The Impact of Negative Affectivity, Job Satisfaction and Interpersonal Justice on Workplace Deviance in the Private Organizations

Mazni Alias[1], Roziah Mohd Rasdi[2*] and Al-Mansor Abu Said[1]

[1]*Faculty of Business and Law, Multimedia University, Bukit Beruang, Ayer Keroh Lama, 75450 Melaka, Malaysia*
[2]*Department of Professional Development and Continuing Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43000 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

Workplace deviance has become pervasive in most organizations today. Researchers conceptualized workplace deviance based on whether the offence is directed towards organizational or interpersonal deviances. This study examined the contributions of individual and situational factors towards workplace deviance in the private organizations. Workplace deviance was conceptualized as interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. Self-administered survey was conducted on 160 employees who worked full-time. The findings of the study indicated that negative affectivity and interpersonal justice were positively and significantly correlated with both types of workplace deviance, and the correlations were low. However, job satisfaction was not correlated with organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Implications and suggestions for future research are also discussed.

Keywords: Interpersonal justice, job satisfaction, negative affectivity, workplace deviance

INTRODUCTION

In the recent years, the issue of workplace deviance (WD) has become pervasive in most

organizations and generated high concerns among organizational behaviour and human resource researchers (Appelbaum, Iaconi & Matousek, 2007; Bennett, Aquino, Reed & Thau, 2005; Krau, 2008; Spector & Fox, 2005). WD researchers have labelled the term differently, such as counterproductive behaviour (Sackett & Devore, 2002), antisocial behaviour (Giacolone & Greenberg, 1997) and misbehaviour (Vardi

& Weitz, 2004). Some previous researchers have focused on specific types of negative behaviour, such as misbehaviour (Vardi & Weitz, 2004), whistle blowing (Miceli & Near, 1992), and betrayal of trust (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). However, this focus has changed, whereby research on WD is narrowed into developing a unified construct and validated measures of WD behaviours (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Bennett and Robinson (2000) defined WD behaviour as an occupational crime which may vary along a continuum of severity, ranging from minor acts (such as embarrassing colleagues, taking longer breaks, and leaving early) to serious acts such as sabotage and theft. Further examples of deviant behaviour include misuse of time at work, absenteeism, causing damages on employer's property, employees who are always late for work, use of drugs and alcohol, stealing from their employers, poor-quality of work and performing unsafe behaviours (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). Robinson and Bennett (2000) conceptualized WD as having two dimensions, depending on whether the offence is directed towards organizational or interpersonal. Some examples of interpersonal deviance are making fun of co-workers, acting rudely toward others, blaming co-workers for mistakes made on the job, and disobeying supervisor's instructions. Meanwhile, dragging out work to get overtime, stealing from the organizations, and taking office supplies without permission are some examples of organizational deviance. Using these two dimensions of WD (i.e. interpersonal

deviance and organizational deviance), Robinson and Bennett (2000) further identified four categories of WD, namely; production deviance, property deviance, political deviance and personal aggression.

In the Malaysian context, the issues of WD have been given a great deal of discussion in the public media concerning cases such as bribery, tardiness, dishonesty, poor work attitude, fraudulence, underperformance and fake medical claims (Abdul Rahman & Aizat, 2008; Abdul Rahman, 2008; Awanis, 2006). A study conducted by Global Corruption Barometer among employees in the Malaysian organizations found that corruption is prevalence and pervasive. Substance abuse (one of the forms of WD), dishonesty absenteeism, accident and employee turnover, poor work attitude and industrial accidents are also serious problems among employees in the Malaysian private organizations (Abdul Rahman, 2008). Awanis (2006) revealed in her research that taking longer breaks than acceptable, spending longer time fantasizing, saying something hurtful, and making fun of someone at work stand out to be the common forms of deviant behaviour in the Malaysian organizations. Despite the huge media coverage, empirical research conducted on WD is still lacking, especially among employees in private organizations. Abdul Rahman (2008) pointed out that there is no up-to-date statistics or empirical data regarding these deviant behaviours though various destructive behaviours have occurred and been reported by the Malaysian Labour Department.

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors contributing to WD behaviour among employees in the private organizations. The selected factors are job satisfaction, negative affectivity and interpersonal justice. The WD literature have noted that these factors have greatly contributed to deviant behaviours in organizations (Appelbaum & Shapiro, 2006; Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002; McCardle, 2007). In the Tenth Malaysia Plan, the nation is striving to accomplish Vision 2020 and to advance Malaysia towards high-income and developed nation status by 2020 (Malaysia, 2010). To achieve the mission and vision, it is vital to have a workforce which is characterized by creativity, innovations, ethics and high integrity. Good values and ethics are prerequisite to quality service in organizations. In line with this, the Malaysian government has launched several programmes that are aimed to inculcate desirable values such as honesty, discipline, integrity, dedication, accountability, trustworthiness and efficiency among Malaysian employees (Malaysia, 2010).

