Machiavellianism (β= .416, p < 0.01) and power distance (β= .107, p < 0.05) show significant effect with organizational deviance. Total variance explained by Machiavellianism is 41% whereas total variance explained by power distance is 10%. In step 3 again we find significant direct effect of Machiavellianism (β= .384, p < 0.01) but insignificant effect of power distance (β= .074). Also there is a significant moderation effect of PD between Machiavellianism and organizational deviance (β=.315, p < 0.01). The score obtained after the moderation is the average score. Multiple correlation was found to be as R= .565. Here we have considered ΔR² or R square change which is the actual influence of independent variable to the criterion variable. Therefore, the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable i.e. power distance which contributed to the dependent variable interpersonal deviance came out as 9.6%, p<0.01 and F change (35.19, p < 0.01) are significant too. Therefore confirms Hypothesis 4c that “Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.”

Chapter – 5

DISCUSSION

The discussion and interpretation of results in any empirical research is very essential part and seldom given utmost importance. This section of research thesis is usually based on the objectives and hypotheses framed by the investigator. In the present study, the hypotheses are divided into three sections. The first section attempts to investigate the organizational difference on abusive supervision, organizational justice, Machiavellianism, ethical ideology, work passion and power distance. The second section deals with the contribution of abusive supervision, organizational justice and Machiavellianism towards employees’ interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. The third section of hypotheses is intended to examine the moderating effect
of ethical ideology, work passion and power distance towards the association between the antecedents (abusive supervision, organizational justice and Machiavellianism) and employees’ interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance.

The results of the present study have been depicted in different tables. Table 4.1 demonstrate the mean, standard deviation and F ratios for four organizations on all measured variables under this study. Since we framed our very first objective as “To investigate the organizational difference on abusive supervision, organizational justice, Machiavellianism, ethical ideology, work passion and power distance” we assumed that the organizations will differ significantly with relation to the measured variables. The results found that it did not support our objective. The statistical value provided in the table clearly shows that there is no substantial difference among all the measured variables with respect to all the four organizations on Mean, SD, F-ratio and P value. Therefore we clubbed the data on study variables for further analyses purpose. Had there been some significant difference, we would have carried out analyses separately for the organization.

The second hypothesis of this study was to “investigate the contribution of abusive supervision towards employee’s interpersonal and organizational deviance”. The obtained result from regression analysis table fully support the said objective. The result shows a significant direct effect of abusive supervision on interpersonal deviance ($\beta = .397, p < 0.01$) and organizational deviance ($\beta = .407, p < 0.01$). This result also gets support from the studies done by Baron, Neuman and Geddes, 1999; Innes, Barling and Turner, 2005; Aquino, Lewis and Bradfield, 1999; Detert, Trevino, Burris and Andiappam, 2007; Thau, Bennett, Mitchell and Marrs, 2008; Tepper, Lambert, Henle, Giacalone and Duffy, 2008; Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007.

Findings from this research is also supported to the idea that individuals interpret their abusive supervisor when they decide to retaliate in aggressive way to abuse. The present research is stable with earlier studies which have shown that when employees feel they are abused they get engaged in deviant acts acts directed both toward the organization, for e.g. sabotaging equipment, stealing from the firm and intentionally slow work (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007) and also toward their superiors (Inness et al., 2005).
Further support of the present finding can be explained through the work in the area of uncertainties in organizations. Employees often encounter different uncertainties in the workplace that can be questionable and require cognitive management to make it bearable. Uncertainty management theory proposes that employees find means to manage uncertainties when fairness related information is provided to them (Lind and van den Bos, 2002; Van den Bos and Lind, 2002). Thus, for employees fairness concern becomes a relevant feature when uncertainty is experienced by them. As part of their research, Thau et al., (2008) demonstrated that strict management style in organizations altered the relation between abusive supervision and workplace deviance. When employee experience uncertainty the influence of mistreatment on deviant behaviour is stronger. Consistent with this idea their results depicted positive relationship with respect to abusive supervision and organizational deviance and this relationship was stronger when subordinates perceive the whole management style to be low i.e. high situational uncertainty.

