

Auto-Ethnography: “Employee Behavior Towards Supervisors and Managers” Or “Interaction as the Ideal Behavior”

Ehsan Farzin Abdehgah*

Date Received: 96/05/17
Date Accepted: 96/12/14

Abstract

Before managing the staff in dealing with supervisors and managers, it is necessary to recognize types of behavior they exhibit. This has not been previously analyzed through concise research. Using Analytic Auto-ethnography can help us to provide a model based on two indicators of courage and adaptability, which can be low, medium or high. Four main types of employee behaviors towards supervisors and managers will be examined in this study and other less analyzed behaviors will be examined in future research. Within the framework of this model, great courage and low adaptability leads to aggressive employee behavior towards supervisors or managers, courage and great adaptability to staff interaction with supervisors or managers, courage and low adaptability to vilifying, and a low courage and great adaptability results in staff ingratiation in dealing with supervisors or managers. Desirable treatment is the interaction that comes from the loyal staff.

Keywords: *Auto-ethnography; Employee Behavior; Supervisors and Managers*

*. Researcher of Sadr International Institute for Researches & Studies In Islamic Banking, Iran;
ehsanfarzin@outlook.com

Introduction

While I was working on an industrial project, I faced many problems and I wondered why dealing with such problems is not taught in universities. As a lecturer and expert in the industry, I felt the onus is on me to transfer my experiences in an authentic form to students and researchers. I also believe that the gift of writing is not given to everyone, and being a novelist, engineer and a lecturer at the same time makes a greater responsibility than ever.

Several years of research in the social sciences and management, which was conducted within quantified known framework, was not enough to satisfy my idealistic attitude, which was writing honestly and practically. On the other hand, the methods used in Iranian universities are fundamentally different with common qualitative research conducted in universities around the world and as a result none of my colleagues who were faculty members and teachers could help and guide me in my goal. In the last year of my postgraduate program, when I asked the professor of strategic thinking that I want to use my talent to be a novelist in relation to my field of study, but he strangely changed the subject and said, "The story is that you should have a valid translation of scientific papers and email me ". He knew nothing about the techniques of fictional writing in management science.

So with limited knowledge I had in the field, I decided to turn my experiences into short stories. For various reasons, however, these short stories were neither categorized as literary fictions nor scientific texts I was familiar with. This was until, in one of his lectures, Dr. Fazeli (2012), the faculty member of Institute for Humanities and social studies, courageously pointed out a fact that I had never dared to mention in the scientific community: the fact that the quantitative researches in our country are used as the legal justification for the researches that are often not valid which is tantamount to money laundering in Economy! Scientific projects and research papers are written to earn scientific score points or as a source of income and because they are provided as a valid framework, they cannot be easily refuted. He introduced the methodology called auto-ethnography, a method based on the researcher (Sparkes, 2000, 21) or the author's

experiences to promote understanding of sociological aspect of society. This method (exposures) is the researcher's perceptions, fears, and hopes (Tracy, 2010).

Auto-ethnographic studies are helpful for researchers, participants and readers (Raab, 2013: 6). Writing stories, feelings and experiences have a therapeutic effect on the author. (Poulos, 2008)

According to Chang (2008), ethnographical study is the process of obtaining knowledge of oneself through soul-searching and analyzing one's own experiences.

The primary goal of writing for many writers is to satisfy their own desire to write. Many even consider writing so sacred that the claim "art for art" notion applies to it. In the management sciences, however, we have a practical viewpoint, and we aim to develop it in different ways, so that even our personal experiences can be useful to others. The author passes out his feelings to others, "feelings which the readers did not have before" (Boylorn, 2006). Therapeutic role of stories based on one's own experience on readers has already been proven through research (Ellis et al., 2011).

Lack of defined framework for the industrial projects on the employee behavior towards managers or supervisors is the main purpose of this study. Employees display different behavior towards their superior which is shaped by employees' different personality types, their organizational positions, psychological factors etc. While doing a project, this behavior becomes more important for various reasons, including work or workshop and harsh working conditions. In the quantitative studies, citing whatever is said to be very important and researcher does not predefine his/her personal idea on it. Therefore, sufficient resources must be available to conduct a study. Imagine you are going to conduct a study on a novel issue or the one with insufficient resources. In this case, so often, researcher can be confused with using the quantitative approach and the research has low validity. Therefore, qualitative research methods such as auto-ethnography can be used in which the researcher's experiences will be considered valid.

