

# Selected Manifestations of Social Deviance in Organizational Culture

**Martina Urbanová\***

*Faculty of Law, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic*

**Jana Dundelová\*\***

*Faculty of Business and Economics, Mendel University, Brno, Czech Republic*

**Abstract:** *The objective of this paper is to contribute to the discourse about the issues of trust in management, authority and meaningfulness of human labour, which are inseparably connected with effectiveness, productivity, competitiveness of companies, organizations and the whole society as well. The authors want to provide a conceptual theoretical framework for further studies of social deviance in organizational culture, and that is why it has a form of a theoretical study providing a platform for future empirical researches. This study is opened with defining the concept of social deviance as a deviation from the normality and by reminding of difficulties related to determination of normality. The organizational culture is defined as a coherent set of values, norms and patterns of behaviour that determine the manners and forms of behaviour of employees, their relationships inside (but also outside) the social system of the organization. Further, the paper is focused on selected social deviances, which undermine the effectiveness of organizational structures to fulfil their objectives and missions. Based on the empirical analyses, the attention is paid particularly to nepotism, clientelism and cronyism as tools for reaching latent goals of individuals and groups in the organization. The issue is set in the contemporary society and solved from the view of social psychological mechanisms of human behaviour in the group. The authors also remind the issue of responsibility, conscience and the negative effects of conformity, group thinking, obedience and the authoritarian leadership, which is even more obvious when the employees are under the pressure (e.g. economic sanctions). In conclusion are outlined the tools of control of clientelism and similar phenomena, and possibilities of applications of Weber's socio-analytical model of bureaucracy in organizations.*

**Keywords:** normality, norms, social deviance, nepotism, clientelism, cronyism, organization culture.

**Cuvinte-cheie:** normalitate, norme, devianță socială, nepotism, clientelism, *cronyism*, cultură organizațională.

## Introduction

*“Human being is just as easily capable of cannibalism as of critique of pure sense and can do both of them with the same conviction and with the same characteristics under the appropriate circumstances.”*  
Robert Musil, “The Man Without Virtues”

---

\* Department of Legal Theory, Faculty of Law, Masaryk University, Veveří 70, Brno 61180, the Czech Republic. E-mail: [martina.urban@seznam.cz](mailto:martina.urban@seznam.cz).

\*\* Department of Law and Social Sciences, Faculty of Business and Economics, Zemědělská 1, Brno 61300, Czech Republic. E-mail: [jana.dundelova@seznam.cz](mailto:jana.dundelova@seznam.cz).

Organizational culture is a coherent set of values, norms and patterns of behaviour and institutions, which determines behaviour of employees, their social relations within the organization and external relations. Its character is anchored in each organization and influences the activity of their members, and also their behaviour in public.

In the current, post-modern time, is emphasized the immediate performance of each individual; the priority is competitiveness, achievement of satisfactory position, profitability in the long term horizon. For sustainable development of any organization is necessary to provide for their members not only physical but also mental suitable conditions. Members of the organization should have confidence in their leadership and in meaningfulness of their work.

One of main factors threatening the effectiveness of organizational structures is social deviant behaviour, which is the topic of the following text. Socially deviant behaviour causes that the organization does not fulfil its manifested objectives. The latent functions of organization contribute to the deterioration of the quality of the organizational culture and of its public image.

If we regard organizations to be rationally designed systems, then we have to emphasize the fact that organizations follow pre-set goals (e.g. in education it is the quality of education). If other hidden objectives emerge in organization – which are often in the conflict with previously set goals (e.g. egoistic powerful goals or goals related to clientelism) – the organizational rules are significantly disrupted, because the main principle of the organization is that its members behave in a predictable way that leads to the set aims. In an organization it is assumed that leaders (managers, etc.) act always in the interest of organization and all its members. In this concept, there is no space for abusing of leadership for personal and group goals.

The study was conducted in the form of a survey, with data being gathered via examination of related literature. Data for this study were collected using a number of documents

dealing with social deviance in the context of organizational culture. The documents are analysed in order to develop understanding of the issues such as trust in management, authority and meaningfulness of human labour, which are inseparably connected with effectiveness, productivity, competitiveness of companies, organisations and the whole society as well. Authors are not only describing these issues but they are also providing a new conceptual theoretical framework. This study, therefore, provides an important material for better understanding of these issues and serves as a necessary starting point to further empirical research. The aim of this study is to shed new light on this topic through an examination of corporate social deviance, and the importance and possibilities of exploring legal consciousness in this area. In conclusion, the authors give a number of recommendations, so this study has also the socio-technical elements. This paper aims to show that efficiency in this area cannot be measured only economically, but also the elements affecting the legal consciousness of the population must be taken into account.