Another support for this proposition is found by negative reciprocity belief which is a common subject in deviance research (Bennnett & Robinson, 2003). Reciprocity says that when something is given, it creates an obligation to return with an identical gesture. Negative reciprocity connotes unfavourable treatment which in turn generates unfavourable treatment. Those who display negative reciprocity believe that retribution is a proper response to unfavourable treatment. Individuals holding this sort of belief are more expected to look for retaliation. Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) in their study demonstrated that undesirable reciprocity belief strengthened the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance.

Present findings of this research is further supported by study done by Tepper et al., (2008). Their finding has also identified a stable link between abusive supervision and employees’ organizational deviance. They demonstrated that affective commitment mediated the relationship between abusive supervision and organization deviance. This can be interpreted as abusive abusive supervision results in subordinates’ lack of attachment to the organization, which explains their engagement in costly and damaging organizational behaviors such as sabotage and theft.
This research also gets support from the studies done by Schaubhut, Adams and Jex (2004). In their research abusive supervision was found linked to subordinates’ interpersonal and organizational deviance. Additionally, strength of this relationships depended on self-esteem of subordinates. It was revealed that employees whose self-esteem was low, abusive supervision was unrelated to their deviant behaviour than those whose self-esteem was high. They explain these phenomenon on the ground that abusive supervision constitute more threat to the high self-esteem individuals than those having low self-esteem. Because when self-esteem is threatened, it elicits hostile reactions, as a result abusive supervision produces deviant behaviour on the part of high self-esteem individuals.

Therefore, consistent with findings discussed above, the hypothesis 2(a) “To investigate the contribution of abusive supervision towards employees’ interpersonal and organizational deviance” is also supported.

Another part of the second hypothesis was to investigate the contribution of “organizational justice towards employees’ interpersonal and organizational deviance”. The obtained result from regression analysis table fully support this hypothesis too. Result from the table shows a significant direct effect of organizational justice on interpersonal deviance ($\beta= .494, p < 0.01$) and organizational deviance ($\beta= .652, p < 0.05$). The present finding is supported by the studies done by Lara et al., 2007; Judge et al., 2006; Khan, Quratulain and Crawshaw, 2013; and Singh and Sharma, 2014.

Previous research has shown that either dimensions of organizational justice or the entire construct predict deviant behaviour in similar manner. Study done by Kennedy et al., (2004) offer support for this research. They demonstrated that perception of procedural injustice was related to the highest level of aggression, followed by interpersonal injustice and distributive injustice. These researchers further state that besides locating the source of workplace aggression in employees, it is equally important to shift and focus the attention to organizational climate for reducing the prospective trigger of various employee deviance.

Additional support for the present study can be found in Henle (2005)’s work. Apart from examining the relationship between organizational justice and workplace
deviant behaviour, his research further explained the role of personality trait which enhanced the prediction of workplace deviance behaviour.

The pernicious effects of deviance can further be understood by more findings. Related study carried out by Skarlicki and Folger (1997) gives further support to present research. Surveyed on manufacturing employees, his findings revealed that employees feeling of less fairness in job (distributive justice), less fairness in allocation policies (procedural justice) and less fair interpersonal treatment (interactional justice) were found reporting more engaging in retaliatory behaviors. Findings of this research is also in contention with the research done by Ambrose, Seabright & Schminke, 2002; Hershcovis, Turner, Barling, Arnold, Dupré, Inness, LeBlanc & Sivanathan, 2007.

Moreover, stable with the work of Ferris et al., (2012), the present finding gets further support. Suggesting that perception of injustice can lower the self-esteem which leads to deviant behaviour, their research explained the mediating role of ‘esteem threat’ in the association between injustice perception and workplace deviance.

Support for present research can also be find from the study done by Ahmadi et al., (2011). They found that distributive justice and interactional justice had negative relationship with cyber loafing, a form of organizational deviance. Procedural justice was found to have highest correlation with cyber loafing. To put differently, unjust feelings about making organizational decisions becomes more affecting in the occurrence of workplace deviant behaviour like cyber loafing.

Another study carried out by Khan et al., (2013) provides additional support to the present research. They explored the roles of discrete emotions like annoyance and unhappiness in the relationship toward distributive and procedural injustice regarding raise in slary and a number of counterproductive work behaviors. Findings revealed that only distributive injustice perception pertaining to one’s salary raise predicted negative emotions such as anger. Further, anger was found positively linked to abuse against other employees and production deviance.
Therefore, consistent with the findings discussed above, the hypothesis 2(b) “To investigate the contribution of organizational justice towards employees’ interpersonal and organizational deviance” is also supported.

