

# A STUDY ON THE EFFECT OF PANDEMIC CONDITIONS ON ANTI-PRODUCTIVE BUSINESS BEHAVIOURS IN THE ORGANIZATION

**Nil KONYALILAR**

*Istanbul Rumeli University,  
532 3120826, Sarıyer, Istanbul, Turkey  
nkonyalilar@hotmail.com*

**Abstract:** The aim of this study is to determine whether people with working conditions and daily standards changing during the pandemic period exhibit anti-productive work behaviours. During the pandemic period when many restrictions were experienced, the functioning of many organizational structures has also changed. Accordingly, it is of utmost importance to determine the changes in the working habits of individuals and to determine the measures that organizations can take in this direction. For this reason, the effects of pandemic conditions on anti-productive work behaviours on people working in the civil aviation sector will be examined. The reason why the civil aviation sector was chosen is because it is the sector most affected by the pandemic conditions. In this study, it is planned to use the "Pandemic Conditions" scale developed by Conway et al. (2020) and the "Anti-Productivity Work Behaviours" scale developed by Spector et al. (2006). The 'pandemic conditions' scale is under one dimension and data are collected with the help of a 5-point Likert scale. The 'anti-productive work behaviours' scale consists of five sub-dimensions: withdrawal, abuse, theft, sabotage, and deviation from production. Also in this scale, a 5-point Likert scale will be used to collect data.

**Keywords:** pandemic, anti-productive work behaviours, civil aviation

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Epidemic means epidemic disease. If this epidemic has continental or worldwide effects, it is called a pandemic. The word of Greek origin is a combination of the words pan and demos (Maital and Barzani, 2020). It is inevitable that natural disasters, epidemics and similar crisis situations will have both social and economic effects in all countries of the world. We have suffered from epidemics many times. Today, serious measures and bans regarding the

Covid-19 pandemic are being implemented. Also in the next period, the emergence of epidemic diseases seems to be highly probable. In the time period they emerged, economic risks that started with the restriction of transportation opportunities have a negative impact in a wide range of areas, ranging from employment problems arising from the restriction of domestic and foreign investments to the anti-productive behaviour of people in the working environment. While the pandemic has created negative effects in many sectors, it

has also brought serious problems in the aviation sector.

The social impacts experienced in the aviation sector should be evaluated in a range that extends to the point of individual and social psychology, boredom, fatigue and, accordingly, withdrawal from the economic or social sector to which it belongs. Globalization has permanently changed our lives since the first day it was introduced and has become our livelihood (Shrestha et al., 2020). However, the phenomenon of globalization continues to exist as a social phenomenon beyond capital movements. Whether for business or travel purposes, individuals are on the move and these activities are seen as the main cause of the spread of the disease. In addition, the increasing urbanization phenomenon and the fact that the world economy has an increasingly closer integration also cause the disease to spread rapidly. As the mobility is very high, the trade and tourism sectors have ranked among the sectors most affected by the pandemic. As the aviation sector is the backbone of the tourism and trade sectors and the transportation sector, it has been one of the sectors most affected by the pandemic and it has been started to be considered that the employees exhibit anti-productive work behaviour.

In the present situation, shared economic activities are in a "precarious" state and the reason thereof is the Covid-19 pandemic. This devastating phenomenon has particularly hit the accommodation and transportation industry. Therefore, the effects of Covid-19 on shared economic activities need to be understood.

It is not very possible to clearly understand the effects of the disease, which first appeared in China and then continues to exist as a threat on a global scale, and to determine the losses and gains with precise lines (McKibbin and Fernando, 2020). Therefore, policy makers at the highest scale have difficulty in finding a solution that can fully respond to the effects of the crisis (Assche & Lundan, 2020).

It is stated that the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on the global economy can be divided into three parts (Maital and Barzani, 2020), which includes negative effects experienced directly by the manufacturing sector, market disruption experienced due to the emergence of a new supply chain, and financial effects on firms and markets. The supply-side effect, which has caused the closure of factories in China and other countries, has led to a global contraction in goods and services. Due to these reasons, the aviation industry also went into restrictions, and as a result of applying different working methods such as remote working and alternate working on employees, it has made a negative impact on the motivation of the employees.

A drift into a stagflation conjuncture is expected in the spiral of lower output and higher prices in the aviation sector. In this context, employees are also affected by the pandemic period and it has been predicted that they exhibit anti-productive work behaviours and the necessity of conducting a study on this issue has been put forward.