Ellis (2004) asserted that ethnographical research sets out to obtain an understanding of people's feelings, thoughts, and deeds.

So, I entitled my article as Auto-ethnography: “employee behavior towards supervisors and managers or “Interaction as the ideal behavior”. The main reason for was the lack of a valid model for the employee behavior towards superiors so that managers can apply to efficiently manage their human resources. However, the lack of this model in industrial projects, which is basis of my experience for writing this article, is more evident. The managers' awareness of existing practices can be used to promote organizational behavior and develop policies and strategies to achieve the desired goal. Currently employee behavior is difficult to managed as it is clearly identified recognized.

In this study, employee behavior towards superiors is measured by two indicators that they themselves are considered positive traits in popular culture: "courage" and "adaptability". Ideally with respect to these indices, having great courage and adaptability makes people interact with their superiors.

Although, the interaction is a known subject, less attention is paid to it in industry and particularly in industrial projects as a research topic. However, some researchers have studied it in conjunction with other topics such as: C. Jackson (2003) interactive planning, Maturana and Varela (1980) on the system, Ackoff (1999a) on systems thinking, Aguinis (2002) and Palich, Cardinal, & Miller (2000) on the effects of interaction, Alan Fine & Hallett (2014) on the interaction Orders to name but a few.

So interaction as an independent topic for research has not received much attention. The importance and value of the interaction is considered in the industry when is considered along with other behaviors, there is not any study of these behaviors that are compared or referred to. Therefore, while working on industrial projects, I examined how employee interacted with their supervisors and managers in the organization through making inquiries, taking notes and observing the employee’s behavior.

Because this article is my first experience in auto-ethnography, I think the methodology used in this research should be briefly explained .The research framework is that after preparation of the introduction, research methodology, and auto- ethnography and finally

the result will be presented. The required discussions are provided after presenting the subject and will not be considered separately.

Methodology

Auto-ethnography is about the importance of social and individual stories (Ellis's, 2002). Smith (2005) defines auto-ethnography as a method for authenticating a person's experiences. Taber (2010) believes that auto-ethnography is identifying oneself and the community and different degrees of attention is given to each. Walford (2004) describes auto-ethnography as a way beyond self-discovering. According to him, it should be considered as a discussion and experience in the study, otherwise, it should be called storytelling that plays an important role in understanding our world, but it cannot necessarily be classified as research.

There are three types of auto-ethnography: realist, impressionist, and confessional (Van Maanen, 2011). A real story, as Ellis (2004) describes, is told through a based theory and analytic discussions. In this kind of research, the theoretical method is used, and conversed with perceptual theories. In this case, there is only one idea. The reader may propose some questions such as: how do we know? How can the reality be explained? And what is its meaning?

This study was carried out based on Analytic Auto-ethnography expressed by Anderson (2006). He states that:

"The author proposes the term analytic auto-ethnography to refer to research in which the researcher is (1) a full member in the research group or setting, (2) visible as such a member in published texts, and (3) committed to developing theoretical understandings of broader social phenomena".

The five characteristics He presented for this method are as follows:

"(1) complete member researcher (CMR) status, (2) analytic reflexivity, (3) narrative visibility of the researcher's self, (4) dialogue with informants beyond the self, and (5) commitment to theoretical analysis".

When I took my first notes about the current issue I had been working as the expert planning and project control of phase 14 of South Pars gas refinery in Iran. At the time, I used my free time in the department, to discuss this issue with my colleagues. Hence as mentioned by Anderson (2006), I was "a complete member in the social world under study". That was divided into two categories by the researchers: Complete Member Researcher "opportunistic" and "convert" (Anderson, 2006; Adler and Adler, 1987). An opportunistic CMR is a researcher was accidentally placed in the study group and convert CMR has started by a research interest and he/she gradually becomes the main component.

