THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR AND PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEFEMATURIZATION: THE TRNC CASE

Ali AYSU
aliaysu29@gmail.com

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azmiye YINAL
azmiye.yinal@akun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors. The study was designed using quantitative research method and the data were evaluated by statistical analysis. The study was conducted on individuals actively working in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The study targeted employees in businesses operating in the insurance and body shop sectors in Nicosia, Kyrenia and Famagusta regions of TRNC. Within the scope of the research, a total of 437 participants were reached. Data were collected using the Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale and the Perception of Organizational Dehumanization Scale. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 26.0 software, which is widely used in social sciences.
The study revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship between the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors. Participants' perception of organizational dehumanization was generally at low-medium level, while their counterproductive work behaviors were at low levels. In particular, the sub-dimensions of "dehumanization" and "workplace relations" showed a stronger relationship with counterproductive work behaviors. Regression analysis showed that the increase in counterproductive work behaviors significantly affected the perception of organizational dehumanization. However, the low level of explanatory power suggests that other factors affecting this perception should be examined.
Key Words: Perception of Organizational Dehumanization, Counterproductive Work Behaviors, Organizational Behavior, Employee Psychology

1. INTRODUCTION
1.1. Problem status
The effectiveness of institutions and the productivity of employees are one of the basic elements of organizational success. However, employees' experiences within the organization can have various consequences at both individual and organizational levels. The positive or negative situations that employees encounter within the organization play a critical role in organizational dynamics by affecting their motivation, job performance, and commitment to the organization. In particular, the perception of organizational dehumanization can cause employees to not feel like a part of their organization and, as a result, negative outcomes such as emotional exhaustion, intention to leave, and low commitment can emerge. In addition, the perception of organizational dehumanization can negatively affect employees' motivation and behaviors and trigger counterproductive work behaviors (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Counterproductive work behaviors can be defined as behaviors that employees intentionally engage in at work in a way that harms the organization's goals. Such behaviors include a series of actions that can have significant consequences on the individual and organizational level, such as absenteeism, theft, sabotage, gossip, and conflict with coworkers. The association of organizational dehumanization with such behaviors emphasizes the importance of organizational ties and employees' psychological needs (Ferris et al., 2008).

experienced by employees in work environments can lead to serious problems for both individuals and organizations. Dehumanization refers to situations where individuals do not see themselves as part of a community or group or feel that they are deprived of their human characteristics by others. The perception of dehumanization within the organization can have negative effects on the psychological and emotional health of employees, significantly affecting their experiences and performance in the work environment. It is known that when employees feel dehumanized, their commitment to the organization decreases, their job satisfaction decreases, and they tend to engage in counterproductive work behaviors (Haslam, 2006).

Such perceptions threaten the basic psychological needs of individuals. When needs such as belonging, autonomy, and self-actualization are not met, employees may experience feelings of alienation, inadequacy, and worthlessness within the organization. Dehumanization can affect not only the individual's perception of himself/herself, but also the organization's culture, leadership style, and work environment. This can lead to a number of negative consequences within the organization. For example, problems such as decreased employee motivation, deterioration of relationships with coworkers, and thus decreased harmony in the work environment may occur (Tepper, 2000).

Counterproductive work behaviors are another important problem that draws attention in this context. These behaviors refer to behaviors that consciously or unconsciously reduce employees' performance at work and harm the goals of the organization. These behaviors may include actions such as skipping work, gossiping, exhibiting passive-aggressive attitudes towards coworkers or managers, sabotage or misuse of organizational resources. It is seen that the perception of dehumanization triggers such behaviors. Employees may tend to harm both the organization and other members of the organization with such behaviors. This situation can have serious negative consequences not only on the individual level, but also on teamwork and overall organizational performance (Dalal, 2005).

The effects of dehumanization may vary depending on individual differences and contextual factors. For example, when an employee feels excluded, this perception may lead to different outcomes depending on their level of self-efficacy, psychological resilience, and perception of organizational support. Similarly, the impact of organizational culture, leadership style, and social support mechanisms may play an important role in determining the severity and consequences of this perception. Preventing the perception of dehumanization within the organization not only increases the well-being of individuals, but also contributes to the more effective achievement of organizational goals (Demir & Çelik, 2020).