The rate of spread of the Covid-19 disease, the fact that people are not getting vaccinating fast enough, food inflation and the deterioration of other related livelihoods have exposed many people to famine and starvation. In parallel to this, the downsizing efforts of the enterprises caused the employees to be unemployed and to work for lower wages. There is a prevailing opinion that the pandemic will increase absolute and relative poverty all over the world and, in particular, efforts to end illiteracy and low education will be adversely affected by it (Buheji et al., 2020).

Restrictive measures implemented in response to the pandemic have led to a decline in production, consumption, employment and supply chain worldwide. It is thought that the global economy and value chains have created a more severe economic depression than the 2008 financial crisis, and in these situations, employees exhibit anti-productive work

behaviours. Employees working in sectors such as transportation, construction, retail, service and accommodation, especially aviation, do not have the opportunity to work remotely. In this case, the individuals who are at the highest risk during the pandemic period and have to work are the people in this group. This situation will cause people to exhibit absolute anti-productive work behaviours.

GDP generated by aviation and tourism sectors accounts for more than 10% of global GDP and they are among the sectors directly affected by Covid-19. Numerous international competitions, conferences and concerts have been cancelled due to the pandemic, causing great losses in host countries. It is expected that tourism and aviation sector will be affected even more by this process. Tourism destinations in Indonesia, Thailand and Malaysia and the Asia Pacific region are also expected to be significantly affected by the pandemic. It is reported that at the end of the pandemic, the loss of workforce in the aviation and tourism sector will be around 14%. This also emerges as an important problem. In addition, academic research and higher education as well as basic, clinical and population-based studies are affected due to restrictions and physical distancing requirements, as well as the loss of international students and scholars (Shresta et al., 2020).

Briefly speaking, pandemics and similar infectious diseases cause significant differences in the attitudes of employees in the aviation sector. The aforementioned studies foresee decisions in this direction and point out that much more extensive study is needed in order to perceive the differences in the aviation industry after the pandemic. In this respect, it is of utmost importance to examine all the behaviours of aviation sector employees in the post-pandemic period in a wider range and to compare them with previous studies. It is thought that the findings to be obtained in this field will be useful for the literature in the theoretical sense and, in

the actual implementation, for the determination of the demands and expectations and the formation of strategies in the field of service in the post-pandemic process.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 *Anti-productive Business Behaviours*

Due to the large number of studies on the concept of anti-productive work behaviours, it will be possible to state that the studies on this concept are comprehensive (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). For this reason, anti-productive work behaviours, which we will deal with conceptually, will be examined in many aspects (Spector and Fox, 2002). In studies, it is generally stated that the behaviours vary according to the organization and the individual, the severity of the behaviours shown, their source, and the degree of violation of the general rules in organizations (O'Boyle, Forsyth, & O'Boyle, 2011).

According to a study conducted by Spector and Fox in 2002, anti-productive work behaviours are defined as behaviours that directly target the organization and other stakeholders of the organization, in which the sense of consciously causing harm is shown openly or secretly. They can also consist of behaviours, which can be expressed more passively, such as aggression, not obeying the rules and consciously not doing their job correctly (Spector and Fox, 2002).

According to a study conducted by Jonas and Leberherz in 2008, the concept of anti-productive work behaviour is used to express behaviours that constitute a threat to the development of the organization as a result of the violation of organizational rules and are completely intentional (Jonas and Leberherz, 2008).

In a study conducted by Sackett in 2002, anti-productive work behaviours were expressed in a different way and explained as behaviours exhibited against the legal interests of the organization (Sackett, 2002). Spector et al. (2006)

expanded the scope of this definition and suggested that anti-productive work behaviours can be shown not only against the organization, but also against employees, buyers and all other stakeholders. For this reason, the expressed anti-productive work behaviours are generally defined as behaviours that do not comply with organizational rules and are harmful to the organization and all other stakeholders of the organization (Spector and Fox, 2002). Based on this definition developed, Marcus and Shuler (2004) stated that the conditions stated below must be met in order for anti-productive behaviours to occur.

