Chapter – 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A research venture cannot be an isolated endeavor but it emerges from the body of knowledge and previous literature established by researchers which later becomes a helping direction for other to complete the picture and generate further findings.

This section of thesis provides insight into the history of the study of workplace deviance and reviews relevant literature. The aim of this study is to investigate how deviant workplace behavior relates to various antecedents and how moderator variables buffer the relationship between dependent and independent variable. Therefore, this chapter attempts to present a brief resume of findings related to abusive supervision, organizational justice, Machiavellianism, ethical ideology, power distance and work passion.

Since the data for this research were collected from four different private organizations namely, HCL, WIPRO, Accenture and Hewlett Packard situated at Delhi, it is hypothesized that these study variables will have a difference with respect to the organizations.

Therefore, the researcher frames the hypothesis,

\( H1: \) There will be difference between organizations with reference to abusive supervision, organizational justice, Machiavellianism, ethical ideology, work passion and power distance.
2.0.1. Abusive Supervision

As defined by Tepper (2000) “subordinates abusive supervision is the perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact.” In this definition, the description of abusive supervision focuses on subordinates’ subjective assessments related to their continuous encounter and exposure to top-down mistreatment in the organizational hierarchy, especially by their superiors.

Moreover, this definition can further be understood in three aspects of this construct which gives this a different understanding from other negative workplace interactions. First, the experience of abusive supervision is subjective in that shows an individuals’ perception of his/her supervisor behavior. Next, the behavior of the supervisor a sustained one. A supervisor can only be called as abusive if his behavior is consistent and long-term in nature. Therefore, a boss shouting at his subordinate once in a blue moon or acting rudely cannot be cannot be considered as abusive. Finally, this behavior is willfully performed by the supervisor. Supervisor behavior can only be termed as abusive supervision when the supervisor knowingly and deliberately engages in negative behavior (Tepper, 2000). Examples of abusive supervision include invasion of privacy, displacement of anger, throwing tantrums etc.

Proposed by Tyler and Lind (1992) “fairness heuristic theory” states that once people form fairness decisions they use these in deciding how to behave; the perception of fairness for supervisors makes employees to react favourably and this as a result will push them to accept to demands and challenges or requests with concern for material outcomes.

It’s very much important to know how individuals are treated in workplace by their employers. With regard to these treatment substantial negative consequences occur at many levels as an outcome of supervisory mistreatment and felt emotions. At the extreme level they often feel that they are physically, emotionally and psychologically hurt.
Previous research has revealed that when employees get the feeling that they are becoming the victims of interpersonal mistreatment they feel to react with aggression (Tedeschi & Felso, 1994). Findings of Keashly, Trott, and MacLean (1994) revealed that employees who experienced supervisory mistreatment also experienced dissatisfaction in their job.

In their study Skarlicki and Folger (1997) assert that in an organization employees’ work life and outcomes depend upon superiors’ decision making and other responsibilities. They act as organizational agent and hence affects employees’ well-being. Therefore, organizational retaliation is promoted by unfair supervisory treatment.

Supervisory mistreatment is found associated with lower levels of satisfaction, low employee commitment, low justice perceptions, and higher levels of turnover intentions, role conflict and psychological distress (Tepper, 2000; Ashforth, 1997; Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2002).

Research evidences show the incidences of abusive supervision leads to workplace deviant behaviour. In a study conducted by Lind and Tyler (1998) found that people give recognition and regard to the treatment they get from authorities in the organization. They further report that employees feel respected and valued when just and polite treatment is given to them. Also they believe that they hold a secure place in the organization (Van den Bos, 2001).

Mistreatment in the workplace occurs when an employee believes that he/she has not been treated fairly in the course of performing his or her job. These individuals’ reactions are driven by their perceptions of mistreatment. Potential reasons behind these abusive behavior include- not getting a justified performance evaluation, raise and promotion, being oppressed by their superiors/managers, being treated offensively by clients and harassed by other employees.

Abusive supervision is a non-operating and improper behavior in workplace that elicit scenes of autocratic boss publicly ridiculing and undermining subordinates. A seminal paper on abusive supervision presented by Tepper (2000) was the first study to
develop a validated measure of abusive supervision. This paper systematically examine the negative influence on subordinates’ work outcomes. Since then, there has been a sweep in scholarly interest in the destructive side of leadership.

Tepper (2000) studied the consequences of abusive supervision. His findings revealed subordinates quitting their jobs; lower job and life satisfaction. They were also found to be decreased in lower affective and normative commitment, and higher continuance commitment. In addition to this their conflict between work and family and psychological distress was high as well.