In this paper we will try to put the issue of social deviance in organizational culture in the social context, from the sociological point of view. Sociological knowledge containing theoretical and empirical level can respond to the questions how a certain reality looks like, what are the features of a specific social phenomenon, how a specific process develops; in addition to it, sociology also brings explanations of the whole social process, e.g. why the phenomenon has certain characteristics, and why the social process is proceeding in its specific way. Sociological knowledge enables understanding of social affairs and social phenomena around us. In explaining social phenomena, sociology puts the main emphasis on the social causes of social phenomena, and in this direction will be our attention also focused.

In the following text the authors want to highlight the necessity of solving problematic situation that threatens the efficiency of organizations and negatively affects not only

the organization but also the climate of the whole society. This study will be conducted in the form of critical analysis using professional literature, as well as other related texts including newspapers depicting the atmosphere in organizations. Documents are always analysed in order to provide understanding of the relationship between the causes of selected types of social deviance and organizational culture. In this paper the authors want to provide a conceptual theoretical framework for further studies of this topic, and that is why it has a form of a theoretical study providing basis for next empirical researches. As reflected the name of the greatest books of the 20th century written by the famous philosopher Karl Popper "All Life is Problem Solving", for any situation, including deviance in organizational culture, it is necessary, at first, to establish the existence of the problem, only afterwards is possible to study the issue, and becoming aware of its complexity, to begin to discuss it. The starting point is always an issue or a problem situation, which is followed by attempts to solve it (Popper, 1998, 20-22). Currently we can watch reduced sensitivity of individuals and groups to asocial behaviour, like violating norms and values, which results in perceiving these abnormal phenomena as something normal. This situation leads to decomposition of a regulative system of norms – to anomie, which will also be commemorated in our paper, and which can be one of the reasons why social deviances occur in organizational culture.

The authors have considered the following research questions:

Whether the deviation is considered in the organization as a normal behaviour?

Whether we regard social deviance in the organization as É. Durkheim's social fact?

Whether the deviation is related to the obedience to authority?

What is the role of a manager in clarifying the meaningfulness of work?

What is the role of a manager in awakening the interest of staff in the results of the organization?

What is the role of the manager in the control of deviant behaviour?

What are the forms of protection against social deviations?

## **Methodology**

This paper was based mainly on analysis of written sources using a comparative approach emphasizing selected aspects of social deviance in organizational culture that are – according to the opinion of the authors of the paper – currently very important and which strongly influence the social system of the organization, as well as the whole society.

This paper has the form of a scientific report and is based on descriptively analytical and evaluative method, and on the study of a wide range of original and secondary literature, electronic sources and databases.

## **Theoretical considerations**

We will focus in this paper on formal organizations, which can be defined as artificially established social systems equipped with normative procedures to mobilize and coordinate the collective efforts to achieve the goals (Keller, 2007, 10).

The organization takes the form of a network of relationships among entities, which also represent the needs of individuals, as well as of the higher organizational unit (Nový and Surynek, 2006). Basic characteristics of the organization is integrity – the whole is more than the sum of the parts; dynamics – perceived as the behaviour of the unit and its parts; the structure represents the whole, consisting of components, which contribute to the functioning of the whole; and the activities, which are based on goal orientation.

Organizational culture that was already outlined in the Introduction offers a new point of view, accentuating the integrity and interdependence of the parts of the organization. It is not specific only for the interconnection of parts, but also for the

unique nature of the whole: culture (and this is also valid for the organizational culture) is externally manifested in its “philosophy”, in its own interpretation of the basic ideas setting legitimacy of instruments affecting behaviour, and in symbols representing encoded values influencing the level and the direction of activity. Organizational culture is visible in the symbols that represent language, stories, metaphors, rituals and symbolic material artefacts, such as a logo, architecture of buildings, corporate visual style and also social norms and patterns of behaviour. A part of the culture are also institutions, which can be characterized as sets of interrelated phenomena – goals, values, norms, behavioural patterns and organized activities affecting human behaviour.

An important place in the organizational culture undoubtedly have ethical and moral values, which are associated with norms and patterns of behaviour of employees, managers and of the organization as a whole. Especially the managers should realize the importance of the organizational culture and contribute to create a functional environment.