But my view is slightly different and more functional about the features of the Analytic Auto-ethnography. In my opinion, auto-ethnography is a way of converting superior experience to authentic research. Superior experiences in various fields such as industry, is an achievement that cannot be easily won by a researcher, because the auto-ethnographer has gained superior practical experience to write and knows his first and main task to research. In other words, this individual can be a researcher and professional expert simultaneously. So, the ethnographer assuming that this method is to use a personal, professional experience that should not involve research complexity, such as that there is in quantitative research. With respect to this description, there is a third type in the CMR, which can be explained in this way: professional expert in his jobs is faced with the problem that can be solved sharing and exchanging ideas with other experts. He may or may not have writing skills. If he has good writing and research skills, he can document his experiences, if not, there are two cases: either he is graduated from the college and can write his experience with very simple training, in this way, professional researchers should provide simple and understandable framework for people, or he has no academic education like some professional technicians and workers who can share their experiences with their knowledge to write and share them with the professional researcher and interact together to complete it. Davies (1999) also notes that the auto-ethnographer can develop using others knowledge and experiences.

The second feature of Analytic Auto-ethnography is analytic reflexivity. It means that the auto-ethnographer needs to be involved "in reflexive social analysis and self-analysis" (Anderson, 2006). The present case study is "employee behavior towards supervisors and managers" or "interactions as ideal behavior". In this way other modes of treatment are presented in this study. In other words, the environment where I was working was analyzed. The environment is called a project. My workplace has the matrix organizational graph, and I was working in a research and control unit of a project that I was working had to report not only to the directors of the company, but also the separate and responsive reports for the employer. In other words, this unit was in constant contact with other staff, including project managers and subcontractors. The second characteristic of Analytic Auto-ethnography is also observed in this study.

The third feature is "Visible and Active Researcher in the Text" (Anderson, 2006). He says:

"A central feature of autoethnography is that the researcher is a highly visible social actor within the written text. The researcher's own feelings and experiences are incorporated into the story and considered as vital data for understanding the social world being observed". "Autoethnography demands enhanced textual visibility of the researcher's self".

This feature of auto-ethnography makes the reader to believe that writer or researcher is really involved in the project and has put himself in his place, and tries to understand the problem on one hand, and on the other hand tries to analyze and conclude it. Davies (1999, 5) emphasize the issue, and considers intellectual experience as the main purpose and integral part of this type of research. Having the intellectual experience and saturation by the mind of the writer or researcher to create and write the work or study and as Geertz (1988) has introduced it as "author saturated texts". One of the weaknesses of the quantitative studies that I have been repeatedly faced with was that some uncommitted researchers to ethics published their mental concepts in the form of quantitative research using data in reputable journals, and when they were asked why such results have been disclosed to the public, the answer was that "I am a researcher and

research results are gathered by field study and I do not care.” This issue appears in the quantitative research when in the context of research, the pronoun "I" is not used, and the results are not attributable to the researcher. But in this study which is conducted using Analytic Auto-ethnography, this weakness has been eliminated and researcher is committed to what is attributed to him.

The fourth feature is "Dialogue with Informants beyond the Self" (Anderson, 2006). This is the difference between autobiography and auto-ethnography (Ouellet, 1994, 13). The project planning and control unit is where human, physical, financial and time aspects of the project (Project Management Institute, 2015) are constantly the subject of discussion and dialogue. Some of these issues are discussed within the unit and others are analyzed between the unit and other units of projects, such as office equipment, performance unit etc. So an expert's ideas or thoughts would be analyzed initially by himself and then by colleagues and other experts. When I examined the impact of the project among the staff and staff – directors, while I was working as fellow deputy project manager in the workshop which provided the opportunity to discuss with other project staff. The fourth feature, Analytic Auto-ethnography, is also observed in the present study.

The fifth feature is "Commitment to an Analytic Agenda" (Anderson, 2006). As (Karp, 1996, 14) also considers a valuable sociology as clarifying a theme to evaluate and analyze, the subject of this study was discussed again by me and a group of experts. So what is presented in this study is not my own opinions and is part of it through interaction with others.

Data collecting method is in accordance with (Goodall, 2000) the use of fieldnotes, I actively made notes of my ideas and thoughts and I would classify the collected data after the continuous analyses. On the other hand, I also noted down the important and thought-provoking ideas of other staff members. After a few years, I was intellectually more capable and had a much broader context, I analyzed the issues. Also, after arranging the subject of the study into story form, I sought others experts opinion outside my workplace who were familiar with the professions and found that they were consistent with the research results.