- A deliberate and intentional behaviour,
- Causing a risk that will give rise to harm,
- Acting against laws and policies that require institutionalism
- The fact that the benefit is less than the harm caused

However, the result of an action performed with the intention of doing something deliberately may not be correlated with each other. For example, Marcus and Shuler (2004), the behaviour of an individual who steals a colleague's personal belongings in his working life, for whatever reason, has an anti-productive nature, and on the other hand, the unintentional replacement of the goods is not considered within the same scope. In a different example, it may not be correct to suggest that individuals with low work performance act with the awareness of causing harm to the organization (Marcus & Schuler, 2004).

Although some practices made in organizations are considered to be contrary to institutional policies in terms of their characteristics, they can be considered reasonable in terms of the benefit to be provided by them. For example, losses incurred by any institution as a result of entering a different market may not satisfy its managers and staff, but when the benefit to be provided by it is taken into consideration, it may have a long-term profit (Marcus and Schuler, 2004).

## 2.2 Models Explaining Anti-productive Work Behaviours

In order to explain anti-productive work behaviours, researchers have proposed several models of different types. These models are briefly described below.

### 2.2.1 Work-related Stress Model

According to this model, which was introduced by Spector et al. in 2006, it is predicted that the factors that have an effect on the emergence of anti-productive behaviours are caused by work conditions that have the power to create stress as a result of organizational limitations and coercion. Conditions that cause stress can be caused by any reason required by the job. The absence of a physically suitable working environment, misapplications in management, low level of job control, organizational injustice, lack of necessary tools and equipment to properly perform the job are examples of conditions that cause stress. The Spector's work-related stress model reveals any strain or limitation felt in the organization as well as negative emotions such as reluctance, anxiety, frustration, anger and feeling in the individual. If the individual believes that he cannot overcome the conditions that cause stress, he can use anti-productive work behaviours to combat these conditions (Fox et al., 2007).

### 2.2.2 Stressor-Emotion Model

The stressor-emotion model, which was introduced by Spector and Fox in 2005, was created based on professional research on stress and studies conducted on the inhibition-aggression hypothesis. The inhibition of target-directed movements determined by the inhibition-aggression hypothesis causes the individual to show aggressive behaviours against the source that creates the effect of inhibition. In the study conducted by Spector et al., employees' behaviours that are described as "bad" are named as anti-productive behaviours.

In the stressor-emotion model introduced by the same researchers to express anti-productive work behaviours, they stated that there are general work-related limitations, injustice and environmental determinants that cause stress (Spector & Fox, 2005).

### 2.2.3 Causal Reasoning Model

According to a study conducted by Martinko et al. in 2002, a study called causal reasoning model was introduced. While developing this study, the predicate analyses on achievement motivation and responsibility areas, which were conducted by Weiner in 1985, and the models in the field of learned helplessness created by Abramson et al. in 1978 were used. According to this model, it has been stated that the movements and emotions caused by the attributions to the causes of the events encountered in the work environment are the main determinants in the formation of anti-productive work behaviours. In the causal reasoning model, it is suggested that working individuals will feel shame and guilt when a non-changing personal factor such as lack of skill is attributed to them as a result of the unfair results faced by them and it is predicted that these feelings will lead to consequences such as depression, unhappiness, use of substances, and decrease in work performance (Martinko et al. 2002).

### 2.3 Dimensions of Anti-productive Work Behaviours

Studies conducted on anti-productive work behaviours are combined under some headings and form the dimensions of anti-productive work behaviours. It is not possible to say that there is a clarity in determining the dimensions of anti-productive work behaviours (Spector & Fox, 2002). Anti-productive work behaviour is a concept with broad features that includes behaviours that can harm the performance of working individuals and relationships

established in the workplace (O'Boyle, Forsyth, & O'Boyle, 2011).

It has been observed that anti-productive work behaviours are grouped according to character/self traits and environmental factors. In the variance comparison of character traits and environmental factors, it was determined that 30% of character traits could explain anti-productive work behaviours, and researchers therefore turned to environmental factors (O'Boyle, Forsyth, & O'Boyle, 2011).

In a study conducted by Robinson and Bennett in 1995, anti-productive work behaviours were expressed in two dimensions: for individuals and for the organization. Another study on anti-productive work behaviours was discussed by Hollinger and Clark in 1983 as deviating productivity and damaging the materials used. In a study conducted by Robinson and Bennett in 1995, the first of the dimensions was expressed as the goal to be achieved, and the second as the content of the action.