The third part of this hypothesis was to “investigate the contribution of Machiavellianism towards employees’ interpersonal and organizational deviance”. Result obtained from regression analysis fully support this objective. From the table it shows a significant direct effect of Machiavellianism on interpersonal deviance (β= .437, p < 0.01) and organizational deviance (β= .450, p < 0.01). This result is also supported by earlier studies carried by Giacalone and Knouse, 1990; Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Aquino et al., 1999; Douglas and Martinko, 2001; Hepworth and Towler, 2004; Burnfield et al., 2005; Suresh and Kadhiravan, 2007; Gupta, 2008; Hemlatha, 2008; Tyagi, 2008; Subramaniam and Vinothkumar, 2009.

Findings of the present study gains support from previous research too. Kessler et al., (2010) in their development of new Mach scale found that individuals who were high on the Manipulativeness factor were found to be more likely to report committing counterproductive work behavior.

Another support for the present investigation is sought through the work done by Sudha and Khan (2013). Taking personality trait as one factor in their study, authors found that trait approach adds to discover the causes and structure underlying workplace deviant behaviors. Neuroticism was found positively related to organizational deviance, which meant that high neurotic individuals will also be highly organizationally deviant. This outcome is also reliable with present research and previous findings by Colbert et al., 2004; Judge et al., 2008).

In a classic research done by Gemmill and Heisler (1972), Machiavellianism orientation was found significantly related to job strain, job satisfaction and perception of opportunity for formal control. In other words, the result indicates that greater the Machiavellian orientation in the managers higher would be job strain which in turn lead to less job satisfaction. As an outcome, organizational climate would be seen less in providing an opportunity for formal control. The authors give some explanations to the above finding. First, they argue that high Mach individuals hold a pessimistic view
about human nature. Next, they have the belief that individuals are manipulative in general and lastly that the place where they work contain more stress. With these contentions researcher in the present study may state that all these factors may lead to employees to act in a deviant manner in the organization.

Therefore, consistent with the findings discussed above, the hypothesis 2(c) “To investigate the contribution of Machiavellianism towards employees’ interpersonal and organizational deviance” is also supported.

The third and final section of hypotheses is meant to explore the moderating influence of ethical ideology, work passion and power distance towards the association between the antecedents (abusive supervision, organizational justice and Machiavellianism) and employees’ interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance.

**Moderating effect of Ethical Ideology**

In this regard the hypothesis 3 (a) states that “Ethical ideology will significantly moderate the relation between abusive supervision and employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance”.

As discussed earlier ethical ideology deals with the morality of individuals, their judgement about rightness and wrongness pertaining to individuals or situations or any other phenomenon. This research fully supports this hypothesis. In previous studies, researchers have proved the role of ethical ideology and related constructs. As examined by Mitchell and Ambrose (2007), the association between abusive supervision and workplace deviance was moderated by negative reciprocity belief. Negative reciprocity belief is the individuals’ retribution and response to misbehaviour and unfavourable treatment. It highlights the biblical connotation of “an eye for eye, a life for a life, and tooth for tooth”. Yet Gouldner (1960) suggested that, not everyone look for the revenge back. According to him, some people may feel to ‘turn the other cheek’. Therefore people differ in their views about the proper display of negative reciprocity. Since, in their research Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) found support that negative reciprocity belief strengthen the association between supervisory mistreatment and supervisor directed deviance, based upon their findings the present hypothesis gets
a support. Because ethical ideology talks about morality of peoples’ judgements and actions. Idealists and relativists differ in their thinking and actions. Idealist believe that harming others even to a small degree is wrong, peoples’ actions should not threaten others’ dignity and welfare and that this should be the most significant and vital concern in any society. Relativist believe all these as an individualistic choice and no ethical principles are so essential. Therefore, based upon the findings discussed above it can be said that the present hypothesis is supported and linked to the research done in past.