From a sociological point of view, the influence of socially deviant behaviour in the organizational culture does not make the organization to be non-functional, but evident are the dysfunctions, signifying disruption and deterioration of functions of the organization, of its efficiency and competitiveness. For this reason, we will examine closely the social deviations and their manifestations. We will focus not only on the negative deviations, but also on the positive deviations, which on the contrary can be beneficial to the organizational culture.

## **Results of research analysis**

### ***Social deviance***

Social deviation is a deviation from the expected standardized and institutionalized behaviour prescribed by the social norm and valid in a social formation. Deviation can

be generally defined as a deviation from the culturally expected standards of behaviour.

This definition is also supported by the following definition: “Deviation can be defined as behaviour that does not conform to a norm or to a set of norms which are accepted by the majority of people in the community” (Giddens, 1999, 185).

The deviations are discussed from the perspective of the relativity approach, according to which the behaviour, ideas, cultural symbols and other social products can be understood only in the context of the culture and society of which they are an organic part.

Social deviation can be understood as a complete unit consisting of the elements from which the social values are the most important. Any manifestation of deviation causes the distortion of value rankings, and on the top places appear new values as money, the progress at the expense of others, callousness and other egotistical and hedonistic values, including excessive emphasis of individualism without responsibility for the functioning of the whole. As Ivo Možný stated, for the Czech society of last decades is typical the concept of individualism without responsibility, i.e. individualism without pride, which takes the form of “cunning utilitarianism and selfishness” (Možný, 1999, 18). Such tendencies are also evident in formal organizations.

Other important elements of social deviation are the social institutions which support weakening of social control and increasing of socially deviant behaviour. The other important elements of social deviation are these social norms whose deformation can occur in everyday life, where often arise alternative social norms of various social groups. Deviations in social relations are then the result of interaction among the divergent value systems, social institutions and social norms.

In the current society we are not often even aware of deviant behaviour, because many people product similar deviant behaviour. We often become members of a group which has its own rules set by manners of their members. Deviation

is the aberration from the standard, but from the socio-psychological perspective it is often difficult to define the standard (Syřišťová, 1992).

### *Normality*

The desire to be normal and to exclude and stigmatize everything abnormal is connected with the desire for membership and for the sense of security, which is the basic motive for participation in the social life (Jenks, 1998).

Basic human's need is orientation in the world and life within an organized society, and for this purpose there are necessary rules and laws which are determined also by the concept of normality. Determination of normality is also one of the basic assumption for diagnosis and therapy or resocialization of abnormal behaviour. But the problem lies in the fact that normative judgments, whether applied in the field of ethics, education, mental health, philosophy or politics, are always basically norms of a certain social group (Dundelová, 2003, 12).

If we look at the etymology of the words "normal", "normality" we can see that they are related to the norm. The norm (or standard) is a rule or a principle which is accepted and expected within a certain social group, and which determines what behaviour is appropriate or inappropriate in the particular circumstances (Urbanová, 2006).

In our everyday speech we often use the word „normal”; we say that something or someone is normal or is not normal. Some manifestations of social deviation such as nepotism or clientelism are considered to be normal because we know that this phenomenon is common in cultural principles of our society. But look closely at the social-psychological definition of normality.

Probably the oldest definition of normality is based on the ideal norm. This norm defines a model, an ideal state, or a process which is desirable for achievement. It has a character of the challenge. The more we are approaching this ideal, the more "normal" we are. This norm itself usually is not expressed numerically, exactly and reliably, but it is described mainly

in qualitative terms. For example, truthfulness and honesty represent an ideal. In contrast to the ideal norm, the most commonly used definition of normality is according to statistical norm that relates normality to the frequency of observed phenomena. Simply said, normal is what makes the majority. Characters are divided by the bell-shaped Gaussian curve. The central part of variation is referred to as normal, upper and lower extremes as anomalous – abnormal, deviant. In this sense we can consider some drawbacks as "normal" if they occur quite often in the studied population – or in our case, in the organization. In terms of diametric standards exist only quantitative (not qualitative) differences between normal and abnormal, and the possibility of deviations is in both directions.

In concepts based on statistical standards it can appear that some areas of abnormality (corruption, favouritism, cronyism, nepotism) are "normal" because they statistically prevail. This interpretation can be very dangerous and decomposing for organizational culture. In these cases, it is necessary to return to the ideal standard, which again shows the "right direction".