The target can consist of individuals as well as institutions. On the other hand, the action may range from a simple behaviour in terms of the harm caused by it to an action that can be of high severity (Neuman and Baron, 1998).

### 2.4 Consequences of Anti-productive Business Behaviours

It has been observed that various negative results occur in individuals working in the organization who experience the effects of anti-productive work behaviours on their assets (Taylor, 2012). It is possible to consider the general consequences of anti-productive work behaviours in three groups.

These consequences are psychological, work-related, and behavioural consequences (Goh, 2006). As an example of psychological consequences, burnout syndrome, low quality of life, depression, emotional deficiency and loss of self-confidence can be presented. It has been

observed that individuals who are under the influence of anti-productive work behaviours frequently experience problems such as headache, insomnia and depression due to emotional and psychological problems (Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002). Job dissatisfaction, decreased sense of belonging, and work-family conflict can be presented as an example for work-related consequences.

In individuals who think that they are neglected, the consequences such as poor performance and increased sense of injustice can be seen (Taylor, 2012). In addition, consequences such as lack of communication and reduction in productivity are considered as behavioural consequences. It is observed that the intention to leave the job increases in individuals with reduced productivity (Schat & Kelloway, 2000).

Considering the consequences listed above, it has been anticipated that anti-productive work behaviours will cause poor performance on working individuals. In a study conducted by Macovei in 2016, it was found that anti-productive work behaviours reduce the quality of the current work and cause negative effects on cognitive processes such as distraction, indecision and recall in employees (Macovei, 2016). In a conceptual study conducted by Sackett in 2002, anti-productive work behaviours were considered as a part of individuals' performance and it was stated that they were on opposite sides with organizational citizenship behaviour (Sackett, 2002).

## 3 METHOD

### 3.1 Purpose

The aim of this study is to determine whether people with working conditions and daily standards changing during the pandemic period exhibit anti-productive work behaviours. During the pandemic period when many restrictions were experienced, the functioning of many organizational structures has also

changed. Accordingly, it is of utmost importance to determine the changes in the working habits of individuals and to determine the measures that organizations can take in this direction. For this reason, the effects of pandemic conditions on anti-productive work behaviours on people working in the civil aviation sector will be examined. The reason why the civil aviation sector was chosen is because it is the sector most affected by the pandemic conditions.

### 3.2 Limitations and Assumptions

The study is limited to private airline companies and Istanbul. Only airline employees were allowed to participate in the study. It is assumed that the sample determined in the study is of a universal nature. It is assumed that the answers given by the participants in the sample are correct and reliable.

### 3.3 Universe and Sample

The universe of the study consists of people working in private airline companies. The study is limited to the persons working in the Istanbul base of the private airline companies selected as the universe.

The sample of the study is determined with the help of random sampling method. With the random sampling method, the correspondence addresses of the Istanbul-based employees in private airline companies are obtained, and the study was conducted with randomly selected people. In this context, equal chances are given to all private airline employees. The sample of the study consists of 623 private airline employees.

### 3.4 Data Collection Methods

Questionnaire is used as data collection method in the study. Responses to the questionnaire are collected online from the employees of private airline companies. In this study, the "Pandemic Conditions" scale developed by Conway et al. (2020) and the "Anti-Productivity

*Work Behaviours* scale developed by Spector et al. (2006) are used.

The 'pandemic conditions' scale is under one dimension and data are collected with the help of a 5-point Likert scale. The 'anti-productive work behaviours' scale consists of five sub-dimensions: withdrawal, abuse, theft, sabotage, and deviation from production. Also in this scale, a 5-point Likert scale will be used to collect data.

Relational screening method and survey method are used as methods in the study. In the study, the relation of the scales with each other is examined and correlation analysis is used to determine the level and direction of the relations. Before these, it is determined by various analyses whether the scales have produced valid results in the determined sample group. Regression analysis is used to determine the relationships and differences between pandemic conditions and scales for anti-productive work behaviours, which are the independent variables of the study.

## 4 RESULTS

In this part of the study, the analysis of the data obtained from the aviation employees working in the province of Istanbul is made. Based on the results to be obtained in this context, it will be determined and interpreted whether employees in the aviation sector exhibit anti-productive work behaviour during the pandemic period.