Auto- ethnography, employee behavior toward supervisors and managers

An individual's behavior is directed by the goal(s), either right or wrong, from their point of view, could be beneficial to them (Rezaeian, 2000: 9). The characteristics of each individual are where his various behavioral patterns stem from (Elahi and Pourheravi, 2008: 164). There are a variety of political activities in the organization (Gandz & Murray, 1980) that if looked at from a negative viewpoint (Zanzi & O'Neill, 2001) can be non-interactive behavior with a supervisor or manager. In other words, it will be considered an indicator of the problem with the management (Vigoda and Drory, 2006). Although individual characteristics and environmental conditions can cause a type of behavior, but according to Creswell (2007) that "the ethnographer should rely on his / her judgment and intuition." In my view, two main criteria "adaptability" and "courage" are determinant for type of behavior with the manager or supervisor, such that if the two indicators are high, the individual can interact with the manager or supervisor, and if each of them is not in a desirable level, it will provide grounds for negative behaviors, these behaviors include aggression, vilifying and ingratiating. It is possible that different organizations have different behaviors toward a manager or supervisor that is not addressed in this study, such as praise, envy and so on which will be discussed in another study. Therefore, in the present study, I focus on the specific behavior in a project that is based on my experience and research.

The pre-assumption of a project researcher is that the project starts in a determined timescale and then is finished, and then the individual tries to find the new opportunity in a new project. So, he/she may know his/her colleagues as temporary colleagues and friends. Terms of the project is such that they cannot easily be judged by the rightness or wrongness of this behavior, but each individual project has to know that his life may always pass on the project and the project is a small world that people meet each other as soon as possible. After finishing one project, it is likely that two colleagues of the end of a project are partner again in another project after a few years. Also, they need constant contact with their network of friends and colleagues, so it is

worth having a good image of themselves in the mind of their colleagues.

Generally, the proportionality in ethics is very important in terms of the project, especially the kind of job. For example, a supervisor of the project should be serious. Control project expert who deals with the subcontractors, should behave seriously to develop the determined programs to be able to efficiently advance the company's objectives and programs and behave with other superior colleagues and managers in a friendly manner to gather the required data. A good foreman is a person who can understand the workers and treats in a way that the workers do their tasks in a friendly environment, and always feel his presence in the workplace seriously. My personal experience shows that most of the foremen and executives need to work with great enthusiasm that is labeled sometimes as quick-tempered by some people. A performance director is an individual who, in addition to pursuing the company's goals, is responsible for employees' safety. But some employees may react aggressively or display other behaviors.

In my personal research that I have during working and living at the projects, types of employee behavior by supervisors, managers and some colleagues are categorized in Table 1 that can show a bit of a reality of the work in industrial projects.

The basis of a project is to deliver finished project by contractor to his employee. Contractor tries to finish the project he is assigned to in the shortest period of time (as scheduled) and using the least amount of resources including human resources, machinery and financial resources. For these reasons, most projects are not suspended until the day of completion.

The uselegal.com defines Working Condition Law and Legal Definition (February 21, 2018) as follows:

"Working conditions refers to the working environment and all existing circumstances affecting labor in the workplace, including job hours, physical aspects, legal rights and responsibilities".

Based on the definition above, undesirable working conditions of a project, considering author's experiences as an employee involved in Iranian projects and later as a researcher and writer in this area, are:

- The typical number of working hours and days on a project is difficult to cope with. Typical work and rest intervals, for example, are 20 working days and 10 rest days, 23 working days followed by a 7 days of rest and in few cases 14 working days followed by 7 rest days. Although employers report employee working hours as standard, in fact, employees are occupied with work-related activities during their unpaid lunch breaks, and they are not compensated by their employers for the amount of time they spend commuting to their camps or accommodation during this time. Author’s first-hand experience with projects has shown that employees spend approximately 90 minutes commuting to and from their camps. In addition, a majority of workers spend their lunch break working and having lunch simultaneously. The condition is similar in a large number of other projects.
- According to international standard, especially in HSE, work must be suspended in inclement weather conditions (such as heavy dust conditions, extreme heat and high levels of air pollution). However, such standards are usually ignored.
- Most employees are away from their families while working on a project. This can be particularly difficult for married employees.
- Due to the importance of delivering projects on time, most employees are under tremendous amount of mental and occupational stress compared to non-project-based careers.

Although The Ministry of Cooperatives, Labor, and Social Welfare, as a government body, supports employee rights, lack of a labor union has meant that workers are in a weak position when dealing with their employers and they cannot fully assert their rights. A further problem is that wage growth does not keep pace with inflation.