Therefore, this study is significant to individuals and organizations, as employees who do not commit to any form of WD will increase organizational stability and functionality. The findings of this study are expected to assist human resource personnel in playing more effective roles in managing, reducing, and preventing WD. By understanding the determinants of WD, the human resource personnel will also be in a better position to plan and implement effective policies, as well as practices,

towards reducing the prevalence of WD. In addition, the study contributes to the literature on WD in an international and cross-cultural context through investigation of WD in a non-western context.

This study took an interactionist perspective in supporting its research framework. Using this perspective, individual behaviours were conceptualized as a continuous and multi-directional interaction between individuals who possessed distinct traits and situations in which they encountered (Endler & Magnusson, 1976). The interactionist perspective takes a dual person context approach, suggesting that factors related to both individual (e.g. personality traits) and context are combined to influence behaviours (Magnusson, 1990). Mischel (1977) argued that the expression of individual dispositions (e.g. personality traits) is inhibited in situations that exert a strong influence on behaviour. Behaviours are more likely to reflect relevant traits when the situation is weak. For example, certain situation does not provide clear incentive, support or normative expectations of behaviour. According to Aquino, Galperin and Bennett (2004), most WD researchers are in line with the interactionist perspective, whereby they take into account the contributions of both person and environment variables in predicting WD behaviours. Following the interactionist perspective, this study offered a direct examination on the influence of individual characteristic (negative affectivity) and situational factors (procedural justice and job satisfaction) in

predicting WD. It should also be noted that most studies on WD have been centred in the North America and Europe (Abdul Rahman, 2008; Faridahwati, 2006; Smithikrai, 2008). Thus, most of the literature and studies cited in this paper are based mainly from the studies conducted in these regions.

The paper is organized as follows; it begins with a description of the phenomenon of WD in the Malaysian scenario, and followed by a review on the individual and situational variables and their relationships with WD, as well as several postulated hypotheses. The subsequent sections describe the research methodology, results and discussion are also discussed. The paper ends with a conclusion, as well as the implications and recommendations for future research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

WD Behaviour in Malaysia

Studies on WD among the local researchers have associated individual characteristics and organizational factors as predictors of WD (Faridahwati, 2003; Abdul Rahman, 2008). Abdul Rahman's (2008) study on the predictors of deviant behaviour among production employees in Penang showed that perceived leadership integrity was significantly correlated to organizational deviance compared to interpersonal deviance. In addition, there was no relationship between job satisfaction, job stress and WD. The study also noted that organizational commitment, organizational justice, and perceptions of organizational support were significantly correlated with

WD. In another study, Faridahwati (2003) revealed that saying hurtful things and making fun of someone at work stood out to be the common forms of WD among hotel employees. A subsequent study by Abdul Rahman (2008) concluded that personality traits (i.e., locus of control) moderated the relationship between employees' trust in organization and WD behaviour among production employees in a manufacturing organization. His study also found that trust in organization was correlated with employees' WD behaviour. In addition, he found three dominant forms of WD behaviour among employees, namely, production deviance, property deviance and interpersonal deviance. The results of his study concluded that organizational variables and work-related variables played important roles in influencing employees' attitude and deviant behaviour at the workplace. Collectively, all these studies demonstrated the prevalence of WD in the Malaysian organizations.

Another local survey conducted by Kommen Prufen Meckern Gehen (2004), an international audit, tax and advisory professional firm, indicated that 83% of the Malaysian public and private limited companies experienced fraud which is considered as a serious form of WD. What is more shocking is that this percentage has continuously increased as compared to the previous years. The survey also revealed that 23% out of 100 Malaysian large companies surveyed have been subjected to fraud, in which 70% of the cases reported were committed by employees (Zauwiyah & Mariati, 2008).

Aznira's (2006) study among 73 lecturers at one of the government colleges in Malaysia found that there was a negative and significant relationship between emotional intelligence and WD. Using a sample of 58 managers, executives and assistant executives in a private organization, Norhayati (2006) revealed that occupational stress was significantly correlated to WD, and the correlation is moderate. However, the study also found that demographic factors do not contribute to employees' WD. Mazni, Tong and Hishammuddin's (2008) interviews with human resource managers from various manufacturing industries showed that various forms of organizational and interpersonal deviance exist in the workplace. Some examples of deviant behaviours are harassment, spreading negative rumours, bullying, and physical attacks to co-workers. A more recent study by Zauwiyah and Hasmida (2009) found that age, gender, conscientiousness and organizational justice significantly predicted cyber loafing (a form of organizational deviance) among Malaysian employees.