### 4.1 Reliability and Factor Analysis Results

Structural validity of pandemic conditions and anti-productive work behaviour scales used in the study is made by testing with reliability analysis (Cronbach Alpha). The Cronbach Alpha method is the most widely used reliability determination method in determining internal consistency in scale development and adaptation studies (Seçer, 2013).

The Cronbach Alpha value of the 'pandemic conditions' scale used in this study has been 95.4% and the Cronbach Alpha value of the 'anti-productive work behaviours' scale has been 91.8%.

Table 1. Distribution of Personal Information

Gender					
		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Gender	Female	371	59,6	59,6	59,6
	Male	252	40,4	40,4	100,0
Marital Status	Married	289	46,4	46,4	46,4
	Single	334	53,6	53,6	100,0
Age	18-25 age group	336	53,9	53,9	53,9
	26-35 age group	207	33,2	33,2	87,1
	36-45 age group	68	10,9	10,9	98,0
	46 and over	12	2,0	2,0	100,0
Working term	Less than 1 year	93	14,9	14,9	14,8
	1-3 Years	522	83,8	83,8	98,7
	3 years and above	8	1,3	1,3	100,0

Gender					
		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Educational Status	High School	65	10,4	10,4	10,4
	Two-year degree	99	15,9	15,9	26,3
	Undergraduate degree	446	71,6	71,6	97,8
	Graduate degree	13	2,2	2,2	100,0
	Total	623	100,0	100,0	

The Cronbach Alpha value is above 70%, which is the general acceptability limit for reliability. Considering this result of the reliability analysis, it has been concluded that the factor structure of the scale is compatible with the Original version of the scale. After determining the Cronbach Alpha coefficients, a separate factor analysis has been performed for each of the 51 expressions in the 'pandemic conditions' and 'anti-productive work behaviours' scales.

In addition, as stated in the method section, the 'pandemic conditions' scale consists of one dimension and the 'anti-productive work behaviours' scale consists of five dimensions, which include withdrawal, abuse, theft, sabotage, and deviation from production. According to the factor analysis, it has been determined that the general reliability and globality criteria of each expression are above values.

#### 4.2 Demographic Findings

The personal information of the aviation sector employees participating in this study is determined through the personal information form in the first part of the questionnaire.

The table below shows the demographic distribution of the participants. In the study carried out on people working in the aviation sector in Istanbul, it has been determined that 59.6% of the participants are female and 40.4% are male; 40.4% are married, 46.4% are single; 53.9% of them are in the 18-25 age range, 33.2%

are in the 26-35 age range, 10.9% are in the 36-45 age range, 2% are 46 years old and over; 14.9% of them work for a period less than 1 year, 83.8% of them work for a period between 1-3 years, 1.3% of them work for 3 years or more; 10.4% of them are graduated from high school level, 15.9% of them have a two-year degree, 71.6% of them are graduated from an undergraduate level, and 2.2% of them have a graduate degree. In addition, the participants are asked whether there has been a decrease in their income before and after the pandemic period and they work in an environment away from home. It has been determined that 92.5% of the participants experienced a decrease in their income during the pandemic period.

In addition, it has been determined that 98.7% of the participants have to work away from their homes during the pandemic period. From this point of view, it is understood that business activities in the aviation sector are not suitable for the remote work. In addition to these, the last question directed to the participants within the scope of this study is, "Have you been diagnosed with Covid-19?". When the answers to this question are evaluated, it has been understood that 52.5% of the participants have been diagnosed with Covid-19. From this point of view, it is found that 1 out of every 2 individuals working in the aviation industry has been diagnosed with Covid-19, and this causes the aviation industry to be considered among risky sectors during the pandemic period.

It has been determined that 92.5% of the participants experienced a decrease in their income during the pandemic period.

### 4.3 Correlation Analysis

Based on the answers given by employees in the aviation sector, a correlation analysis has been carried out. With the correlation analysis, it has been tried -specific to the aviation sector- to determine the direction and degree of the relationship between pandemic conditions and anti-productive work behaviours and their sub-dimensions. The correlation table is presented below.

According to the results of the correlation analysis, it has been concluded that the pandemic conditions in the aviation industry have a positive effect on anti-productive work behaviours, that is, significantly have affected the employees in the aviation industry. From this point of view, it can be stated that the pandemic conditions in the aviation sector have a negative effect on the productivity behaviour of the employees.

The difficulty of pandemic conditions also causes an increase in anti-productive work behaviours.