In this context, managers and leaders have important responsibilities. Creating a work environment that will enable employees to feel valued and respected as individuals within the organization can be a critical step in preventing dehumanization. Elements such as open communication, inclusive leadership, valuing employees' opinions, and a fair management approach can reduce the perception of dehumanization, prevent counterproductive work behaviors, and increase organizational commitment. Therefore, a better understanding of the individual and organizational consequences of the perception of dehumanization and the development of preventive strategies in this regard constitute an important area of research for both academic studies and applications (Kaya & Yılmaz, 2021) .

1.2. Purpose and Importance of the Research

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors. While the perception of dehumanization refers to individuals feeling undervalued or detached from their human characteristics within the organization, counterproductive work behaviors refer to behaviors of employees that may harm the goals of the organization (Einarsen et al., 2016) . In this context, the focus of the study is to reveal how the effects of the perception of organizational dehumanization on employees are related to counterproductive behaviors. In addition, it is aimed to provide a more comprehensive perspective by evaluating the demographic variables that affect the perceptions and behaviors of employees from different sectors in the context of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC).

The TRNC context offers a unique research area. A small-scale economy, a limited labor market, and regional cultural norms are among the factors that shape the perceptions and behaviors of employees in organizations. The perception of organizational dehumanization can lead to the prevalence of counterproductive work behaviors by damaging the degree to which employees feel part of the organization and the social ties in the workplace (Zohar and Luria, 2005; Cortina et al., 2001) . Examining this relationship in the TRNC context will provide critical information, especially for developing strategies to increase employee satisfaction and minimize dysfunctional behaviors within the organization.

1.3. Hypotheses

The research hypotheses are as follows:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between counterproductive work behavior and perception of organizational dehumanization.

H1 : There is a significant relationship between counterproductive work behavior and perception of organizational dehumanization .

H₀: Counterproductive work behavior has no significant effect on the perception of organizational dehumanization.

H2 : Counterproductive work behavior has a significant effect on the perception of organizational dehumanization .

1.4. Limitations

Research;

- Since the study was conducted only in the Nicosia, Kyrenia and Famagusta regions of TRNC, the results are limited to these regions.
- The research was limited to employees working in businesses operating only in the insurance and bodywork sectors; employees in other sectors were not included in the research.
- Since the research is based on data collected over a specific period of time, the results may reflect conditions specific to that period.

1.5. Definitions

Perception of Organizational Dehumanization: This is the situation where employees feel that they are deprived of human values in the workplace and that their individual needs and identities are ignored (Demir and Çelik, 2020) .

Counterproductive Work Behaviors: These are intentional and negative behaviors of employees that may harm the interests of the organization or their co-workers (Dalal, 2005) .

Organizational Behavior: It is a field of research that examines the behavior, interactions and performance of individuals, groups and organizations in the workplace (Cortina et al., 2001).

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Counterproductive Work Behavior

Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) is a term used to describe behaviors that are contrary to workplace rules, norms, or values and that negatively affect both the productivity of individuals and the workplace in general. CWB encompasses a variety of actions by employees that disrupt workplace functioning, harm the organization, or prevent the achievement of business goals. These behaviors can directly threaten both workplace culture and work processes. CWB is seen as actions that harm not only the productivity of employees but also their commitment to the organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

It should be noted that such behaviors can be seen directly among people within the workplace, as well as negatively impacting the organizational structure. Counterproductive work behaviors can be classified in different ways, and each behavior can have different consequences. These behaviors can include, for example, arriving late to work, wasting time at work, malicious gossip, doing poor work, or physical or emotional violence at work. Some subtypes of CWB focus on harm done in pursuit of personal goals (such as sabotage of the workplace), while others are more concerned with violations of organizational goals or norms (Dalal, 2005).

The organizational damages of CWB can be great. Especially long-term counterproductive behaviors can reduce both the individual performance of the employee and the organizational efficiency. It also negatively affects the motivation of other employees and disrupts the general workplace environment. Such behaviors can damage the relationships between employees and cause the elimination of positive features such as cooperation within the organization. As a result, the damages that CWB will cause to the organization can lead to significant losses, both materially and morally. Therefore, it is clear that CWB is an issue that needs to be managed and minimized (Spector and Fox, 2005).