In a study carried out by Tepper (2000), a link is established between the experience of abuse by supervisor and work-family conflict which may later resulted in serious organizational consequences (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux & Brinley, 2005) like job dissatisfaction (Brick, Allen & Spector, 2002) and high turnover intention (Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Collins, 2001).

According to Bolin and Heatherly (2001), other researchers have shown that how incidence of minor offence becomes the outcome of employees’ dissatisfaction but does not certainly lead to severe violation and wrongdoings. An employee who is less satisfied with his work may also become less creative when his/her requirements are not met. The cases of frustration, injustices and threats to one’s identity are few major antecedents to employee deviance in a workplace.

Since abusive supervision is a kind of non-physical, harmful supervisory behavior, it is believed that abuse by one’s supervisor adversely affects employees’ attitudes associated with his work and also their mental health (Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2001).

The “group engagement model” proposed by Tyler and Blader (2003) proposes this phenomenon as specifically correct for discretionary behaviors; the commitment for work of employees’ increases once they feel respected by their superiors, also they feel motivated to help the group. This statement is supported by social exchange theory that individuals return back the encouraging regard which they accept from the employers, organizations and its member and, as a result they engage in constructive
behaviors like organizational citizenship behaviors and other illustrations of workplace commitment (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 2000).

Abused employees in the hands of their supervisors seek the revenge back and want their harm doers to suffer in the same way (Skarlicki & Folger, 2004). In fact these arguments are supported by further research. Employees who become victims of interpersonal mistreatment in the hands of their supervisors are more likely to counter their supervisor’s tactics to influence them, withhold constructive work behaviors for e.g., organizational citizenship behaviour (Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002), and engage in deviant behavior which solely targets their supervisor (Innes, Barling & Turner, 2005; Baron, Neuman & Geddes, 1999;) and the organization (Aquino, Lewis & Bradfield, 1999; Detert, Trevino, Burris & Andiappam, 2007).

Further studies have discovered relationships between abusive supervision and subordinates’ hostile behaviour. Innes, Barling and Turner (2005) too revealed in their studies that mistreatment by supervisors was positively associated with supervisor targeted violence and this violence was even more when the subordinate had a history of being more anger and hostility. Studies done by Schat and Desmarais et al (2006) found positive relationship amid abusive supervision and subordinate’s irritation which they found further related to their level of aggression against fellow employees.

High cost of abusive supervision in corporate world is substantial. In a study, Schat, Frone and Kelloway (2006) estimated that supervisory mistreatment affects 13.6 percent of employees in the USA. Tepper et al., (2006) assessed the health care cost and lost productivity for corporations in the USA to be a staggering US$23.8 billion per annum. There is also the social/personal cost associated with abusive supervision. Researches on abusive supervision have shown to have negative consequences for employees, such as psychological distress (Tepper, 2000), consuming alcohol (Bamberger & Bacharach, 2006), family-directed aggression (Hoobler & Brass, 2006) and poor job performance (Harris et al., 2007).

Burton and Hoobler (2006) studied about the relationship amid nature of supervision and employee’s self-esteem. They found negative relationship amid nature of supervision and subordinate’s state self-esteem moderated by influence of gender.
Ferris, Zinko, Brouer, Buckley & Harvey (2007), Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans & May (2004) studied leaders’ abusive behavior in many ways affecting greatly on the workplace attitudes and also the behavior of their subordinates and organizations as a whole (Ferris, Zinko, Brouer, Buckley & Harvey, 2007; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans & May, 2004).

Social exchange principle (Blau, 1964) too explains that mistreatment by one’s supervisor helps reciprocal behavior (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

As Mitchell (2007) examined workplace deviance happens as a consequence of the shift in employee’s frustration with their bosses and hence it gets shifted toward fellow employee and toward the organization. The explanations behind these displacements, especially those which take place toward the organization are few. Not always the employees get the chance to depict reciprocal behavior towards the particular boss and sometimes employees get afraid of retaliating direct to the person whom they perceive to be at fault. Moreover, experiences which they have in the workplace can importantly push them to act out or deviate. Researchers have put their effort in knowing how the perception of being mistreated is one of the major reasons for deviance in the workplace.

Ambrose (2007) in his study found that abusive supervision was associated with three forms of workplace deviant behavior on the part of subordinates: supervisor-directed, organizational, and interpersonal deviance.

In another study, abusive supervision was found to be associated with deviance directed toward the superior, organizational deviance, and interpersonal deviance along with the moderating effects of undesirable reciprocity beliefs. Also, when individuals hold higher undesirable reciprocity beliefs, the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed deviance was found to be stronger.

Mitchell and Ambrose (2007) interviewed jurors for jury duty in the Southeastern United States and established a positive association amid supervisory
mistreatment and various forms of deviance including interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance and supervisor-directed deviance.