Normality can be also defined according to functional norm, which disregards the criteria of ideal and statistical norm, but defines as normal (proper, appropriate or healthy) such characteristics, behaviours and conditions that correspond to given individual's goals, needs and satisfaction. This is based on the fact that a number of variant of considerably different behaviour can be considered normal. Recognition of functional standards is characteristic for many structures based on the value of individual's freedom. But there is a risk of excessive right to self-determination. In the case of organizations it is the ignorance of their main objectives and the focus only on personal interests, which can be in a direct conflict with the idea of the organization. (For example, we care only about short-term personal gain, own career, satisfaction, etc., but we are not able to see the future development of the organization, its needs and interests from the point of view of long-term continuity.)

Normality is usually defined on the basis of a *subjective norm of the observer*, which is related to the diametric (statistical) norm. The observer sets, according to his experiences with a segment of reality accessible to him, some reference points, neutral values, due to which certain phenomena are evaluated as exaggerated or different. Neutral values then become the meaning of “normal” or “still normal”. Objectively measurable characteristics correspond to the geometric mean of the measured values.

To say that something is normal, respectively someone is normal, is still quite difficult; in this context, we can remind Philip Zimbardo's Prison Experiment, which proves that even university educated and socially adapted people can produce unethical behaviour under special circumstances (Craig, Banks and Zimbardo, 1973). Similar doubts evoke also other experiments focused on the study of obedience to immoral authority.

### ***Obedience to Authority***

Obedience to authority is a necessary condition of social life. The division of labour in society requires that individuals be able to submit and synchronize their independent activities with the purpose of the organization and adapt themselves to organizational culture. The enculturation, i.e. integration of the individual into the culture which is represented by parents in childhood, further by the system of education and employment, leads individuals to fulfilling tasks assigned by authorities without thinking and awareness of their own.

Absolute obedience to authority can have disastrous consequences, as shown by experiment of American psychologist Stanley Milgram from Yale University. According to Milgram (1974, 11) the division of labour causes that “a person does not get to see the whole situation but only a small part of it, and is thus unable to act without some kind of over-all directions. He yields to authority but in doing so is alienated from his own actions... Thus,

there is fragmentation of the total human act; no one man decides to carry out the evil act and is confronted with consequences. The person who assumes full responsibility for the act has evaporated. Perhaps this is the most common characteristic of socially organized evil in modern society.”

The Stanley Milgram Experiment was created to explain some of the concentration camp-horrors of the World War 2, where Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, Slavs and other “enemies of the state” were slaughtered by Nazis. Many war-criminals claimed in the trials following the World War 2 that they were merely following orders and could not be held responsible for their actions. Milgram wanted to find out if the Germans were, in fact, evil and cold-hearted, or if this is a group phenomenon which could happen to anyone under the “right conditions”. For this study, Milgram hired through a newspaper ad normal people of different professions, offered them \$4.50 for one hour of work at Yale University for a psychology experiment studying memory and learning. The experimenter explained that one subject would be assigned the role of “teacher” and the other would be assigned the role of “learner”. Whenever the learner gave an incorrect answer, the teacher was told to administer an electric shock from 15 to 450 volts. What the teacher did not know was that the experiment was a digger; no shocks were actually administered. The result was that 65 percents of the “teachers” reached 450 volts on the shock machine (it means they would in reality endanger health or life of the “learners”) even if they know it and could hear (recorded) squirming, groans, and screams from the room where was the “learner”. “Teachers” in the Milgram experiment believed in scientific research and in the importance of their activities, and, in particular, they fully relied on the experimenter – the responsible person who knows what he is doing. The social pressure of the researcher telling the “teacher” that they must go on plays a huge role in the teacher continuing to increase the voltage. It shows that the impact of social pressure is indeed very strong (Milgram, 1974).

Extreme obedience to authority and also the effort to be – at least – partially involved in control of the surroundings is typical for the authoritarian personality type.

### ***Normality and social climate***

Before we will continue in dealing with the issue of obedience to authority we should also mention the influence of the social climate on normality; e.g. it is evident from the research of corruption conducted by Roman Džambazovič (2012), which shows a discrepancy between real behaviour of respondents and their opinions and attitudes publicly proclaimed related to corruption. Džambazovič states that, on the one hand, corruption is recognized as a major social problem and, in the opinion of people, it cannot be excused, on the other hand, we can see only a little willingness to be resistant to the request for a bribe, or to complain about such behaviour. Respondents in researches conducted in the Slovak Republic repeatedly answered that corruption cannot be justified, but they also expressed the idea that corruption is often rationalized due to social pressure. Therefore, we can speak about the existence of corruption climate, which Džambazovič considers as one of the main causes of corruption, which is considered as a part of everyday life for most people (Džambazovič, 2012, 138-139). Thus, the society accepts and tolerates corruption, which contributes to the existence of corruption climate. This produces a tendency to downplay or legitimize corruption, and to justify people involved in corruption transactions. It is supported by the phenomenon of *mutual reinforcement*, which means that many people are convinced that people around them are corrupted. This resulted in using corruption for achieving goals, because this behaviour is considered to be normal. According to the statistical concept of normality, thus becomes a kind of standard deviation.