Hastings and Finegan (2011), in their study attempted to examine the effect of ethical ideology and organizational justice in predicting deviant behaviour. Their study shown that those high in idealism were less probable to engage in either form of deviance i.e. organizational and interpersonal deviance than low idealists. The reason possibly would be that idealists are concerned with actions which gives positive consequences for all people. To him behaviors such as coming late at work or backbiting others are unacceptable. Furthermore, employees who were low in idealism and high on relativism were found to be more engaged in organizational deviance.

A similar support for this proposition is also sought by study done by Leary, Knight and Barnes (1986). Researchers examined that Machiavellian subjects were found to more relativistic and less idealistic than those who scored low in Machiavellianism.

Therefore, above findings lends support for the present work and hence the hypothesis 3 (b) which states that “Ethical ideology will significantly moderate the relation between organizational justice and and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance” is supported in the present research.

Though the relationship between Machiavellianism and employees’ deviant behaviour has been discussed, it is very much clear how an individual’s personality trait can influence and predict his/her deviant behaviour. Previous research has found significant direct effect of Machiavellianism on employees’ counterproductive work behaviour and related constructs. This contention gets support from the findings of Repacholi, Slaughter, Pritchard and Gibbs, 2003; Russell, 1974; Touhey, 1971;

Research has shown the relationship between Machiavellianism and Type A personality and ethical orientation of people. In a study carried out by Rayburn and Rayburn (1996) Machiavellians were found to be having type A personality and found to be less ethically oriented than Nonmachiavellians. They were also found to be possessing high levels of intelligence. Besides, research in this direction has also found that people high on idealism are more expected to be aware of morally questionable behaviors as ethical issues (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999). Similarly, Schlenker et al. (2008) revealed that when principled ethical ideology was adopted by individuals they were found telling fewer lies, were less expected to justify immoral behaviors and had high standards of moral conduct.

Therefore, the above mentioned studies directly and indirectly explain the role of ethical ideology and people’s moral judgments related to their personality traits and acts of deviance. Hence the hypothesis 3 (c) stated as “Ethical ideology will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance” finds support.

**Moderating effect of Work Passion**

Work passion of an individual is a collection of various factors that describes his/her state of well-being, his emotional and cognitive appraisals, and behavior directed towards a goal. Through this, an employee meets challenges on his job and accomplishes his work goals. It involves sense of volition, a motivational force which makes them active on their work.

The concept of work passion is somehow similar to work engagement and commitment. When employees feel passionate and committed for their work they enjoy doing it. The more they enjoy the more they stick to their job. Also when employees
are engaged in their job it increases the occurrence of behavior which promotes and helps in effective functioning of the organization.

Consistent with findings of Srivastava (2012) work passion in the present research did not play a significant role in moderating the link between abusive supervision and interpersonal deviance, but it moderated significantly the relation between supervisory mistreatment and organizational deviance. The possible explanation could be that since employee’s work passion is more concerned with the work and workplace, employees are more bothered about the organization than with their peer employees.

Hence the hypothesis 4 (a) “Work passion will significantly moderate the relation between abusive supervision and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance” is partially supported.

The moderation effect of the next hypothesis 4 (b) “Work passion will significantly moderate the relation between organizational justice and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance” was not found in the present research.

It has already been mentioned in the earlier part of this chapter that individual’s personality trait is a good predictor of deviant behavior. Machiavellianism has been shown to predict employees’ deviant behavior, also negative affectivity too contributes significantly in predicting workplace deviance. Since these are negative constructs which cause negative consequences to the organization, apart from these there are some positive personality traits which bring positive and productive outcomes. For instance, conscientiousness is found to be the most reliable forecaster of work performance (Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Barrick, Mount and Judge, 2001). These individuals are punctual, careful, dependable and laborious. These attributes are shown to yield higher work performance.

Similarly, one related construct of work passion is job satisfaction, defined as an emotional state of an individual which is positive and pleasurable and that results from one’s job appraisal or job experience. It is very much clear from this definition
that if an individual who carries a bad appraisal of his/her job or have negative job experiences will be expected to engage in workplace deviant behavior. This contention is also supported by social exchange theory where receiving unfavorable treatment leads to feel dissatisfied, angry and seeking revenge. Judge, Scott and Ilies (2006) found employees reported engagement in more deviant behavior when they felt not as much pleased with their jobs than when they were more pleased. Employees with high work passion have high intrinsic motivation and remain satisfied with their job. Therefore, consistent with the previous studies showing relationship between job satisfaction and deviant behavior, the researcher substantiate the hypothesis mentioning the moderating effects of work passion toward workplace deviance.