Preventing CWB is a critical factor for organizational success. It is essential for organizations to better understand the attitudes of their employees in the workplace and take the necessary measures to prevent such behaviors. Increasing employee motivation, providing a fair work environment, and encouraging open communication can be effective strategies for reducing CWB. Early detection of such behaviors and the establishment of appropriate disciplinary mechanisms can also help take important steps in this regard (Kelloway and Barling, 2000).

Another important factor is the understanding of leadership and management in the workplace. The effective transfer of the organization's values and norms to employees by leaders plays a critical role in shaping general attitudes in the workplace. A fair and inclusive leadership style can increase employees' commitment to their jobs and thus reduce CWB. Leaders' motivating approaches to employees help prevent negative behaviors (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).

2.2. The Concept of Dehumanization

The concept of dehumanization means that a person is considered devoid of human characteristics and is seen as an object or tool. The perception of employees in the workplace as mere labor force manifests itself by ignoring their emotions and human needs. The perception of dehumanization in organizations leads to the alienation of employees from their organizations, their colleagues, and their own roles (Demir and Çelik, 2020).

The concept of dehumanization comes into play when employees feel like they are merely labor or a resource. This perception usually stems from management styles and organizational structures. Elements such as authoritarian leadership and poor communication can cause employees to dehumanize. It is known that authoritarian leadership styles and organizational structures that limit participation strengthen the perception of dehumanization and cause employees to feel excluded. It weakens employees' ties to the organization and encourages counterproductive behaviors (Kaya & Yılmaz, 2021).

Dehumanization leads to an increase in counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) in organizations. When employees feel dehumanized, they become alienated from the organization and their coworkers. For example, it can lead to negative behaviors such as organizational sabotage, slowdown, absenteeism, and theft. In a study conducted by Özkan and Çelik (2022), it was determined that when the perception of dehumanization in the workplace increases, employees' tendencies to exhibit behaviors that harm the organization are strengthened. An employee who feels dehumanized may begin to have negative feelings towards the organization and their managers and, as a result, exhibit counterproductive work behaviors. Such situations can negatively affect the efficiency of organizations and employee motivation.

Dehumanization of employees has many negative effects on individual and organizational levels. When employees feel dehumanized, they lose their commitment to their jobs and this leads to psychological problems such as burnout. The perception of dehumanization negatively affects employees' job satisfaction and increases their intention to leave their jobs. Aksoy and Demir (2023) revealed that the perception of dehumanization leads to a significant decrease in job satisfaction and negatively affects job performance. When employees do not feel valued, they lose their commitment to the organization and this can lead to the formation of a negative culture in the workplace.

3. METHOD
3.1. Research Method
This study was designed using the quantitative research method . Quantitative research is a scientific approach used to measure, analyze and generalize the results of a specific phenomenon based on numerical data. This method provides a framework that is compatible with the objectives of the study as it aims to obtain objective and measurable results (Yıldız, 2017) . The main purpose of the study is to investigate the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behavior. is to statistically evaluate the relationship between these two variables. In this context, the data to be collected with the quantitative research method aims to reveal the nature and strength of the relationship between these two variables. It is aimed to obtain generalizable and reliable findings by focusing on the process of systematic collection, analysis and interpretation of data.

3.2. Universe and Sample
This study was conducted on individuals working in different sectors in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). The economic structure of the TRNC is densely populated with small and medium-sized enterprises, which provided an important data source to examine the experiences of employees in these enterprises. In the study, subgroups were created according to criteria such as sector, enterprise size and demographic characteristics using the stratified sampling method, and random samples were selected from each stratum. A total of 437 participants were reached from enterprises operating in the insurance and bodywork sectors in the regions of Nicosia, Kyrenia and Famagusta, and data were collected using a survey method. This systematic approach provided a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors in the context of the TRNC.