In one study positive relationship was found amid abusive supervision and organizational deviance and positive association between abusive supervision and supervisor-directed and organizational deviance (Thau, Bennett, Mitchell & Marrs, 2008).

Tepper, Lambert, Henle, Giacalone and Duffy (2008) investigated the nature of association between abusive supervision to subordinate’s organization deviance. They found it indirectly related to organization deviance when employees observed that their co-workers were more favourable about organization deviance and when their co-workers executed more acts of organization deviance.

Another study revealed that employees who experienced increased conflict amid work and family roles reacted by violating the norms of the organization (Darrat et al., 2010). In another study using “conservation of resources theory”, Ferguson et al., (2012) examined the impact of conflict on deviant behaviour and found a relationship between family-to-work conflict and deviance.

All these findings are consistent to what we predict and later results in workplace deviance.

Therefore, based upon the above review related to abusive supervision we pose the hypothesis as:

\[ H2 (a): \text{There will be significant contribution of abusive supervision towards employees' organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.} \]

2.0.2. Organizational Justice

Refers to employees’ perception of fairness in the organization which holds a situation based explanation of deviant workplace behaviour. As described by theory and research, there exist four distinct forms of justice namely distributive, procedural, interactional and informational. Distributive justice stresses a proportional distribution
of resources according to investments in a give-and-take relationships (Adams, 1965). Procedural justice is explained as “perceived fairness of the process by which outcomes were arrived at”. Interactional justice defines the quality of the interpersonal treatment which they receive by an individual (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Informational justice is explained as “the adequacy of the information used to explain how decisions are made and the thoroughness of the accounts provided”.

Researchers have suggested that workplace deviance occurs as a response to unfairness in the workplace experienced by the employees or employers’ violation of obligations owed to employees (Greenberg and Scott, 1996). This assertion is often supported by equity theory which asserts that employees equate their ratio of outcomes to inputs with the ratio of a co-worker. When equivalent inputs results in equivalent outputs they feel valued and unbiased.

Organizational justice is often cited one of the cause of misconduct. Research evidence shows that organizational justice perceptions talks not only judgements of fairness in income but also about the manner in which decisions were taken. Researchers have been focusing on the causes of employees’ engagement in deviant behaviour and such research directs that injustice experience is one of the most shared reasons of deviant behaviour. Particularly, interpersonal justice- where one is given polite treatment, dignity and respect has been said to be an essential antecedent of deviant behaviour.

The role of workplace violence and/or workplace aggression has also been a topic of discussion for researchers which is linked to deviant behaviour of employees and is predicted by perception of injustice. Once employees feel injustices it resulted in anger toward their employer or specific employees whom they saw doing wrong and harm to them. They perceive their job as threatened and their career as stymied as a result of unjust treatment. Bies and Tripp (1998) rightly pointed out that as a result of perceived injustice it creates feeling of hatred, anger and a desire of revenge.

In the words of Skarlicki and Folger (1997), if decisions in organizations and actions taken by managers are deemed unjust and unfair then employees who are affected experience feelings of resentment, outrage and anger. Such kind of emotions
have been associated with deviant behaviour, in turn (Spector & Fox, 2005) and these emotions are being shown to have mediating relationship between workplace deviant behaviour and procedural and distributive justice (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001).

Aquino, Lewis and Bradfield (1999) found distributive justice negatively linked to interpersonal deviance. Interactional justice was also found to be negatively related to both categories of deviance and negative affectivity was considerably and positively linked to both forms of deviance.

Few researchers have explored the role of ‘esteem threats’ which signifies an action or event that intimidate a person’s ego or decreases his or her self-esteem (Baumeister, Smart & Boden, 1996; Baumeister, 1997; Leary, Twenge & Quinlivan, 2006). Baumeister (1997) says that esteem threats have been emphasized as one of the potential cause of workplace deviance. These works tell that a momentary fall in self-esteem levels caused by esteem threat help people more expected to involve in deviant workplace behaviour (Smart Richman & Leary, 2009).

Kennedy et al., (2004) conducted their study to determine the relationship between injustice perception and support for workplace aggression. They presented with four different scenarios with different levels and types of injustice to their respondents and asked them to respond on aggression scale. Results revealed that procedural injustice scenario was perceived as most unjust which led to the most support for aggression followed by interpersonal injustice. The means of aggression followed reasonably well the pattern of injustice means. Therefore, greater the perception of injustice, greater is the support for workplace aggression. Moreover, based upon these findings we can say that workplace aggression can further lead employees to act against the organizational norms resulting in workplace deviance.