As shown in Table 1, people can show the following four general behaviors in the organization:

1. Aggression: staff with high level of courage and low level adaptability behaves aggressively toward supervisors and managers.

Table 1. Types of employee behavior by supervisors and managers in the organization

		Compatibility		
		Low	Medium	High
Courage	Low	3. vilification	N	4. Ingratiation
	Medium	O	P	M
	High	1. Aggression	R	2. Interaction

Aggression is defined as any type of behavior which is aimed at harassing or hurting another living creature who desires to avoid such behavior. (Baron & Richardson, 1994, 7). The major elements of this definition are hurting and willingness to do so (Graham et al, 2006). Aggressive behavior can be physical or non-physical (Graham et al, 2006) and in current study because the employee behavior is toward their superior is the main issue and managers and supervisors have high level authority, indirect non-physical aggression is more common. The non-physical aggressive behavior includes abusing, swearing, insulting or demeaning someone; mutual argument; and threat / challenges (Graham et al, 2006: 289). In the project, indirect aggression behavior of the employee is so conservative with manager or supervisor because the employee is afraid of being fired that employees indirectly express their discontent, for example with his loud talk and even seen swearing at himself, he shows discontent with others in a way that the manager or director notices his anger or on a courageous effort, he makes sarcastic remarks while talking with the manager or supervisor. In other words, he tries to show his discontent by showing the he is not in the mood or he is upset so that he could influence his superior.

2. Interaction: employees with great courage and great adaptability with supervisors and managers show the interactive mood.

One of the most distinctive characteristics of the work environment for staff is the quality of interaction of employees with manager

through which employees can define their work environment (Porter et al, 1975). Most of the misunderstandings that arise between managers and employees result from the not understanding the manager and his messages. Lack of or poor knowledge of the treatment and personnel management staff is due to managers' inadequate feedback or inadequate knowledge of staff (Elahi and Pourheravi, 2008: 166).

High levels of political behavior in organizations hinders the performance of the organization as it is interpreted as an indicator of problems with leadership or management, will disrupt the social relations among members of the organization, intensifies the lack of trust between employees as a result, damages the social bonds in the organization; will block the correlative channels and causes the reduction in going beyond the duties and lowest working situation and organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, it may greatly reduce the performance of the organization (Vigoda and Drory, 2006).

Interaction in this study was means a positive and desirable relationship between manager or supervisor and the employee in order to achieve organizational goals, which requires high courage and adaptability of workers to establish and continue the relationship.

3. Vilification: the employees with less courage and low adaptability with supervisors and managers, generally, vilify their colleagues.

Jap and Anderson (1998) illustrate that although vilification is not the synonymous with contradiction or mistrust, it can be the main trigger for both. Vilification is stimulated by observing negative treatment in other party. It has more possibility to be revealed if the vilifying party develops a habit of doing so. Pellegrini (2002) states that vilification is connected with different kinds of misbehavior in the organization.

Vilifying employees who oppose either officially or unofficially (Stevens and Lavin, 2007: 47). The focus on staff as a sinner as contrary to just being frivolous or indolent is a rather recent point of view (Stevens and Lavin, 2007: 43).

Vilification is the type of behavior that the vilifying party displays when he has low adaptability with him. The abusive person because

does not have the courage to deal with the manager, and due to the power and authority of the person and some other reasons cannot be aggressive and thus vilifies the person. The vilifying party may display his vice through sending a report to observing organizations or higher ranking manager that the victim does not want to talk about, or present the information to other employees of other organization members that he thinks by presenting the information to them can increase his strength and popularity or destroy the other person. Sometimes the abusive person vilifies other managers, supervisors and even ordinary employees that have nothing to do with him, which may have various reasons.

Therefore the vilification is the information that can be true or false and damage victim's status both in the organization and in the way others think of them and the victim is not willing to disclose it. The intent of the person who discloses the information is negative.

If someone reveals the information without having negative intentions and sometimes for praising his superiors, this act – potentially or actually- hurts the supervisor or manager, it is not the vilification. For example, one day when talking with his colleague, reveal some news about the bonus that he has been given secretly by the director. This is not because he wants to confront with someone else, but he may have wanted to show that his manager is a competent manager, but the manager is not willing to disclose this information, because they may accuse him of discriminatory treatment.