Hence, the hypothesis 4 (c) “Work passion will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance” gets support for this research.

**Moderating effect of Power Distance**

In the words of Hofstede (2005), individual’s power distance may be elucidated as the degree to which the less powerful fellows of institutions and organizations in a country accept and expect that power is unequally distributed. The nation or culture which signifies high power distance reflects hierarchy and the existing variation and disproportion between lower and higher levels. Supervisory is dominant and subordinates are expected to follow what they are told. Management is considered as autocratic. Through the top and bottom of organizations a different in salary range can be clearly seen. On the other hand, in low power distance culture the scenario is reverse. People do not accept the inequality in the hierarchy and therefore emphasis is more on equity and autonomy.

As demonstrated abusive supervision significantly predicts employees’ deviant behavior, but at the same time there is significant moderating influence of individual’s power distance orientation. Researches carried by Lian, Ferris and Brown, (2011), Wang, Mao, Wu and Liu, (2012) and Lin et al., (2013) depict similar findings. Power distance has been found to moderate the relationships amid abusive supervision and employees’ psychological health as well as satisfaction with their job (Lin et al., 2013).
These authors further revealed that employees who were low in power distance had been affected by abusive supervision which caused more detrimental outcome on their psychological health and job satisfaction. Moreover, the mean difference of abusive supervision was found more for blue collar employees than white collar employees.

Wang et al., (2012) came out with similar findings in Chinese organizational context. They depicted how influence of abusive supervision on deviant workplace behavior was mediated by interactional justice and moderated by power distance. Furthermore, consistent with these findings Tepper (2009) found that employees’ intention to quit was a moderator in their responses to abusive supervision.

Hence, this research lends support for the current hypothesis saying 5 (a) “Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between abusive supervision and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance”.

Perception of injustice and unfair treatment in organizations have been linked many times by the researchers with employees’ deviant behavior. This is seldom cited as one of the prime reason of misconduct. Researchers like Ambrose, Seabright and Schminke, (2002), Felson and Steadman, (1983), Lara et al (2007), Kennedy et al (2004), Judge et al (2006), Smart Richman and Leary, (2009), Leary, Twenge and Quinlivan, (2006), Ferris, Spence, Brown and Heller, (2012) have contributed through their research and findings for the same.

In their meta-analysis Lian et al., (2011) found that abusive supervision predicted interpersonal deviance and interpersonal justice, which were moderated by power distance. Results revealed that high power distance individuals were engaged in greater interpersonal deviant behaviour when supervisors exhibited more abusive supervision. Also power distance weakened the relation amid abuse by supervisor and supervisory interpersonal justice.

In another study, Loi et al., (2012) found adherence to organizational moral standards could benefit employees in coping insecurity with their job. Results showed that when perceived procedural justice was high, employees experienced less job
insecurity and this link was strengthened by ethical leadership. Additionally, this was moderated by low power distance employees.

Therefore, these findings extend the current hypothesis 5 (b) “Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between organizational justice and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.”

At last, a number of studies have identified the association between personality traits like Machiavellianism, Type A personality and negative affectivity and employees deviant behaviour. Burnfield et al (2005), Skalicki et al (1999), Fox, Spector & Miles, (1999), Hepworth and Towler, (2004). All these authors have identified the prediction of personality variables on deviant behaviour. However, the role of individual’s culture moderating the relationship between personality traits and deviant behaviour is little explored in research till date. Power distance orientation is related to deviant behaviour in many aspects.

According to Merton (1957), individual situated in the lower level of hierarchy with little power and contingency may feel denied and this feeling may propel them to delinquency and to be deviant. It has been proved that there is a moderation effect between abusive supervision and employee’s psychological health and job satisfaction caused by this. Also since Machiavellianism is a kind of behavioural misconduct for dealing with others for own benefit using mean tactics, it can be inferred that peoples’ power distance orientation can alter the association amid the two as power distance reflects inadequate distribution of power in organisations. It may influence individual’s dealing with people for personal gain and their deviant behaviour.

Therefore, these contentions and findings lend support to the hypothesis 5 (c) “Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.”