Henle (2005) in his study found that all the three forms justice namely procedural, distributive and interactional justice were adversely correlated with deviance. Two personality variable namely socialization and impulsivity were related negatively and positively to deviance respectively. This study further explored that employees who were low scorer in socialization dimension had greater chances of deviance at work when their perception of interactional justice was low. Similarly,
when interactional justice was perceived high they perceived decreased frequencies of deviance. Moreover, employees who were impulsive found more expected to be engaged in deviant work behaviours when they perceived low interactional justice.

Researchers have also explored the effect of emotions in the relationship among injustice and counterproductive work behaviors. These studies propose that workplace deviant behaviors are employees’ behavioural response to the negative emotions. These emotions are the result of some unfair and unfavourable incidences (Barclay et al, 2005).

Judge et al. (2006) demonstrated that interpersonal justice was related to workplace deviance and this association was intermediated by job satisfaction.

Lara et al., (2007) found support for their study that procedural justice was related positively with organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Further, through SEM, they found significant path between procedural justice and perceived normative conflict which mediated the link between procedural justice and workplace deviance.

Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani (2009) examined the relationship between perceived organizational justice, job satisfaction and organization commitment on employees working in medical college. Findings of their study showed distributive justice was significantly associated with job satisfaction while the relationship of procedural justice was insignificant. Also distributive and procedural justice, both were found to be significantly related to organizational commitment.

Thomas and Nagalingappa (2012) concluded in their studies that interactional justice was a stronger predictor of turnover intention and job satisfaction than other two dimensions of justice. Moreover, it was found that distributive justice well predicted for pay satisfaction and commitment with organization than interactional justice.

Ferris, Spence, Brown and Heller (2012) conducted one study to test self-esteem playing mediating role on the relationship between interpersonal injustice and workplace deviance. Results of their study revealed that interpersonal justice was
related positively to self-esteem and self-esteem was related negatively to workplace deviance.

Kumari and Afroz (2013) in their study on employees of thermal power industry investigated that all three dimensions of justice were negatively related to affective commitment and continuance commitment. The more employees experienced injustice, the less they found to be committed.

Mathur and Padmakumari (2013) conducted their study on store executives. Results revealed that all the dimensions of organizational justice i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional were significantly related to organizational citizenship behaviour. Among the dimensions of justice, interactional justice was found to be the most significant and crucial in effecting extra-role behaviors.

Khan, Quratulain and Crawshaw (2013) in their study discovered distributive injustice positively associated to employee resentment and sadness and resentment was related positively to abuse against others and deviance associated with production as well. Furthermore, mediating role of anger was found in the relationship amid distributive injustice and employee abuse against others and production deviance.

A recent study in this direction is conducted by Singh and Sharma (2014). They investigated that occupational stress and interactional justice were good predictors of interpersonal deviance. Their result indicates that higher the employees’ occupational stress lesser will be their interactional justice which leads employees to be engaged in interpersonal and organizational.

Therefore, based upon the findings and review of related literature we pose the hypothesis as:

\[ H2 (b): \text{There will be significant contribution of perceived organizational justice towards employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.} \]

2.0.3. Machiavellianism
Researchers in behavioural sciences have been interested in the concept of Machiavellianism which has drawn their attention for the past forty years. The concept is originally linked and associated with Niccolo Machiavelli’s unusual work, The Prince. This personality trait is characterized by deceitful, harsh and manipulative leadership practices. Researchers who have explored this trait define Machiavellian as a manipulative individuals, i.e. those who score high on existing Mach scales involve in cunning and devious behaviors.

The idea of Machiavellianism was first and foremost studied by Richard Christie and Florence L. Geis (1970). Their work in this area was to study the ideologies associated with Machiavelli’s two famous works- The Prince and The Discourses, and to know whether they are practiced by people in today’s society.

Machiavellian are found to be amoral, cold and hold an aggressive inclination and an ability to manipulative other individuals (Geis, Christie & Nelson, 1970). These authors also possess power orientation, cunning, and distrustful to people. In the words of Christie and Lehman (1970), Machiavellian are cynical and hold a pessimistic view of the world and of man’s nature. They are also found to be questioning people’s motives (Geis et al, 1970).

Research indicates that Machiavellianism has a relationship with counterproductive work behaviors and related constructs. In one study researchers found that those who were found high on Machiavellianism exhibited more hostile behaviors (Touhey, 1971; Repacholi, Slaughter, Pritchard & Gibbs, 2003; Russell, 1974).

Machiavellianism was also found to be linked with self-reported anti-social behavior conducted on a sample of undergraduate students. Lake (1967) investigated that Machiavellians show more retaliatory behavior in response to aggressive behavior than those who are low Machs.

Another effort in this direction was made by Giacalone and Knouse (1990). In their study they questioned employees about their explanation for organizational damage. These authors found high Mach individuals and those high on aggression
displayed greater excuse for damaging method associated with information manipulation and control. Instances include spreading the rumors, deleting or altering data and enlisting wrong orders.

