoings. These corporate wrongdoings are termed by Trevino (2006) as cited by Einarsen (et.al., 2017) as unethical behaviors.

The action of bringing up the issue during the meetings imply that the undesirable behavior is not tolerated. If the superior meddles to in settling the issues, it will lead to prevention of similar issues in the organization. It shows how strong the ethical system is specifically, how it is being followed by the workers. Sanction systems make individual mor sensitive and alert to ethical situations (Rottig et al as cited by Das, 2017). The organization's decision of discussing the issue through open forum with workers involved is a manifestation of the organization's conflict management system.

Workers or superiors as well as the organization itself execute various actions of addressing undesirable behavior or practices in the workplace. These actions taken implies the priorities of workers in working into an organization that is healthy and stress-free environment. Working in an organization where there is less conflict, or no conflict leads to a healthy working environment. Moreover, considering appropriate actions of by organizations could motivate or demotivate employees to perform their task. Thus, ethical system of organizations must strengthen to address and handled undesirable behavior and practices. Different actions taken by employees affects the quality work done as well as quality of output produced. Thus, actions taken are carefully considered to build up a healthy working environment.

Conclusions

Supervisors make decisions as to whether employees are complying with ethical standards however, employees observed that even supervisors exhibit unethical behaviors such as favoritism, giving too many tasks or requirements, not listening to subordinates, demanding, unappreciative, unfair, disregarding policies, guidelines, and protocols, not admitting mistakes, moody, inability to trust subordinates,

indecisive and tardiness. Unethical behaviors may be explicitly or implicitly stated. Illegal actions may be explicit thus punishable offense as stated by law. On the other hand, implicit activities such as not listening to subordinates, demanding, unappreciative, unfair may be considered as some moral obligation that supervisors should not demonstrate. Although, supervisors should not explain his or her actions every time, the effort to reach out and be vulnerable to the feelings of the employees may be considered.

Generally, these unethical practices by supervisors impact the supervisor's integrity and credibility. Employees experience anxiety and stress caused by supervisor's undesirable practices. Quality of work output is sacrificed and declined productivity is observed due to undesirable behaviors. Unhealthy work environment is a result also of undesirable practices of employees and superiors. To solve the issue, employees took different actions to correct the undesirable behavior which shows their desire to work in a healthy environment. Workmates or perpetrators react differently to the undesirable behavior manifesting their willingness to help in correcting and preventing the undesirable practices in the workplace. Moreover, organization exemplifies the appropriate procedures in addressing the issue. This action shows strong and effective ethical system of the organization.

References

1. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2020.) "*Report to the nations – 2020 global study on occupational fraud and abuse*". Association of Certified Fraud Examiners.
2. Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., and Einarsen, S. (2010). "The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour". *British Journal of Management*.
3. Bentley, T. A., et. al. (2012). Perceptions of workplace bullying in the New Zealand travel industry: Prevalence and management strategies. Tourism Management 33, 351–360.
4. Brown, D. (2016). "Ethics and professionalism in the workplace," Indianapolis Recorder. http://www.indianapolisrecorder.com/business/article_36d05298-7b96-11e6-8226-033c365dab07.html.
5. Brown, M. E., Mitchell, M. S., (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. Business Ethics Quarterly 20, 583–616.
6. Cabana, G. C., And Kaptein, M. (2021). "Team ethical cultures within an organization: A differentiation perspective on their existence and relevance". *Journal of Business Ethics*.
7. Cacciattolo, K. Defining Workplace Learning. European Scientific Journal. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277206749_Defining_Workplace_Learning
8. Chahal, B. (2015). The Impact of Employee Sycophantic Behaviour on Organisation Environment: A Conceptual Study of Hospitality Sector in India. Arts and Social Sciences Journal. 06. 10.4172/2151-6200.1000117.
9. Chaput, A. The Impact of the Use of Favoritism on Work Groups (2012). Seminar Research Paper Series. Paper 36. http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/lrc_paper_series/36http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/lrc_paper_series/36
10. CIPD. (2019). "*Rotten apples, bad barrels and sticky situations: an evidence review of unethical workplace behaviour*". Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development
11. Das, M. (2015). Impact of Perceived Workplace Arrogance on the Stress levels. researchgate.com
12. Das, M. (2017). Ethical Infrastructure and Successful Handling of Workplace Bullying. researchgate.com

13. Einarsen, S., et. al. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. The Leadership Quarterly 18, 207–216.

14. Ellemers, N., et. al. (2019). "The psychology of morality: A review and analysis of empirical studies published from 1940 through 2017". *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 23, 332–366.