Negative Affectivity and WD

Previous WD studies suggested that individual personality plays an important role in the manifestation of deviant behaviour in organizations (Neuman & Baron, 1998). In this study, negative affectivity was selected to represent the individual variable. Negative affectivity indicates the extent to which persons perceive level of distressing emotions, such as anger, hostility, fear and anxiety. Meanwhile,

past researchers (e.g., Aquino, Lewis & Bradfield, 1999; Appelbaum & Shapiro, 2006) also believe that individuals with high negative affectivity are predisposed to react more strongly to negative events when they occur. Studies revealed that high-negative affectivity individuals were more likely to engage in both types of WD behaviour compared to low-negative affectivity individuals (Goh, 2006). Goh (2006) further explained that individuals with high-negative affectivity were more likely to feel anxiety when they interacted with other people and perceived situations as annoying, frustrating and provocative. In short, negative affectivity was found to be related to interpersonal and organizational deviances, such as work avoidance, work sabotage, abusive behaviour, threats and overt attitudes. Based on the above, it was postulated that:

$H_0 1$: There is no significant contribution of negative affectivity towards interpersonal deviance.

$H_0 2$: There is no significant contribution of negative affectivity towards organizational deviance.

Job Satisfaction and WD

Job satisfaction is one of the situational variables involved in this study. It is defined as positive feelings about one's job, based on one's evaluation of job characteristics (Robbins & Judge, 2007). Job satisfaction also reveals the degree to which an employee is content with his or her job as a whole, which encompasses multiple aspects of one's job, such as the work itself,

the quality of interpersonal relationships, compensation and career advancement opportunities (Bruck *et al.*, 2002).

Zhang, Chen and Chen (2008) found that job dissatisfactions, which resulted from dissatisfying work situation, tend to be associated with higher level of WD. Individuals tend to retaliate against their organization by doing something that can harm the organization and/or their colleagues. A study conducted by Mulki, Jaramillo and Locander (2006) on 208 healthcare and social employees concluded that dissatisfied employees resorted to both types of deviant behaviours as a way to cope with frustration. Another study by Crede, Chernyshenko, Stark, Dalal and Bashshur (2007) found that job satisfaction was strongly and negatively correlated with both types of WD behaviour and job withdrawal among 950 university's staff. Therefore, the following hypotheses were put forward:

$H_0 3$: There is no significant contribution of job satisfaction towards interpersonal deviance.

$H_0 4$: There is no significant contribution of job satisfaction towards organizational deviance

Interpersonal Justice and WD

Interpersonal justice is another situational variable involved in this study which focused on individuals' perceptions on the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the execution of organizational decisions. Interactional justice is an important predictor of employees' responses or judgments about their supervisors (McCardle, 2007). Bies

and Moag (1986) found that insensitive or impersonal treatments were more likely to provoke intense emotional and behavioural response compared to other types of injustice such as distributive and procedural justice.

Aquino *et al.* (2004) indicated that the level of interpersonal injustice was positively related to individuals' tendency to conduct WD behaviours. Meanwhile, the level of individual's interpersonal justice could trigger deviant behaviours such as anger, resentment and moral outrage. A meta-analysis study by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng (2001b) also supported the relationship between interpersonal justice and interpersonal deviance, as well as organizational deviance. They revealed that interpersonal justice was the strongest predictor of WD when other types of justice were controlled. Henle (2005) also found that deviant behaviours tend to occur among employees who perceived low interpersonal justice. Similarly, Ambrose, Seabright, and Schminke's (2002) research revealed that interactional justice was linked to the severity of sabotage (one form of organizational deviance). Based on the above, the following hypotheses were presented:

$H_0 5$: There is no significant contribution of interpersonal justice towards interpersonal deviance.

$H_0 6$: There is no significant contribution of interpersonal justice towards organizational deviance.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

This study was conducted on full-time workers from a variety of private organizations in the state of Malacca, Malaysia. Following Israel (1992), the sample size in this study was determined by the type of quantitative research data analysis. Using the analysis of G*Power (Erdfelder, Faul, & Bruchner, 1996), specifically for F-test in Multiple Regression, the total suggested sample size is 119 (effect size = 0.15, power = 0.95; numbers of predictors/independent variables = 3). The values of Alpha and power are acceptable for social science research, while the number of independent variables is determined from the research framework. G*Power is a reliable method for determining sample size because the calculation is based on the type of statistical analysis used for each investigation (Erdfelder *et al*., 1996). Likewise, Cohen (1988) suggested that the sample size determination should take into account the significant criterion (alpha), the desired degree of statistical power and effect size.