3.3. Data Collection Tools
In this study, data were collected using the Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale **and** the Perception of Organizational Dehumanization Scale. was collected using . Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale **was** developed by Spector et al. (2006) and was designed to measure the negative behaviors of employees in the work environment. The scale, which consists of 40 items in total and 5 sub-dimensions (arson, withdrawal, deviation from productivity, stealing/theft, and harming others), was evaluated using a Likert-type rating system between "1 = Never" and "5 = Every Day". In the study conducted by Ekinci (2022), the reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of the scale was calculated as 0.734 and the scale was found to be reliable.
The Organizational Dehumanization Perception Scale was developed by Mamatoğlu and Topçu (2015) and was designed to measure employees' perceptions of dehumanization. The scale consists of a total of 21 items and 3 sub-dimensions (not being treated as a human being, workplace relations, work conditions). According to the factor analysis results, the overall internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of the scale was determined as 0.92 and the reliability coefficients for the sub-dimensions were determined as 0.89, 0.90 and 0.68, respectively. The Likert-type rating system of the scale was arranged between "1=Never" and "5=Always". These scales, as the basic data collection tools used in the study, allowed for a reliable and valid analysis of the relationship between organizational dehumanization perception and counterproductive work behaviors. The reliability analyses of the scales used in the study were carried out using Cronbach Alpha The Organizational Dehumanization Perception Scale consists of 21 items in total and the Cronbach Alpha value of the scale was calculated as 0.887. This value shows that the scale is highly reliable. **The** Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale consists of 40 items and the Cronbach Alpha value was determined as 0.923. This result shows that the scale has a very high internal consistency. Both scales were found to be suitable in terms of reliability and were used in the study.

3.4. Analysis of Data
The data collected in the study were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 26.0 software. SPSS is a reliable and comprehensive data analysis software widely used in social sciences. According to the normality analysis, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk test results show that the p-value (Sig.) is 0.000 for both scales. This result indicates that the data is not normally distributed. However, when the skewness and kurtosis values are examined, it is seen that the distribution of both scales is close to normal distribution. For the Perception of Organizational Dehumanization Scale , the skewness value was calculated as 0.757, the kurtosis value as -0.010; for the Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale , the skewness value was calculated as 0.193 and

the kurtosis value as -0.015. These values are in the range of -1.5 to +1.5 suggested by Tabachnick (2004) and show that the distributions can be considered normal. Since normality tests can show deviations from normality even in small deviations in large samples ($n > 50$), it can be said that both scales are suitable for parametric analyses when the skewness and kurtosis values are taken into account. First, descriptive statistics were calculated in order to reveal the basic distribution properties of the data. In this context, the general characteristics of the data set were examined by determining the mean, standard deviation, percentage and frequency values. Correlation analysis was conducted to analyze the relationships between variables and the direction and strength of the relationship between organizational dehumanization perception and counterproductive work behaviors were examined. Regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the explanatory nature of this relationship. In order to determine the differences between the sample groups, independent samples t-test was used when the independent variables were categorical and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used when more than one group had to be compared. During all analyses, complete, consistent and appropriate coding of the data set was ensured and the accuracy of the analysis results was assured.

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Tablo 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

		n	%
Gender	Male	281	64.3
	Woman	156	35.7
Civil status	Married	279	63.8
	Single	158	36.2
Age	18-24 years old	93	21.3
	25-31 years old	102	23.3
	32-38 years old	68	15.6
	39-45 years old	90	20.6
	45 and Above	84	19.2
Working hours	0-10 years	183	41.9
	11-20 years	92	21.1
	21-30 years	47	10.8
	31 years and above	115	26.3
Education Status	Primary/Secondary Education	57	13.0
	High school	195	44.6
	Licence	123	28.1
	Master's/Doctorate	62	14.2
	Total	437	100.0

When the demographic characteristics of the 437 people who participated in the study were examined, 64.3% of the participants were male (n=281), 35.7% were female (n=156). In terms of marital status, 63.9% of the participants were married (n=279), 36.1% were single (n=158). According to age groups, 21.3% of the participants were between the ages of 18-24 (n=93), 23.3% were between the ages of 25-31 (n=102), 22.4% were between the ages of 32-38 (n=98), 19.2% were between the ages of 39-45 (n=84), and 13.9% were 45 years of age and over (n=60). When the working period is examined, 41.9% of the participants have 0-10 years (n=183), 21.1% have 11-20 years (n=92), 26.3% have 21-30 years (n=115) and 10.7% have 31 years and above (n=47) working experience. When the distribution of educational status is examined, 13.1% of the participants are primary/secondary school graduates (n=57), 44.4% are high school graduates (n=195), 28.3% are bachelor's graduates (n=123) and 14.2% have master's or doctoral level education (n=62).