4. Ingratiation: staff with low courage and high adaptability with supervisors and managers prefer to advance their work with ingratiation.

Ingratiation is identified with indirect alteration of opinion or excessive praise (Kumar and Beyerlein, 1991; Vonk, 2002) and its main components are flattery and conformity of opinion (Park, Westphal, and Stern, 2011: 259). Flattery is a hypocritical praise (American Heritage Dictionary, 2015) and deceives the people, while legitimate praise is encouraging and increases personal morale (Boxx, 2007: 1). Skilled persons at ingratiation often use different terms in public comparing what they express in private (Boxx, 2007). Ingratiation is a radical praise to ingratiate in other people's presence.

The average level is considered positive, and if the person is lower than what he wants, it is not ingratiation.

In the present study, ingratiation is a negative behavior by an employee that has great adaptability with his manager or supervisor, but do not have enough courage in his behavior.

Interaction as the ideal behavior

In the organization studies the importance of interaction is increasing (Aguinis, 2002: 208). C Jackson (2003) believes that in the social sciences, the objectivity is possible only through interaction of people with different values. (Ackoff, 1999a; Ackoff, 1999b) believes that the interactive people are those who do not want to return to the past, leave things as they are, or accept future as something they cannot change. They believe that beneficiaries would be able to shape their future, especially if they are sufficiently motivated to achieve their goals. In this regard some models of social interaction are provided, such as Barley, (2008); Fligstein (2001) and Hallett & Ventresca (2006). There are few theories in management and applied psychology that do not involve the interaction confirmed effects (Aguinis, Beaty, Boik, & Pierce, 2000).

The project is where the project manager has reigned. So the power of people is different considering the closeness of their relationship to the project manager and organization, and different levels of authority in the project is more obvious than other industrial spaces. Therefore, workers in industrial projects seek to satisfy their top personnel. To do this, discharging their duties by itself is not enough, and the individual needs to develop a closer relationship with managers, supervisors and the higher ranking authorities. The most important aspect of the project is its matrix nature. It means that most employees involved in the project try not only to establish a relationship with their own superior, but also with the person who is superior to their manager and building a relationship with the latter is more important than the former. In this regard, it has been seen that workers with good interaction, have been able to secure a position in the employer's company transform their work life. There have been a lot of

employees were in serious problems because of dissatisfaction of the employer with their behavior.

In 2010, the manager of concrete batching system in a large company located in South Pars and Technical Office Manager, there were two young engineers who began to establish close relationships with the Project Manager. The close relationship between the two men with their project manager who was very young caused some former managers to be ousted at the end, the appointment of previous director of the Technical Office as the Plenipotentiary Representative Project Manager in the company and chaired by the head of the plant. In a two-year period, the number of the staff of the company which was more than 1,000 people shrank to 100 due to the economic sanctions and survivors of the project, all were trusted staff and friends of the two new managers. Now, after three years of this process, the project is still semi-active and these employees enjoy a better job security compared to others.

To interact with the manager or supervisor means employee has great adaptability with his superior authority and has the courage to actively and constantly be in contact with him and prove his loyalty.

Loyal employee can be described as employee who is trying to help the organization to be successful and believes that working in the department is his best option (Iqbal et al. 2015). In this study, loyalty to the director is considered that he respects the rules of the organization and discharges his duties properly; in this case, loyalty to leaders and organizations deemed to be the same. Interaction and loyalty are more important in industrial projects. In industrial projects because the loyal person wants his manager to be successful and in practice also proves this, showing high courage and adaptability helps the manager to be introduced as a successful manager in the organization. The success of the project makes the department that he serves as a loyal employee to be introduced as a strong company and obtain better organizational status. Such interaction is beneficial to the manager and the organization and the employee. In this project, after the director of the Technical Office developed a good relationship with the project manager and showed his loyalty, was authorized as the plenipotentiary representative in the workshop that he could help

the director of Technical Office more than ever and in the first step, increased the salary of the technical staff who in turn had the most interaction with him. During the downsizing, also the least loss of power appeared in the technical office. He even transferred some of them to other positions to keep them in the company.