Since the number of samples required is at least 119 (based on G*Power analysis), we decided to send a total of 200 sets of questionnaire to the four types of industries (i.e., manufacturing, construction, services and trading). These industries were selected based on their major contributions to Malacca's economic growth (Data Asas Melaka, 2010). Based on a proportional stratified random sampling technique, a total of 50 sets of questionnaire were distributed to each industry involved.

Out of the 200 sent out questionnaires, 160 respondents responded to the surveys. The high response rate, i.e. 80%, was due to researchers' effort in building good rapport with the involved organizations through frequent follow-up calls and repeated visits. The respondents were support staff working at the selected organizations. The human resource managers of each organization were contacted prior to data collection for permission to enter the organizations. They were briefed about the study purposes and the research instrument. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents who worked in various departments by the human resource managers. Using a cover letter, all respondents were assured that their returned questionnaires would be kept anonymous and confidential. The completed questionnaires were sent back to the human resource managers to be collected by the researchers.

Instrument

The research questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part captures the respondent's socio demographic details, such as age, marital status, qualification, tenure and type of industry. The second part focuses on items relating to WD, i.e., negative affectivity, job satisfaction and procedural justice. WD instrument was adopted and adapted from Bennett and Robinson (2000), consisting of 11 items which responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (everyday).

The instrument measures interpersonal deviance (four items) and organizational deviance (seven items). Sample item for interpersonal deviance: "Said something hurtful to someone at work". Sample item for organizational deviance: "Taken a longer break at your workplace". In this study, the internal reliability coefficient was .89.

Negative affectivity was measured using Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) which was developed by Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988). It comprises of seven items which were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). Items in PANAS describe negative emotions (e.g., irritable, upset, and afraid) and the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they generally perceived each emotion. High scores indicate high levels of negative affectivity, and vice-versa. The overall internal reliability for the present sample was .74.

Job satisfaction was assessed using the nine items of job satisfaction scale developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951). The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items are: "I am satisfied with my current job; I feel real enjoyment in my job". In this study, the reported internal consistency was .90.

Interpersonal justice was measured using the six items of interpersonal justice scale developed by Colquitt (2001a). The items are related to how they perceived that their supervisor/s have treated them at work, and this ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items are: "My supervisor treats me in a polite manner; My supervisor treats me with dignity". In this study, the internal reliability coefficient was .87.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive analysis, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and Multiple Stepwise Regression analysis. The construct validity of WD instrument (11 items) was established using factor analysis, with the principal component analysis method and varimax rotation. The results of the factor analysis produced two factors, with the total variance explained of 33.75% ($KMO = 0.857$). The factor loadings of 0.50 and above were considered as practically significant (Hair, Tatham, Anderson, & Black, 2006). The first factor, i.e. organizational deviance ($\alpha = 0.8$), consists of seven items. The second factor, i.e. interpersonal deviance ($\alpha = 0.7$), consists of four items. Subsequently, the Multiple Stepwise Regression was used to determine the contribution of the selected independent variables towards the criterion variable (interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance).

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic profile of the respondents. This study involved 55.6% male and 44.4% female employees. The age of respondents ranged from 21 to 50 years old. Majority of the respondents' age ranged from 21-30 years old. Most of them (60%) were married, followed by

single (33.1%) and divorced (6.9%). The respondents' levels of education ranged from secondary level (Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia) to degree level, with most of the respondents obtained their degree (44.4%). Half of the respondents (51.3%) reported to having work tenure of less than three years, while only 1.1% of the respondents stated that they have worked for more than ten years. Most of the respondents worked in the construction industry (37.5%), followed by 23.1% employed in the manufacturing sector, 23.8% laboured in the service sector, and 15.6% were from the trading industry.