Additional research on workplace aggression has revealed that Machiavellianism was related to both the forms of employee deviance, i.e. interpersonal and organizational deviance, both (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

In their study Repacholi et al., (2003) established that those high on Machiavellianism showed more bad intention to another people’s action in uncertain situation. Moreover, high Mach have been found more expected to forecast adverse consequences from the ambiguous situations than individuals who were found less in Machiavellianism.

A noteworthy finding in this area is also related to trait anxiety. Individuals with this trait are found to be hyper-responsive and are more probable to experience a move up in state anxiety to circumstances which involves mutual relations. In fact an individual high on trait anxiety may interpret a very friendly and benign situation as a threat to one’s self-esteem and happiness (Spector, 2003).

The construct of trait anxiety is further expanded and relabeled as “negative affectivity”. People who are high on negative affectivity have a tendency to experience anger, distress, nervousness, guilt and rejection. They are negativistic and focus on negative side of the world and others. Examined by Douglas and Martinko (2001) and Hepworth and Towler (2004) level of employees’ negative affectivity is associated with their aggressive behaviors in workplace. It is found that negative affectivity was related to both interpersonal and organizational deviance (Aquino et al., (1999). It has also been linked to an overall measure of workplace deviant behavior.

Negative affectivity is also been related to other dimensions of workplace deviant behavior including work avoidance, abusive behavior, work sabotage and threats (Fox, Spector & Miles, 1999). It has been found that negative affectivity moderated the relationship between interpersonal conflict and counterproductive work behavior. This relationship was intense for people high on NA than people who were low on negative affectivity. It has also been investigated that negative affectivity
strengthened the relationship amid incivility and CWB in such a way that the correlation was stronger for persons high on negative affectivity than persons low on negative affectivity (Penney, 2002).

Negative affectivity has also been found to enhance the association amid perceived organizational injustice and organizational reciprocal behavior (Skalicki et al., 1999).

The purpose of mentioning some studies pertaining to negative affectivity is that both, Machiavellianism and negative affectivity share some common attributes and central tendency to perceive the environment in negative fashion. The linkages between the two can be stated as follows: Machiavellian people are reported as being emotionless, while high negative affectivity persons are defined as being detached. In other words both the expressions connotes an unfavorable and faraway fashion of mixing with other people. Additionally, Machiavellians are also reported as being sarcastic and mistrustful while those high negative affectivity individuals are negativistic. As an outcome, both the traits share an adverse view of other people and the world.

In their study Repacholi et al., (2003) explored those high on Machiavellianism showed more bad intention for another people’s action in uncertain situation. Moreover, high Mach have also been found more probable to forecast harmful effects from the unclear situations than people who were found less in Machiavellianism.

Sharma and Bhal (2003) investigated the impact of individual personality variables on ethical frameworks and ethical decision making. Machiavellianism and locus of control were found to be very essential personality variables in effecting individual’s cognitive process that leads to the choice of ethical decision making. Machiavellianism was also found to be a good predictor of ethical decision behaviour.

Burnfield et al. (2005) examined that the relation amid the dimensions of customer rudeness and interpersonal deviance and organizational was moderated by negative affectivity.
A number of Indian studies done in the past on personality traits in relation with factors which affects individuals’ performance (Suresh & Kadhiravan, 2007; Gupta, 2008; Tyagi, 2008; Hemlatha, 2008; Subramaniam and Vinothkumar, 2009). Studies conducted by these authors covered different contexts. They examined explanatory behaviors with various terminologies, for instance low performance, poor self-skills and behavioural misconduct.

A comparative study between public and private sector has been carried out by Sudha and Khan (2013) to explore the role of personality and motivational traits with relation to workplace deviance. Findings of the study revealed that public and private sector employees differed significantly on deviant workplace behaviors and openness trait of Big Five personality traits. Moreover, neuroticism emerged as a major correlate of organizational deviance in public and private sectors, both. Also, motivational traits such as Behavioral Activation System (BAS) and Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS) significantly correlated to dimensions of workplace deviance in private sector only.

Therefore, after going through the above review of Machiavellianism we pose the hypothesis as:

\[ H2 (c): \text{There will be significant contribution of Machiavellianism towards employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.} \]

2.0.4. Ethical Ideology

People hold ideological beliefs about a variety of issues ranging from the legal systems, social roles, ideas about wrong and right and epistemology. Ethical ideology can be described as a psychological phenomenon which look for understanding and explaining how people show their ethical and honest beliefs and opinions in the context of organizations.