15. Ethics & Compliance Initiative. (2021). "*Global business ethics survey 2021*". Ethics & Compliance Initiative.

16. Fleith, D. et. al. (2002). Effects of a creativity training program on divergent thinking abilities and self-concept in monolingual and bilingual classrooms. Creat.Res.J. 14, 373-386. Doi:10.1207/S15326934CRJ1434_8.

17. Gächter, S., And Schulz, J. F. (2016). "Intrinsic honesty and the prevalence of rule violations across societies". *Nature*, 531, 496–499.

18. Gino, F. (2015). "Understanding ordinary unethical behavior: Why people who value morality act immorally". *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 107–111.

19. Grant, A. et. al. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. Personnel Psychology, 62: 31–55.

20. Jones, T. M. (1991). "Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model". *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366–395.

21. Kaptein, M. (2008). "Developing a measure of unethical behavior in the workplace: A stakeholder perspective". *Journal of Management*, 34, 978–1008.

22. Kish-Gephart, J. J., et. al. (2010). "Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 1–31.

23. Kutsyuruba, B. & Walker, K. (2016). The Destructive Effects of Distrust: Leaders as Brokers of Trust in Organizations. 10.1108/S1479-366020160000026008.

24. Lašáková A. And Remišová, A. (2015). Unethical Leadership: Current Theoretical Trends and Conceptualization. Science Direct 34, 319 – 328.

25. Leonard, K. (2019). Why is Punctuality Important in the Workplace? Chron. Retrieved from: https://smallbusiness.chron.com/punctuality-important-workplace-10253.html

26. Lu, J. G., Lee, J. J., Gino, F., And Galinsky, A. D. (2020). "Air pollution, state anxiety, and unethical behavior: A meta-analytic review". *Psychological Science*, 31, 748–755.

27. Managing Life At Work. (2021). Unethical behavior in the workplace: Definition, examples, and statistics. https://managinglifeatwork.com/unethical-behavior-in-the-workplace/

28. Mcquerrey, L. 2015. Factors Affecting Productivity in the Workplace.

29. Merit Systems Protection Board. (2011). Understanding Favoritism- MSPB takes a closer look at what the concept of favoritism means. Issues of Merit, 1–7.

30. Mitchell, M. S., et al. (2020.) "The study of behavioral ethics within organizations". *Personnel Psychology*, 73, 5–17.

31. Namie, G. (2021). "*2021 WBI US workplace bullying survey*". Workplace Bullying Institute.

32. Rafferty, A. E. And Restubog, S. L. D., (2011). The influence of abusive supervisors on followers' organizational citizenship behaviours: The hidden costs of abusive supervision. British Journal of Management 22, 270–285.

33. Ratsula, N., et. al. (2019.) "*Nordic business ethics survey 2019*". Nordic Business Ethics Network.
34. Robinson, S. L., And Bennett, R. (1995). "A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study". *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555–572.
35. Spector, P. E., Et Al. (2006.) "The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446–460.
36. Tepper, B. J. (2000). "Consequences of abusive supervision". *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178–190.
37. Vardi, Y. And Weitz, E. (2016). Misbehavior in organizations: A dynamic approach. Routledge.
38. Whalen, R. (2017). The Dangerous Link Between Overworked Employees and Their Health. Retrieved from: https://info.totalwellnesshealth.com/blog/the-dangerous-link-between-overworked-employees-and-their-health.

About the. Author

Johna Garin Belardo is a professor at Benguet State University, Philippines, currently enrolled in her PhD in Education major in Educational Management. This research is a product from one of her subjects in Human Resource Management. She is now working on another research, this time on Dynamics of Communication in the Workplace.

Email: j.belardo@bsu.edu.ph