Tablo 2. the Organizational Dehumanization Perception Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions

	Min.	Max.	Avg.	P.S.
Not being treated as a human being	1.00	4.11	1,6796	0.65598
Workplace Relationships	1.00	4.00	2,3823	0.63981
Working conditions	1.00	4.50	2,0292	0.92269
Perception of organizational dehumanization	1.00	4.00	2.0334	0,64717

the Organizational Dehumanization Perception Scale and its sub-dimensions, the minimum score was 1.00, the maximum score was 4.11, the mean score was 1.6796 and the standard deviation (Sd.) value was 0.65598 in the "Not being treated as a human being" sub-dimension. It was observed that the perceptions of the participants were at a low level in this sub-dimension. The minimum score was 1.00, the maximum score was 4.00, the mean score was 2.3823 and the standard deviation was 0.63981 in the "Workplace Relations" sub-dimension. This sub-dimension has a higher mean compared to the other dimensions and it can be said that workplace relations are more effective in the perception of dehumanization. The minimum score was 1.00, the maximum score was 4.50, the mean score was 2.0292 and the standard deviation was 0.92269 in the "Working conditions" sub-dimension. This dimension shows that there is a moderate level of variability in the participants' perception of working conditions. In general, the minimum score for the Organizational Dehumanization Perception Scale was calculated as 1.00, the maximum score as 4.00, the mean score as 2.0334, and the standard deviation as 0.64177. These values reveal that the participants' perception of organizational dehumanization was generally at a low-medium level and that the perception differed among the sub-dimensions.

Tablo 3. Descriptive Analysis Results of Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions

	Min.	Max.	Avg.	P.S.
Arson	1.00	4.00	1.1342	0.40231
Withdrawal (Abstraction)	1.00	3.38	1,2663	0.42716
Production Diversion	1.00	3.00	1.1430	0.33287
Stealing	1.00	3.00	1.0412	0.18756
Do Not Harm Others	1.00	2.94	1,1879	0.30384
Counterproductive Work Behavior	1.00	3.04	1,1545	0.25509

the Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale and its sub-dimensions, the minimum score for the "Arson" sub-dimension was determined as 1.00, the maximum score as 4.00, the mean score as 1.1342 and the standard deviation (Sd.) value as 0.40231. This result shows that arson behavior is perceived at a very low level. The minimum score for the "Withdrawal (Abstraction)" sub-dimension was calculated as 1.00, the maximum score as 3.38, the mean score as 1.2663 and the standard deviation as 0.42716. It is seen that the behaviors are at a low level in this sub-dimension as well. The minimum score for the "Diversion from Production" sub-dimension was determined as 1.00, the maximum score as 3.00, the mean score as 1.1430 and the standard deviation as 0.32387. These values indicate that the deviation from production behaviors are at a very low level. In the "Stealing" sub-dimension, the minimum score was measured as 1.00, the maximum score as 3.00, the mean score as 1.0412 and the standard deviation as 0.18756. This dimension also shows that stealing behavior is at a low level. In the "Harming Others" sub-dimension, the minimum score was found as 1.00, the maximum score as 2.94, the mean score as 1.1879 and the standard deviation as 0.30384. This result shows that behaviors that harm others also occur rarely. In general, the minimum score for the Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale was calculated as 1.00, the maximum score as 3.04, the mean score as 1.1545 and the standard deviation as 0.25509. These values reveal that the counterproductive work behaviors of the participants were at a low level in all dimensions.