Manifestation of social deviance is also supported by anomie. As reported by Juraj Schenk (2004) symptoms of anomie include: absence of

standards, acceptance of socially unacceptable norms or values, dysfunctional institutions, behaviour in contrary to the standards or values, or more precisely, without sanctions for their violation, inescapable perspectives of the society and reflection of anomie of population in terms of acceptance of anomic state as a normal state. These factors were successfully suggested on the basis of empirical research explaining the growth of manifestations of anomic behaviour in the Slovak Republic and – in the opinion of the authors of this paper – they are also valid in other countries, e.g. in the Czech Republic. These factors include the disintegration of institutions and of human behaviour, unpromising development of uncontrolled society, crime, insecurity, mistrust, acceptance of immorality, recklessness and corruption. In addition to the uncertainty, mistrust, acceptance of immorality in organizational culture is often observable self-preservation at all costs; it means – in the short term – the self-preservation without ability to see into the future.

### ***The Authoritarian Personality***

According to Theodor Adorno and Erich Fromm, the authoritarian personality type is, in its extreme form, the psychological basis of fascistic movements. But this extreme form manifests itself in social reality, in real social life, apparently only if it has the social opportunity. Otherwise, the authoritarian personality is docile, conventional, unoriginal, but with a rigid, haughtily confident thinking, which, however, can be quickly and willingly adapted to powerful and emotional influence.

Authoritarianism is the first mechanism of escape from freedom. Authoritarianism means giving up independence of own self, and through connecting with someone or something outside of self to gain the strength that the self is missing (Fromm, 1993).

Throughout the human history we can see the evidence of the danger of surrendering to the authority, and there is nothing worse than when the power is accumulated in the hands of

immoral person. But there is always true that “supporters make the king” and without these supporters, the king is becoming a mere jester. Unfortunately, people with deviant behaviour very often find many supporters. The probable cause of this state is missing relation of the modern man to results of his work, because the results are lost in the division of labour (see section four) and lost are also moral standards. And it can happen that absolutely normal people are able to commit very cruel acts, if the social space is monopolized by one authority whose opinions and acts represent the only norm of the society, and they are undiscussable and every sign of questioning of the norm is less or more cruelly punished. Therefore, there appears the explanation what was heard even in the context of the Nuremberg trials of Nazi criminals that guilty is not the individual but the system and also their defence – fortunately did not accepted by the trials – that they were only doing their duty.

In *Unmasking Administrative Evil*, authors Guy Adams and Danny Balfour (2009) emphasize that individuals do much less harm than systems do. It wasn't Eichmann – it was the Nazi ideology; it's the system rather than the individual. There is no denying that “evil” has existed in public administration throughout human history. Hundreds of millions of human beings have died as a direct or indirect consequence of state-sponsored violence. The authors argue that administrative evil, or destructiveness, is a part of the identity of all modern public administration (as it is a part of psychoanalytic study at the individual level). It goes beyond a superficial critique of public administration and lays the groundwork for a more effective and humane profession. Constructing a positive future for public administration requires a willingness to deal with the disturbing aspects of the field's history, identity and practices. Rather than viewing events such as genocide as isolated or aberrant historical events, the authors show how the forces that unleashed such events are part of modernity and are, thus, present in all contemporary public

organizations. The authors also point out that we focus on individual villains, as much as we focus on individual heroes.

The topic of hero is popularized mainly by the professor emeritus at Stanford University, Dr. Zimbardo who is best-known for his controversial Stanford Prison Experiment that highlighted the ease with which ordinary intelligent college students could cross the line between good and evil when caught up in the matrix of situational and systemic forces. Dr. Zimbardo's current research looks at the psychology of heroism. He asks: “What pushes some people to become perpetrators of evil, while others act heroically on behalf of those in need?” And he, with his team, is preparing programme for training ordinary people on how to become everyday heroes by learning how to stand up, speak out and take wise and effective action in the challenging situations they face daily at home, school, business, community and nation. (<http://www.zimbardo.com/>).