Researchers have found that people high on idealism are more probable to acknowledge behaviors which are ethically questionable as moral issues (Bowes-Sperry & Powell, 1999). Idealist have also been found to distinguish the significance of moral principles in achieving organizational efficiency (Singhapakdi et al., 1995).
Henle et al. (2005) explored that ethical ideology plays an essential role in the workplace deviant behavior and performance which has an economic effect and long term consequence on organization.

Studies carried out in this direction suggest that ethical ideology plays a significant role in deciding whether employees engage in deviant behavior. In one study, direct effect was tested for ethical ideology and deviant behavior (Henle et al. 2005). They argue that since deviant behavior involves ethically questionable acts, there will be variation in employees’ decision to get engaged in this as a purpose of dissimilarity in their ethical ideology. Therefore, it was expected that high idealists would be less expected to engross in deviant acts than people low in idealism. On the other hand, high relativists were expected to involve in more deviant behaviors than those low in relativism.

As expected, idealist people were found less likely to engage in organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. No relation was found between relativism and deviance. Furthermore, result showed that the relations between idealism and relativism found only for organizational deviance and not for interpersonal deviance.

Henle, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2005) in their study demonstrated that idealism was adversely correlated with organizational and interpersonal deviance. These authors did not find support for relativism as it was not meaningfully linked to either organizational or interpersonal deviance. Additionally, interaction effect was also found idealism and relativism to predict organizational deviance. This interaction effect was insignificant for interpersonal deviance.

Another research was conducted by Fernado, Dharmage and Almeida (2008) exploring the association amid ethical values concerned with corporate and ethical ideologies of Australian managers. Result demonstrated that corporate ethical values negatively relates with managers relativism and no relationship between CEV and idealism.
Schlenker et al. (2008) showed that individuals who adopted principled ethical ideology possessed higher standards for ethical behavior, found telling less lies and were less expected to justify immoral and ethical behaviors. In fact they were found to display more helping behaviors.

Valentine et al., (2010) found that marketing employees’ ethical values were positively linked to job satisfaction. This study also revealed that moral values and job satisfaction were significantly linked with decreased turnover. Since job satisfaction is a crucial dimension of employee engagement which leads to decline in turnover intentions, we can assume that employees high in ethical ideology will tend to be satisfied with their job and will be less oriented to deviant behavior.

Importance of ethical ideology is coming into light very swiftly and making organizations to ponder about it and related issues. Todays’ organizations are now measuring ethical ideology of applicants at the time of pre-employment screening as it predicts a person’s ethical decision making on the job (Callanan et al., 2010).

In an empirical investigation carried out by Chan and Lai (2011) sought to identify computer user's ethical ideology and its association with software piracy attitude and behaviour. Findings of this study revealed that out of four ethical ideology categories (i.e. situationists, absolutists, subjectivists and exceptionists) when compared, subjectivists are found to have the least unfavourable attitude towards software piracy. Also, relativism exerted stronger influence on their piracy attitude than idealism.

Hastings and Finegan (2011) studied the moderating role of ethical ideology and organizational justice and constructive and deviant reactions to injustice. Results showed that idealism associated adversely with both interpersonal and organizational deviance, also correlated positively with constructive behaviors. Further, ethical ideology moderated the relationship amid procedural justice and organizational deviance. Significant three-way interaction between relativism, idealism and procedural justice was obtained. Additionally, similar results were obtained with regard to distributive and interactional justice with constructive reactions.
Therefore, based upon the above review of ethical ideology we pose the hypotheses as:

**H3 (a): Ethical ideology will significantly moderate the relation between abusive supervision and and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.**

**H3 (b): Ethical ideology will significantly moderate the relation between organizational justice and and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.**

**H3 (c): Ethical ideology will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.**

### 2.0.5. Work Passion

With the dynamic changes in corporate world and nature of the job there has been a significant change in the expectations that organizations have from their employees. In today's workplace employees are expected to turn with creativity and enough passion and engagement in order to excel. Bringing and/or creating passion in the workplace requires a lot of strength and time from employees’ and organizations side. In the words of Vallerand et al. (2003) it is a profound tendency toward the activity that one loves, that is highly valued, and in which a considerable amount of time and energy is spent. He describes passion in two categories, harmonious and obsessive. In brief, harmonious passion is a kind of motivational force which leads an employee to perform his work with a sense of volition and self-endorsement. These sort of employees willingly devote themselves for their work. On the other hand, obsessive passion is talks about a force which is motivational in nature. Employees are pushed by this force so that they can accomplish their work. Employees falling in this category maintain high self-esteem and seek social acceptance and value.