Table 2. Correlation Results

		<b>Anti-productive work behaviours</b>	<b>Withdrawal</b>	<b>Abuse</b>	<b>Theft</b>	<b>Sabotage</b>	<b>Deviation from Production</b>	<b>Pandemic Conditions</b>
Anti-productive work behaviours	Pearson Correlation	1	,661**	,714**	,426**	,442**	,872	,788
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,589	,000
	N	623	623	623	623	623	623	623
Withdrawal	Pearson Correlation	,661**	1	,211**	,062	,038	,816	,824
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,208	,444	,744	,000
	N	415	415	415	415	415	415	415
Abuse	Pearson Correlation	,714**	,211**	1	,323**	,009	,755	,736
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,859	,267	,000
	N	623	623	623	623	623	623	623
Abuse	Pearson Correlation	,426**	,062	,323**	1	,002	,844	,869
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,208	,000		,971	,374	,000
	N	415	415	415	415	415	415	415
Sabotage	Pearson Correlation	,442**	,038	,009	,002	1	,839	,844
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,444	,859	,971		,860	,000
	N	623	623	623	623	623	623	623
Deviation from Production	Pearson Correlation	,872	,816	,755	,844	,839	1	,841
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,589	,744	,267	,374	,860		,000
	N	623	623	623	623	623	623	623
Pandemic Conditions	Pearson Correlation	,788	,824	,736	,869	,844	,841	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	623	623	623	623	623	623	623
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).								

#### 4.4 Regression Analysis

Within the scope of this study, regression analysis has been applied to measure the effects of pandemic conditions on anti-productive work behaviours in the aviation industry. Simple linear regression has been used within the scope of regression analysis. A simple linear regression evaluates the linear relationship between two

continuous variables to estimate the value of a dependent variable based on the value of an independent variable.

In the table presented below, the effect of the total score of the 'pandemic conditions' scale, which is directed to the participants working in the aviation industry, on the score of the 'anti-productive work behaviours' scale has been examined within the scope of the study.

Table 3. The Effect of the Total Score of the 'Pandemic Conditions' Scale on the Score of the 'Anti-Productive Work Behaviours' Scale

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Non-standardized Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	T	p
		B	Standard error	Beta		
1	Constant	2,249	,306		16,455	,000
	Anti-productive Work Behaviours	,246	,073	,088	1,710	,028
a. Pandemic Conditions						

According to the simple linear regression analysis, it is seen that the scores of the participants working in the aviation industry, which are obtained from the 'pandemic conditions' scale, have an increasing effect on the score of 'the anti-productive work behaviors' scale ( $R=,176$ ;  $R^2=,190$ ;  $F=2,548$ ;  $p<0,05$ ). It is seen that the predictive accuracy of the equation created for anti-productive work behaviours and pandemic conditions is 19%. In light of this result, it is possible to have an opinion that employees in the aviation industry are adversely affected by the pandemic conditions and exhibit anti-productive work behaviours.

#### 5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this study, the types of anti-productive work behaviours, their relations with similar concepts and dimensions have been tried to be classified within the framework of a comprehensive literature review. In addition, it

has been tried to present with summary tables which concepts related to the subject are frequently used in the national literature of this field, in which studies these concepts are included, with which concepts they are associated and on which areas they are concentrated.

The most important feature that distinguishes this study from other studies is that it measures the effects of pandemic conditions on anti-productive work behaviours.

Anti-productive work behaviours are a problem that organizations are increasingly exposed to. Therefore, researchers have begun to show more interest in the subject. Researchers from different fields consider various types of behaviour as negative work behaviours. However, determining the boundaries of such behaviours well will have a leading role for the steps to be taken in order to prevent them. It is widely accepted in the literature, as it provides a more understandable

framework for the causes and measures to be taken by clarifying the targets of anti-productive work behaviours, which is the concept used by researchers who approach this type of behaviour from the perspective of the organization.

Anti-productive work behaviours consist of many different dimensions. According to the purpose of the research, these dimensions can be considered at a certain level.

All types of behaviours that can be considered negative, that prevent the proper execution of organizational activities, damage organizational and individual property, reduce the performance and productivity of individuals in the organization, and lead to a decrease in overall organizational performance can be expressed as anti-productive work behaviour.