It should be noted that employees with high courage and adaptability will not have the opportunity to interact with their manager or supervisor. For example, in a project of building a refinery that is my case study, maintenance, transport units etc. did not have a good level of interaction with higher ranking managers. On the other hand, project control and technical office and executive managers had more opportunity to interact with their managers because of the nature of their jobs. Also, to interact with managers and supervisors, employees need a common language with them. In other words, if they have the same experiences and, it is more likely to interact with each other. Evidence shows after managers and supervisors are promoted, will give preferential treatment to the department they used to work in because of prior connection they had made.

Based on the above cases, I would categorize the employees into two groups: One which have commonalities with the manager or supervisor, such as a shared working experience or shared education. This group of employees needed to interact with their manager and supervisor and if they also have enough courage and adaptability can interact with them. The second group, are those whose only commonality with the manager or supervisor is to attempt to achieve organizational goals. In this case, if the employee has enough courage and adaptability to interact, he should use these features to improve the position of the department and his synergies in the department and next to manager make him to attract the positive attitude of the manager or higher ranking authorities and can interact with them. Although the second group has more to do in order to interact with their superior, but to achieve personal and organizational goals, this should be done.

Future research

The five cells of the Table that have not been addressed in this article will be focal point of the future research. Those cells include N, O, R, M, and P. NORM modest behaviors that although in one of the indices of "adaptability" or "courage" are less than the average, they are in line with the objectives and strategies of the organization. P stands for Positive, is the employee behavior that is moderate in the mentioned index.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Reference

- Ackoff, RL. (1999a). **Ackoffs Best: His Classic Writings on Management**. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Ackoff, RL. (1999b). **Re-creating the Corporation: A Design of Organizations for the 21st Century**. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Adler, PA. & Adler, P. (1987). **Membership Roles in Field Research**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Aguinis, H. (2002). Estimation of Interaction Effects in Organization Studies. **Organizational Research Methods**, 5 (3), 207-211.
- Aguinis, H., Beaty, JC., Boik, RJ. & Pierce, CA. (2000). **Statistical power of differential prediction analysis: A30-year review**. In: FL Oswald (Chair) Differential prediction in personnel selection: Past, present, and future. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. New Orleans, LA.
- Alan Fine, G. & Hallett, T. (2014). Group Cultures and the Everyday Life of Organizations: Interaction Orders and Meso-Analysis. **Organization Studies**, 35(12), 1773–1792.
- Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic Auto ethnography. **Journal of Contemporary Ethnography**, 35 (4), 373-395.
- Barley, S. (2008). **Coalface institutionalism**. In: Greenwood R, Oliver C, Suddaby R & Sahlin-Andersson K (Eds) The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, 490–516.
- Baron, RA. & Richardson, DR. (1994). **Human aggression**. New York: Plenum.
- Boxx, R. (2007). Avoiding the pitfalls of false ingratiation. Available at: <http://193.2.241.139/poslovnitok/view/mm/i/55>.
- Boylorn, RM. (2006). E pluribus unum (out of many, one). **Qualitative Inquiry**, 12(4), 651-680.
- Chang, H. (2008). **Auto ethnography as method**. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Creswell, J. (2007). **Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davies, CA. (1999). **Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others**. London: Routledge.
- Elahi, T. & Pourheravi, H. (2008). The role of employees in the organization and interaction with management staff. Tehran. **Paike Noor Press**, 21, 163-171. Available at: <http://www.noormags.ir/view/fa/articlepage/335978>.
- Ellis, C. (2002b). Shattered Lives: Making sense of September 11th and its aftermath. **Journal of Contemporary Ethnography**, 31(4), 375-400.
- Ellis, C. (2004). **The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about auto ethnography**. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.
- Ellis, C., Adams, TE. & Bochner, AP. (2011). Auto ethnography: An overview. Forum: **Qualitative Social Research**, 12(1).
- Fazeli, N. (2012). Auto ethnography. Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies. Available at: <http://farhangemrooz.com/download?ts=1428991313000&f=2014/10/18/0/12611.mp3>.
- Flattery. (2015). In American heritage dictionary of the English language (5th ed). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Available at: <https://www.ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=ingratiation&submit.x=52&submit.y=16>
- Fligstein, N. (2001). Social skill and the theory of fields. **Sociological Theory**, 19, 105–125.