Research in this area has found that employees’ work passion was an important aspect in creating customer devotion and organizational vigor and strength. Eight
significant elements were found accountable for motivating employee work passion, they are- meaningful work, independence, cooperation, equality, recognition growth, connectedness to fellow employees and connectedness to leaders. However, these eight elements are not inclusive. Further research through factor analysis narrowed the list from 33 to 12 factors. In a nutshell these factors can be quoted as organizational factors, job factors, moderating factors and intentions.

When we talk about work passion we try to exhibit three attributes of the worker- questing, connecting and commitment to the area that collectively defines the characteristics of an employee who is passionate about his/her work. However, there is a difference between employees’ passion and employee engagement. Employee engagement is defined as feeling of happiness of the workers in their work setting, with their co-workers, organization and the overall treatment by their employer. It’s important in the sense that improving it typically gives a raise in organization’s performance. But giving a bump in the organizational performance does not gives the benefit forever, passionate worker will do, though. They help themselves and the organization through their behavior, rather than one time performance they give out sustained and significant performance improvement.

Vallerand (2010) and Phillipe et al., (2010) found that harmonious passion leads to the feeling of positive emotions and safeguards against undesirable emotions and help promoting psychological well-being.

Research shows how employees’ work passion may be linked to deviant behaviors. Srivastava (2012) demonstrated the moderating role of workplace passion between job satisfaction and workplace deviant behavior. Results revealed that organizational deviance and job satisfaction had significant relationship, work passion and job satisfaction were positively related, and work passion was negatively related to interpersonal deviance. Moreover, women were found to be more passionate towards their work than male counterparts. Lastly, work passion significantly moderated the association between organizational deviance and job satisfaction.

In another study Vallerand (2012) concluded that experience of positive emotions during the engagement in an activity created harmonious passion which helps
in sustained psychological well-being which in turn prevents encountering negative affect and psychological conflict.

Ariyani (2013) found a substantial positive link amid employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior and a significant negative relationship between employee engagement and counterproductive work behavior, also between OCB and CWB.

Trepanier et al., (2014) found that job demands were positively associated to obsessive passion and undesirably related to harmonious passion, job resources were positively related to harmonious passion. Further obsessive was positively linked to burnout and harmonious passion was negatively linked to burnout and positively related to work engagement. Also, harmonious passion partially mediates the relationship between job demands and burnout/work engagement.

In a recent study Birkeland and Buch (2014) established that harmonious passion was negatively linked to burnout and positively related to life satisfaction.

Therefore, based upon the above review of work passion we pose the hypotheses as:

**H4 (a):** Work passion will significantly moderate the relation between abusive supervision and employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.

**H4 (b):** Work passion will significantly moderate the relation between organizational justice and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.

**H4 (c):** Work passion will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and employee’s organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.

**2.0.6. Power Distance**
As a characteristic of a society, power distance describes “the degree to which unequal distribution of power is accepted in a society”. Societies high in power distance are seen to be hierarchically ordered. They are given many privileges which are reserved for individuals high in status or ranking. Contrary to this, low power distance societies are found to be egalitarian. In their opinion there should not be any difference in status. Subordinates in this society are less likely to submit to their superiors.

This one form of value viz. power distance comes from one of the four dimensions of Geert Hofstede’s (1980) cultural values. Though Hofstede strongly asserted that these values of a culture are meaningful only at “societal level”, research has demonstrated that every single value of these dimensions vary largely among the individuals in different cultures and societies. The individual dissimilarities tells direct effects on many consequences (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Clugston, Howell & Dorfman, 2000).

Subordinates feel that their position in the organization is below their supervisors, and also they feel lesser in position and status to their supervisors. As a result subordinates agree to take the discrepancy and inequality of power (Tyler, Lind & Huo, 2000). They don’t bother much about how they are treated by their supervisors and therefore take abusive supervisory mistreatment for granted. Hence, they may demonstrate less deviant behaviour.

Contrary to this, subordinates with low power distance orientation have a firm belief of equal status with their supervisors, they often have disagreement and criticism with authorities and find themselves more accomplished to communicate to their supervisors regarding the guidelines leading them in the organization (Farh et al., 2007; Tyler et al., 2000).

Lam, Schaubroeck and Aryee (2002) demonstrated that power distance moderated the association between perceived organizational justice and work consequences of job satisfaction, performance and absenteeism. Result was significant for individuals who are found low on power distance than individuals high on power distance.
Through power distance, an individual’s status and his values, authority and power is reflected, which in turn moulds the superior-subordinate relationship. Subordinates who exercise high power distance orientation acknowledge and accept the presence of hierarchy and depict regard and compliance to their bosses (Farh, Hackett & Liang, 2007).

Research done by Lian, Ferris and Brown (2012) shows that the relationship between abuse by superiors and subordinate’s interpersonal deviance is modified by individual’s power distance orientation. Their research further indicates that power distance orientation moderates the relation amid abuse by supervisors and likelihood of rewards and self-regulation impairment.