If we return to the organization, isn't obedience of employees to immoral decisions of executives only mere dishonest escape from the “anguish of choice” and from the responsibility for consequences of own decision? At the beginning of the 1990's, sociologists called dissident movement in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, in the former regime, as negative deviance (as was the dissident movement to end of the '80s of the last century defined, often under the label of complaining or mental disorder), and dissident movement became positive deviance after the Velvet revolution. And, on the other hand, the standards of communist regime, which restricted freedom of individuals fundamentally, started to be publicly interpreted as negative phenomenon, negative deviance.

If we look at the stories of members of the dissident movement we witness the courage and personal responsibility, the ability to bring great victims and face enormous pressure of sanctions of any kind, in the name of the belief of the dissidents. In the current time we can see very often the situation which is very well described



in the Parliamentary Documents (ParlamentníListy) from 2011: the atmosphere of fear among employees is almost tangible. But why? What is the reason? "I'm afraid to tell you something I might regret later, so excuse me, but I will rather not speak about Mr. B (name shortened by authors)," said for the ParlamentníListy.cz one of the employees. Similar statements about Mr. B editors of ParlamentníListy.cz found several, which raises a number of questions and surrounds this situation in some mysterious shadow.

But one employee was more specific: "I'm not satisfied and I'm not the only one. There is discrimination and nepotism. We have more and more work, but wages do not grow. I won't tell you more and don't wonder. People are now afraid to say openly what they think because they are afraid that they could lose the job." (ParlamentníListy.cz)

With similar answers we can meet also in other organizations. It is striking that, in one of the unnamed organization, after the apparent discrimination of one of the employees, chairwoman of the local trade union said: "You're right, but I have to obey the managers."

### ***Organization and Manager***

Already in the '30s of the 20th century, Elton Mayo criticized the classical conception of society as a simple sum of individuals pursuing only their narrowly focused selfish material interests. Mayo set his concept of interpersonal relationships into the broader social context.

The capitalist production shattered the traditional form of human groups, and in the context of work, created a cool space of biased rationality and utilitarianism. This result caused impairment of natural development of integrated personality, and the whole situation threatened the feeling of self-esteem and meaningfulness of work. A natural feature of the humans is to develop the initial value of community, based on cooperation and solidarity.

If management supports this effort and creates the conditions in which the employees

are willing to pursue common goals. Specifically, this means that managers should be qualified not only technically, but also socially, in order to create an appropriate atmosphere stimulating job performance and employee's initiatives (Keller, 2007).

This is supported by the entire system of social rewards and sanctions. In the current time, we are more concentrated on the sanctions and less on rewards. For the work group is also very important the feeling of justice, equity and predictability. The successful manager is not the only a kind of the inspector and the supervisor, but becomes a support of their employees, someone on whom they can rely, and who promotes their interests. Therefore, it is the manager's responsibility to try to prevent all forms of deviant behaviour in the organization, and coordinate the tools of control the organization, employees and even outside.

If this situation is not controlled, it can happen that deviant behaviour occurs in the organization very often and it leads to disorganization, the state of anomie, which is not only a decay of moral standards and values, but also the state of disbelief, when the employees feel no one will help them against perceived unfairness.

Leo Srole (1956) characterized this situation by fundamental propositions:

- Members of the company have the impression that their needs are not important for leaders.
- The company lacks the order; it is not possible to reliably plan the future.
- There is a sense that the realization of the objectives is constantly moving away.
- The belief that life sense escapes.
- The awareness that you cannot trust even in the vicinity.

It is obvious that these feelings undermine the effectiveness of organizational structures to fulfil its objectives, and, in addition, worsen the quality of human life, because the sense of meaningful work is disappearing.

How all these mentioned characteristics affect human life it depends on its type. For the rational economic man is the main motive of action

to maximize profits. The social man (socially sensitive man) seeks his identity in relation with others. E.H. Schein (1965) completed this typology and added self-actualizing man and the complex man.

The concept of self-actualizing man – whose motivation does not finish with social contacts, but is oriented to the need for self-fulfilment – is considered to be a higher level of “human relations”. People want to be proud of themselves and their work. The last type of man, so-called complex, sees man as a very complicated creature. The capable manager must be very receptive to be able to diagnose the variety of motives and circumstances which influence this person. The organization should not be understood as forced cooperation of people (Weber, 1925) but as device to satisfy the specific needs of its voluntarily grouped members (Barnard, 1948).