Tablo 4. Counterproductive Work Behavior and Perception of Organizational Dehumanization (Correlation Analysis)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not being treated as a human being (1)	r	1	,534 **	,711 **	,852 **	0.017	,200 **	,201 **	0.016	,163 **	,166 **
	p.		0,000	0,000	0,000	0.730	0,000	0,000	0.733	0.001	0,000
Workplace relationships (2)	r		1	,650 **	,819 **	0.021	,163 **	,116 *	0.051	,134 **	,131 **
	p.			0,000	0,000	0.671	0.001	0.016	0.291	0.005	0.006
Business conditions (3)	r			1	,930 **	0.063	,218 **	,163 **	-0.007	,180 **	,177 **
	p.				0,000	0.192	0,000	0.001	0.885	0,000	0,000
Perception of organizational dehumanization (4)	r				1	0.047	,227 **	,180 **	0.012	,187 **	,185 **
	p.					0.328	0,000	0,000	0.797	0,000	0,000

		(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Arson (5)	r	1	,539 **	,387 **	,372 **	,471 **	,764 **
	p.		0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Withdrawal (Abstraction) (6)	r		1	,547 **	,372 **	,511 **	,824 **
	p.			0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Production Distortion (7)	r			1	,417 **	,663 **	,786 **
	p.				0,000	0,000	0,000
Çalma (8)	r				1	,438**	,602**
	p.					0,000	0,000
Harm to Others (9)	r					1	,795 **
	p.						0,000
Counterproductive Work Behavior (10)	r						1
	p.						

The correlation analysis results in the table show the relationships between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Perception of Organizational Dehumanization and its sub-dimensions. According to the analysis results, there is a significant and positive relationship between the perception of organizational dehumanization and Counterproductive Work Behavior ($r = 0.399$, $p < 0.01$). This result shows that as the perception of organizational dehumanization increases, counterproductive work behaviors also increase.

When the sub-dimensions are examined, it is seen that the dimension of not being treated as human has a positive and significant relationship with Counter-Productive Work Behavior ($r = 0.384$, $p < 0.01$). Similarly , the dimension of workplace relations has a significant and positive relationship with Counter-Productive Work Behavior ($r = 0.381$, $p < 0.01$). The dimension of working conditions has a positive relationship with Counter-Productive Work Behavior ($r = 0.308$, $p < 0.01$).

There are also significant relationships between the sub-dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors and the dimensions of perceived organizational dehumanization. For example, the dimension of not being treated as human has a positive and significant relationship with the sub-dimensions of arson ($r = 0.376$, $p < 0.01$) and withdrawal (isolation) ($r = 0.352$, $p < 0.01$). The dimension of workplace relations has a significant positive relationship with the sub-dimensions of withdrawal (isolation) ($r = 0.349$, $p < 0.01$) and stealing ($r = 0.343$, $p < 0.01$). Similarly, the dimension of working conditions has significant relationships with the sub-dimensions of UCWB, which are harming others ($r = 0.308$, $p < 0.01$) and stealing ($r = 0.286$, $p < 0.01$).

As a result, it is seen that the perception of organizational dehumanization is generally positively related to the CWB and its sub-dimensions. In particular, it was found that the dimensions of dehumanization and workplace relations showed stronger relationships with different sub-dimensions of CWB. These findings provide an important contribution to understanding the effect of the perception of organizational dehumanization on the counterproductive work behaviors of employees.

Tablo 5. The Effect of Counterproductive Work Behavior on Perception of Organizational Dehumanization (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	1,492	0.143		10,464	0,000
Counterproductive Work Behavior	0.470	0.121	0.185	3,891	0,000

a. Dependent Variable: Perception of Organizational Dehumanization

	F	Shallow.	R	R Square
	15,140	,000 [b]	, 185 [a]	0.034

The regression analysis results examine the effect of the Counterproductive Work Behavior variable on the Perception of Organizational Dehumanization. According to the analysis results, the constant coefficient (B = 1.492) is statistically significant (t = 10.464, p < 0.001). This shows that the base level of organizational dehumanization perception is 1.492 when counterproductive work behaviors are zero.

The independent variable, Counterproductive Work Behavior, positively and significantly affects the perception of organizational dehumanization (B = 0.470, t = 3.891, p < 0.001). This means that a one-unit increase in counterproductive work behaviors leads to a 0.470-unit increase in the perception of organizational dehumanization. The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.185) expresses the magnitude of this effect on a standard scale.