In another study Wang, Mao, Wu and Liu (2012) found abusive supervision had significant positive influence on employee’s organizational deviance, interpersonal deviance and supervisor-directed deviance. They also established that individual-level power distance moderated the association between abusive supervision and employee’s perception of interactional justice.

Loi, Lam and Chan (2012) observed in their study that procedural justice was adversely linked to job insecurity. Also this relationship was moderated by ethical leadership. Additionally, this moderating effect was stronger among employees having low power distance and weak among high power distance employees.

Recently, in a research done by Lin et al (2013) found that employee’s power distance orientation moderated the relationship of supervisory mistreatment and employee’s mental health and their job satisfaction.

Therefore, based upon the review related to power distance orientation we pose the following hypotheses:

\[ H5 (a): \text{Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between abusive supervision and employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.} \]
H5 (b): Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between organizational justice and employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.

H5 (c): Power distance will significantly moderate the relation between Machiavellianism and employees’ organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance.

2.0.7. Workplace Deviance

Described as intentional behaviour that departs from customs and rules of an organization and in doing so impedes the good and welfare of employees and organization, both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Theories and research has shown that there are numerous factors which are responsible for this amoral act. Ranging from situational factors to dispositional factors the consequences of deviant behaviour is devastating. For instance Douglas and Martinko (2001) found that attribution style, trait anger and self-control accounted for 62% of variance in self-reported workplace aggression. Situational factors like perception of organizational injustice leads in the prediction of deviant/reparative behaviour.

Works done by Jones (2009), Gordon (2010) and Onuoha and Ezeribe (2011) have revealed that unfairly treated individuals are more prone to indulge in workplace deviant behaviors especially when they have a sense of entitlement related to perceptions of unfairness. Also deviant workplace behavior could arise as a result of feelings of disrespect, frustration, injustice and threats to self (Griffin & Leary-Kelly, 2004) and when the employee is in financial trouble or feel slighted.

Additional issue that causes and compels employees for committing the acts of destructive deviance in the organization is the effect of deviant role models. This concept is borrowed from social learning theory which postulates that the influence of role models who are considered as deviant in an organization or in a group in general affect others in the group to commit acts of deviance too. To stress the impact of groups in the workplace is very much important here when one is trying to assess the effects of deviant behavior in an organizational set up.
Furthermore, stressors in the organizations are also found to propel the employees to engage in destructive behavior. Earlier research shows that stressors associated with amount of work had a direct relation with employees’ aggression, stealing and the intention to quit.

Moreover, it is found that the environment where people perform their duties also is a good forecaster of employees’ workplace deviant behavior. Studies revealed that environment inside a workplace rather than individual personality attributes are seldom found to predict the incivility in the workplace which is a serious kind of deviance. Research in this direction has revealed that employee deviance can be evaluated on job characteristics such as employees’ contact with the people, carrying out security functions, alcohol usage etc.

A question arises here that whether the negative deviant behavior is direct and straightforward or subconscious or it includes sexual harassment, vandalism, backbiting other employees, organizational sabotage or otherwise, does all these unapproved organizational behavior has undesirable outcomes for the organization and its employees? The answer is very much transparent because negative deviant behaviors comprises employee offences and wrongdoings which includes disobeying the manager’s instructions, intentionally working slow, arriving late at work and performing petty theft. Also dealing badly or rudely with co-workers in the organization (Galperin, 2002).

Personal factors triggering WPD include believing in materialism (Deckop, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2014), locus of control (Wei & Si, 2013) and personality traits (Spector & Zhou, 2014; Michel & Bowling, 2013). Besides there are organizational factors such as commitment (Gill, Meyer, Lee, Shin, & Yoon, 2011), interpersonal conflict (Spector and Zhou, 2014), abusive supervision (Wei & Si, 2013; Ahmad & Omar, 2013), psychological contract breach (Bolin & Heatherly, 2001; Fayyazi & Aslani, 2015) and perception of organizational politics (Wiltshire, Bourdage, & Lee, 2014).

Last but not the least, commitment of employees also play role in predicting the possibility of involving in unauthorized conduct in organization. In this regard Sims
(2002) demonstrated that feeling of continuance commitment was found linked positively to the occurrence of deviant behavior. Moreover, Liao et al., (2004) discovered an inverse relationship between organizational commitment and organizational and interpersonal deviance. Furthermore, researchers also found that employees’ satisfaction was too related to interpersonal and organizational deviance inversely.

In a recent study Caroline (2015) revealed that absenteeism, favoritism and tardiness found to have jointly contributed to employees’ deviant behavior.