People are willing to perform the most menial of tasks, even for little pay, as long as they consider the work meaningful or are recognized for their contributions, according to new research from Duke University, Professor Dan Ariely (Ariely, 2011). Ariely’s findings contain important lessons for managers, and result from a series of novel experiments, including one with Lego figurines. In his first experiment, Ariely’s team asked college students to find sets of repeated letters on a sheet of paper. Some of the students’ work was reviewed by a “supervisor” as soon as it was turned in. Other students were told in advance that their work would be collected but not reviewed, and still others watched as their papers were shredded immediately upon completion. Each of the students was paid 55 cents for completing the first sheet, and five cents less for each sheet thereafter, and allowed to stop working at any point. The research team found that people whose work was reviewed and acknowledged by the “supervisor” were willing to do more work for less pay than those whose work was ignored or shredded.

Ariely and his colleagues recommended that managers should find ways to bring more meaning to all jobs, no matter how routine or

menial, because, in many cases, the production was broken into so many disparate tasks, that workers may have feel very little connection to the final product. The consequence of this is that they feel very little motivation. Ariely’s team recommended to educate employees about the goals of their work, and about the way how individual tasks fit into the larger picture, as one way of overcoming perceived lack of meaning in work. And the managers who wish to have motivated employees must recognize the work people perform.

Ariely’s experiments showed that even the smallest acknowledgement increased willingness to work and decreased the level of pay required. But they also showed just how disastrous it can be to ask someone to perform work that they do not see the meaning (Ariely, 2011).

## Discussion

The main issue emerging from abovementioned analysis is the question if clientelism and cronyism are becoming to be standard forms of business or social deviance and how we can improve moral culture of managers.

Dutch social anthropologist Jeremy Boissevain (1974) is very sceptical about human behaviour. He says that people do not act according to the prescription of “noble” social norms, but according to their wish to acquire specific benefits. Individuals or groups do not win over others because they have more truthful and stronger arguments, but because they have influential allies than their rivals.

People behave as “entrepreneurs” and manipulate norms and relations, or even higher values, in the interest of their own psychic and social profit. Boissevain sees man’s relationship to his network of friends and acquaintances as a standard form of business. He thinks that people can have two kinds of resources; the first is land, money, professional knowledge, status, power, and other goods. Boissevain calls persons with these sources *patrons*. The second source are

the strategic contacts with those who control the resources of the first category, or have access to such persons, – it is called brokers. Not everyone can manipulate others, but if people are cunning, they can for themselves from strategic contacts exploit a variety of services, information, and also ensure for themselves a higher social status and the “good will” from others. Boissevain stresses that the broker’s influence is not caused only by real importance of his “friends”, but mainly by the belief of others in his power and influential contacts. To the certain level, the power relations can operate on the principle of self-fulfilling prophecy: if we believe that a person or a group has a high degree of latent power, we respect them, and thus we further expand their power, which can also work in reverse. Boissevain’s theory is, from the perspective of social deviance in organizational culture, very close to clientelism, cronyism and nepotism, i.e. to preference of relatives, friends, acquaintances, or completely loyal “protected persons”. The consequence of this are violated principles of equality and competition based on performance, and not on ascription. Forms of nepotism can be direct or indirect. A special form of this phenomena is nepotism based on favouritism of own relatives or personal friends.

In connection with these social deviances we can also remind corruption characterized as an abuse of the social status that is associated with the violation of the principle of impartiality in decision-making. There is motivation of obtaining material or other benefits.

Institution’s ability to suppress and prevent corruption is an indicator of the quality of the internal culture of the institutional system. It is so serious violation of the principles of democracy that it is sanctioned by legal norms, which are unlike other social norms provided by the state power. However, if these sanctions are effective, they should meet the criterion of adequacy, timeliness and irreversibility, which still, unfortunately, is not true for crimes related to corruption.

At the present time should be given a special attention to the phenomenon of moral culture

of managers. This is supported by the pressure on permanent education in this field, training – especially ethical training that is teaching managers to analyse their professional behaviour and confront their moral reasoning with their real behaviour. Only so educated managers are able to detect deviant behaviour and actively act against it. The education of moral reasoning based on the Kohlberg’s theory of moral judgments should be the inseparable form of the formation of moral culture of managers (Kohlberg, 2008).

## Conclusion

This paper outlines only some of the manifestations of socially deviant behaviour. The authors intentionally avoided frequently studied issues such as discrimination in the workplace, manifestations of mobbing, bossing, sexual harassment, which are the frequent expressions of a “culture” of the organization. These topics are beyond the defined scope of this text.