- Gandz, J. & Murray, VV. (1980). The Experience of Workplace Politics. **Academy of Management Journal**, 23, 237–251.
- Geertz, C. (1988). **Works and lives: The anthropologist as author**. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Goodall, HL Jr. (2000). **Writing the new ethnography**. New York, NY: Alta Mira Press.
- Graham, K., Tremblay, PF., Wells, S., Pernanen, K., Purcell, J. & Jelley, J. (2006). Harm, Intent, and the Nature of Aggressive Behavior Measuring Naturally Occurring Aggression in Barroom Settings. **Assessment**, 13 (3): 280-296.
- Hallett, T. & Ventresca, M. (2006). Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and organizational forms in Gouldner's Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. **Theory and Society**, 35: 213–236.
- Iqbal, A., Tufail, MS. & Lodhi, RN. (2015). Employee Loyalty and Organizational Commitment in Pakistan Organizations. **Global Journal of Human Resource Management**, 3(1):1-11. Available at: www.ea-Journals.org.
- Jackson, MC. (2003). **Systems Thinking, Creative Holism for Managers**. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK.
- Jap, S. & Anderson, E. (1998). Vilification dysfunctional dynamics in inter organizational collaborations. Working Paper 99/06/MKT, INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France.
- Karp, D. (1996). **Speaking of sadness**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kumar, K. & M, Beyerlein. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiation behaviors in organizational settings. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 76: 619–627.
- Maturana, HR. & Varela, FJ. (1980). **Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living**. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Ouellet, LJ. (1994). **Pedal to the metal: The work lives of truckers**. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Palich, LE., Cardinal, LB. & Miller, CC. (2000). Curvilinearity in the diversification-performance linkage: An examination of over three decades of research. **Strategic Management Journal**, 21: 155-174.
- Park, SH., D. Westphal, J. & Stern, I. (2011). Set up for a fall: The Insidious Effects of Flattery and Opinion Conformity toward Corporate Leaders. **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 56 (2)257–302.
- Pellegrini, F. (2002). Person of the week: “Enron Whistleblower” Sheron Watkins. Available at: <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,194927,00.htm>. Accessed on October 1, 215.
- Porter, LW., Lawler, EE. & Hackman, JR. (1975). **Behavior in organizations**, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Poulos, C. (2008). Narrative Conscience and the auto ethnographic adventure: Probing memories, secrets, shadows, and possibilities. **Qualitative Inquiry**, 14(1): 46-66.
- Project Management Institute. (2015). **A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge: PMBOK(R) Guide**. Fifth Edition. An American National Standard.
- Raab, D. (2013). Transpersonal Approaches to Auto ethnographic Research and Writing. The Qualitative Report 18(42): 1-18. Available at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/raab42.pdf>.
- Rezaeian, A. (2000). **Management and organizational behavior**. Science and Literature Press. fifth printing. Tehran.
- Smith, C. (2005). Epistemological Intimacy: A Move to Auto ethnography. **International**

- Journal of Qualitative Methods**, 4(2, Article 6). Available at: http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/backissues/2004_2002/pdf/smith.pdf.
- Sparkes, AC. (2000). Auto ethnography and narratives of self: Reflections on criteria in action. **Sociology of Sport Journal**, 17(1): 21–43.
- Stevens, A. & Lavin, D.O. (2007). Stealing Time: The temporal regulation of labor in neoliberal and post-Fordist work regime. **Democratic Communique**, 21(2), 40-60.
- Taber, N. (2010). Institutional ethnography, auto ethnography, and narrative: an argument for incorporating multiple methodologies. **Qualitative Research**, 10(1): 5–25.
- Tracy, S. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight big-tent criteria for excellent qualitative research. **Qualitative Inquiry**, 16(10): 837–851.
- Van-Maanen, J. (2011). **Tales of the field**. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. & Drory, A. (eds). (2006). **Handbook of Organizational Politics**. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Vonk, R. (2002). Self-serving interpretations of flattery: Why ingratiation works. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 82: 515–526.
- Walford, G. (2004). Finding the Limits: Autoethnography and Being an Oxford University Proctor. **Qualitative Research**, 4(3): 403–17.
- Working Condition Law and Legal Definition (February 21, 2018). Retrieved from <https://definitions.uslegal.com/w/working-condition/>
- Zanzi, A. & O’Neill, RM. (2001). Sanctioned Versus Non-Sanctioned Political Tactics. **Journal of Managerial**, 13 (2): 245–262.