The overall significance of the model was confirmed by the F test results (F = 15.140, p < 0.001). The R^2 value was calculated as 0.034, indicating that counterproductive work behaviors explained 3.4% of the variance in the perception of organizational dehumanization.

In conclusion, the analysis reveals that counterproductive work behaviors have a significant and positive effect on the perception of organizational dehumanization. However, the low R^2 value indicates that this effect is limited and that there may be other factors that affect the perception of organizational dehumanization. These findings emphasize the importance of counterproductive work behaviors on employee perceptions in the context of organizational behavior.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the research, the perception of organizational dehumanization And counterproductive work behavior **It was found that there was a significant relationship between** the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors. While the participants' perception of organizational dehumanization was generally low-medium, it was seen that counterproductive work behaviors were at low levels in all sub-dimensions. It was found that there was a positive and significant relationship between the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors . It was determined that in cases where the perception of organizational dehumanization increased, employees tended to turn to counterproductive work behaviors. In particular, it was seen that the sub-dimensions of organizational dehumanization perception, "not being treated as a human being" and "workplace relations", showed stronger relationships with different sub-dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors. This situation shows that the relationships within the organization and the perceptions of individuals may contribute to the negative work behaviors of employees.

The regression analysis findings revealed that counterproductive work behaviors positively and significantly affect the perception of organizational dehumanization. It was observed that when there was an increase in the counterproductive work behaviors of the employees, there was a significant increase in their perception of organizational dehumanization. However, the low explanatory power of the model indicates that there are other factors affecting the perception of organizational dehumanization.

Based on the study results, in order to reduce the perception of organizational dehumanization and counterproductive work behaviors, workplace relationships should be strengthened first. Teamwork, social activities and regular feedback mechanisms that will increase interaction between employees can make individuals feel more valued in the work environment. In addition, emotional intelligence and perception management training for managers can contribute to reducing employees' perceptions of being excluded or feeling worthless. In addition, organizational policies and practices should be reviewed with the principles of justice and equality in the foreground, and reward systems and career development opportunities that increase employee motivation should be offered in this direction.

Early detection and intervention mechanisms should be developed to prevent counterproductive work behaviors. Regular surveys should be conducted to understand the reasons for such behaviors of employees and action plans should be created based on the data obtained. At the same time, stress management, motivational training and psychological support programs can prevent individuals from engaging in negative work behaviors. Examining other factors affecting the perception of organizational dehumanization in regression analysis will allow for the development of more comprehensive solution strategies. These suggestions will contribute to the creation of a healthier and more productive workplace environment by increasing employee commitment.

REFERENCES

Aksoy, T., & Demir, S. (2023). Örgütsel insandışılaştırmanın çalışan performansı üzerindeki etkileri. *İş ve Yönetim Dergisi, 10*(1), 92-108.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(1), 64-80.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1241-1255.

Demir, A., & Çelik, B. (2020). İnsandışılaştırma algısı ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6*(2), 45-67.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2016). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207-216.

Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Berry, J. W., & Lian, H. (2008). The Development and Validation of the Workplace Ostracism Scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(6), 1348-1366.

Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(3), 252-264.

Kaya, F., & Yılmaz, Z. (2021). Örgütlerde insandışılaştırmanın çalışan bağlılığına etkisi. *İşletme Yönetimi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 9*(3), 34-48.

Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2000). Job Stress and Safety. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne, 41*(2), 72-81.

Özkan, H., & Çelik, T. (2022). Çalışanların insandışılaştırma algısı ve örgütsel sabotaj arasındaki ilişki. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 10*(1), 92-113.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. Academy of Management Journal, 38(2), 555-572.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. *In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 151-174). American Psychological Association.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of Abusive Supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190.

Yıldız, S. (2017). Sosyal Bilimlerde Örnekleme Sorunu: Nicel Ve Nitel Paradigmalardan Örnekleme Kuramına Bütüncül Bir Bakiş. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, (11), 421-442.

Zohar, D., & Luria, G. (2005). A multilevel model of safety climate: Cross-level relationships between organization and group-level climates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(4), 616-628.