The authors attempted to set the theme of organization and its culture into the framework of socio-psychological problems of social deviance, normality, authority, sanction and legitimacy, and to highlight the issues which we meet our everyday lives, in spite of the fact we are not aware of them, or we consider them to be normal social reality, in terms of Emil Durkheim, which exists independently of us and causes the pressure on us, it is a state of collective consciousness, a kind of “bad mood” to which we become more and more resistant.

One form of protection against social deviations in organizational culture resides in the personal responsibility of each member. But acting according to the law (within the meaning of obedience to authority) does not necessarily mean just blind obedience to orders and getting rid of responsibility for own actions (see section “The Authoritarian Personality”). One ancient wisdom says: “Woe betide the city where everybody performs his duties” (we want to stress “only duties”). Mere compliance

with the law is not enough. Any obedience of orders should be subordinated to conscience, freedom and higher moral principles.

From the perspective of the organization's management in this context we have to emphasize transparent selection procedures, information on workload and performance of each employee. It is possible to apply some of the principles established by Max Weber in his theory of bureaucracy. In

particular, it means decisions in accordance with the formal rules and standards, when the stability of the organization is determined by the functioning of impersonal rational purpose rules; selection of employees according to specific rules, when the main criterion for selection is the professional abilities and qualification, transparent rules for rewards and promotion, as well as transparency of the whole organization.

## References

- Adams, G. and Balfour, D. (2009) *Unmasking Administrative Evil*. London: M. E. Sharpe.
- Ariely, D. (2011) *The upside of irrationality*. London: HarperCollins.
- Barnard, Ch. I. (2010) *Organization and Management*. Cambridge: Harvard University press.
- Boissevain, J. (1974) *Friends of friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Berger, P. L. (1991) *Pozvání do sociologie*. Praha: FMO.
- Craig, H., Banks, C. and Zimbardo, P. (1973) Interpersonal Dynamics in Simulated Prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, vol. 1, 69-97.
- Dundelová, J. (2003) *Sebepojetí a mentální reprezentace rodinných vztahů adolescent s delikventním a predelikventním chováním*, Dissertation thesis, Brno: Masaryk University.
- Džambazovič, R. (2013) Korupcie a jej vnímanie vo verejnej mienke, in G. Lubelcová and R. Džambazovič, *Sociálna patológia optikou sociologického skúmania*, Bratislava: Stimul.
- Fromm, E. (1993) *Strach ze svobody*. Praha: Naše vojsko.
- Giddens, A. (1999) *Sociologie*. Praha: Argo.
- Jenks, C. (1998) *Core sociological dichotomies*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Keller, J. (2007) *Sociologie organizace a byrokracie*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Kohlberg, L. (2008) The Development of Children's Orientation Towards a Moral Order. *Human Development*, 51, vol. 1, 8-20.
- Merton, R. K. (2000) *Studie ze sociologické teorie*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to Authority. An Experimental View*. London: Tavistock.
- Mills, C. (2002) *Sociologická imaginace*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Nový, I. and Surynek, A. (2006) *Sociologie pro ekonomy a managery*. Praha: Grada.
- Možný, I. (1999) *Proč tak snadno. Některé rodinné důvody sametové revoluce*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Munková, G. (2004) *Sociální deviace: (přehled sociologických teorií)*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Nakonečný, M. (1996) *Motivace lidského chování*. Praha: Academia.
- Parlamentní listy (2014) Je tu diskriminace a protekce. Bojí se mluvit. Available at <http://www.parlamentnilisty.cz/zpravy/kauzy/c-Babisova-podniku-Je-tu-diskriminace-a-protekce-Boji-se-mluvit-214982>.
- Popper, K. (1998) *Život je řešení problémů. O poznání v dějinách a politice*. Praha: Mladá fronta.
- Schein, E. H. (1965) *Organisational Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Schenk, J. (2004) Anómia na Slovensku: pokus o meranie. *Sociológia*, 36, 2, 107-136.
- Srole, L. (1956) Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Explanatory Study. *American Sociological Review*, 21, 6, 709-716.
- Syříšřová, E. (1972) *Normalita osobnosti*. Praha: Avicenum.
- Urbanová, M. (2006) *Systémy sociální kontroly a právo*. Plzeň: Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk.
- Večeřa, M. and Urbanová, M. (2011) *Sociologie práva*. Plzeň: Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk.
- Weber, M. (1998) *Metodologie sociologie a politika*. Praha: OIKOYMENH.
- Weber, M. (1925) *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Zimbardo, P. (2014) *Psychology and the New Heroism*. Available at [www.zimbardo.com](http://www.zimbardo.com).