Considering the classification made by Pearson et al. (2005), any behaviour that harms the individual and the organization such as deviant behaviour, aggressive behaviour, physical violence, harassment, bullying, emotional abuse and incivility should be considered as anti-productive work behaviour. In this study, it has been concluded that there is a significant relationship between pandemic conditions and anti-productive behaviours.

This leads to the conclusion that pandemic conditions increase anti-productive work behaviours in the aviation industry. In order to prevent these behaviours, proactive measures such as making the organizational climate more attractive for business and employees, prevention of psychological violence situations that will intimidate employees such as mobbing, making the employee adopt the sense of belonging to the organization and organizational citizenship and thus preventing negative behaviours before they occur, gaining the ability of self-control of the employee can be taken.

In cases of non-compliance with the rules and negative behaviours detected, practices such as notifying the final results in advance and applying them to everyone without prejudice can be implemented.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. ve Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned Helplessness in Humans: Critique and Reformulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 87(1): 49.
- Assche., A., ve V. Lundan., S. (2020). COVID-19 and international business policy *Journal of International Bussiness Policy Cilt:3* 273-279
- Buheji, M., Da Costa Cunha, K., Beka, G., Mavrić, B., Leandro do Carmo de Souza, Y., Souza da Costa Silva, S., Hanafi, M. ve Chetia Yein, T. (2020). The Extent of COVID-19 Pandemic Socio-Economic Impact on Global Poverty. *A Global Integrative Multidisciplinary Review American Journal of Economics*, 10(4) ,213-224
- Fox, S., Spector, P., Goh, A. ve Bruursema, K. (2007). Does Your Coworker Know Qhat You're Doing? Convergence of Self- and Peer-Reports of Conuterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Stress Management*, (14): 41-60.
- Goh, A. (2006). An attributional analysis of counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to occupational stress (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). University of South Florida Graduate School, Florida.
- Hollinger, R. ve Clark, J. (1983). Theft by employees. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Jonas, K. ve Leberherz, C. (2008). Social Psychology in Action. Introduction to Social Psychology: A European Perspective (4. edition). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Leblanc, M. ve Kelloway, E. (2002). Predictors and Outcomes of Workplace Violence and Aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3): 444-453.
- Macovei, C. (2016). Counterproductive Behaviors and Work Performance in Military Organization. *International Conference on Knowledge-Based Organization*, 22(2): 444-450.
- Maital, S. ve Barzani, E. (2020). Global Economic Impact of COVID-19: A Summary of Research Samuel Neaman Institute For National Policy Research. 23

- Marcus, B. ve Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of Counterproductive Behavior at Work: A General Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4): 647- 660.
- Martinko, M., Gundlach, M. ve Douglas, S. (2002). Toward an Integrative Theory of Counterproductive Workplace Behavior: A Causal Reasoning Perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(2): 36-50.
- McKibbin, W., Warwick, J. ve Fernando, R., (2020). The Global Macroeconomic Impacts of COVID-19: Seven Scenarios CAMA Working Paper No:19
- Neuman, J. ve Baron, R. (1998). Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes and Preferred Targets. *Journal of Management*, 24(3): 391-419.
- O'Boyle, E., Forsyth, D. ve O'Boyle, A. (2011). Bad Apples or Bad Barrels: An Examination of Group-And Organizational-Level Effects in The Study of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(1): 39-69.
- Robinson, S. ve Bennett, R. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2): 555-572.
- Sackett, P. (2002). The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behavior Dimensionality and Relationships With Facets of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection of Assessment*, 10(1-2): 5-11.
- Schat, A. ve Kelloway, E. (2000). The Effects of Perceived Control on The Outcomes of Workplace Aggression and Violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(3): 386-402.
- Seçer, İ. (2013). SPSS ve LISREL ile Pratik Veri Analizi. Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Shrestha, N., Shad, M., Ulvi, O., Khan, M., Karamehic-Muratovic, A., Nguyen, U. Ve Haque, U. (2020, October 13). The impact of covid-19 on globalization.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An Emotion-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior: Some Parallels Between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2): 269-292.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A. ve Kessler, S. (2006). The Dimensionality of Counterproductivity: Are All Counterproductive Behaviors Created Equal? *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3): 446-460.
- Taylor, O. (2012). The relationship between culture and counterproductive workplace behaviors: a meta-analysis (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies The University of Western Ontario, Kanada.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An Attributional Theory of Achievement Motivation and Emotion. *Psychological Review*, (92)4: 548-573.