TABLE 1
Descriptive statistics for demographic profile

Profile	N	(%)
Age (years)		
21-30	83	51.9
31-40	56	35.0
41-50	21	13.1
Education level		
SPM (Secondary level)	13	8.1
STPM (High school level)	33	20.6
Diploma	43	26.9
Degree	71	44.4
Type of Industry		
Manufacturing	37	23.1
Construction	60	37.5
Service	38	23.8
Trading	25	15.6
Gender		
Male	89	55.6
Female	71	44.4
Marital status		
Single	53	33.1
Married	96	60.0
Divorced	11	6.9

Table 1 (*continued*)

Tenure in organization		
Less than 3	82	51.3
4-6	58	36.3
7-9	18	11.3
More than 10	2	1.1

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations (SD) and Pearson's inter-correlations of the individual variables used in this study. Job satisfaction was found to be not correlated with both interpersonal and organizational deviances. The table also reveals that there is a positive and low correlation between negative affectivity and organizational deviance ($r = .187$, $p < .01$), and a negligible and positive relationship between negative affectivity and interpersonal deviance ($r = .345$, $p < .01$). Interestingly, the correlation analysis indicated that interpersonal justice was negatively correlated with both organizational and interpersonal deviances, but the magnitude is negligible (organizational deviance: $r = -.172$, $p < .05$), (interpersonal deviance: $r = -.147$, $p < .05$). The inter-correlation values conclude that there is no potential multicollinearity problem (Cohen, 1988). To determine the contribution of the selected variables in this study (job satisfaction, negative affectivity and interpersonal justice) towards employees' WD behaviour, this study then embarked on the multiple stepwise regression analysis.

Two separate multiple stepwise regression analyses were carried out to test for the stated hypotheses. The hypotheses that posit the contribution of the independent

variables towards interpersonal deviance are H_01: There is no significant contribution of negative affectivity towards interpersonal deviance; H_03: There is no significant contribution of job satisfaction towards interpersonal deviance; and H_05: There is no significant contribution of interpersonal justice towards interpersonal deviance.

To test for these specific hypotheses (H_01, H_03, and H_05), the first regression analysis was conducted with "interpersonal deviance" as the dependent variable, whereas job satisfaction, negative affectivity and interpersonal justice as the independent variables. The regression model indicates that negative affectivity and interpersonal justice are two major predictors of employees' interpersonal deviance (see Table 3). The variable that was excluded from the model is job satisfaction. Table 3 shows that negative affectivity is a good predictor of interpersonal deviance, whereby negative affectivity contributed to the highest variation in interpersonal deviance ($\beta = 0.369$, t = 4.995; p = 0.001). Negative affectivity has a high β-coefficient ($\beta =$ 0.369) which denotes that the variable has a moderate predictive value for employees' interpersonal deviance. This is followed by interpersonal justice which has significantly contributed to the variation in interpersonal deviance ($\beta = -0.194$, t = -2.625; p = 0.001). The result also implicates that the higher the employees' negative affectivity and the lesser the employees' interpersonal justice, the most likely that employees engage in interpersonal deviance at their workplace. Table 3 also indicates that the regression model explains 15.6% of the variance in employees' interpersonal deviance (F = 6.889, p = 0.010). This regression model also shows that negative affectivity and interpersonal justice explain 7.4% of the variance in organizational deviance (F = 6.268, p < 0.01). On the basis of these findings, we found no support for H_01 and H_05 for interpersonal deviance; however, we found support for H_03 for interpersonal deviance.

Subsequently, the second stepwise regression analysis was performed to test for the following hypotheses; H_02: There

TABLE 2
Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables

Variables	M	SD	Y_1	Y_2	X_1	X_2
Y_1	2.82	0.66				
Y_2	2.57	0.73	.598**			
X_1	3.28	0.68	.076	.007		
X_2	2.15	0.56	.187**	.345**	-.151*	
X_3	2.7	0.77	-.172*	-.147*	.069	.127

Notes:
$Y_1 =$ Organizational deviance, Y_2 = Interpersonal deviance, X_1=Job satisfaction,
X_2 = Negative affectivity, X_3 = Interpersonal justice.
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 3
Multiple stepwise linear regression on interpersonal deviance

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig
	B	Std error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.048	.269		7.599	.0001
Negative Affectivity	.480	.096	.369	4.995	.0001
Interpersonal justice	-.183	.070	-.194	-2.625	.0001

Note: R=0.395; R²=0.156; Adj. R²=0.145; F=6.889; p=0.010

is no significant contribution of negative affectivity towards organizational deviance; H_04: There is no significant contribution of job satisfaction towards organizational deviance; and H_06: There is no significant contribution of interpersonal justice towards organizational deviance.

In this study, organizational deviance was included as the dependent variable, whereas job satisfaction, negative affectivity and interpersonal justice as the independent variables. Table 4 indicates that two predictors were found to be significantly contributed to employees' organizational deviance. These predictors are negative affectivity (t = 2.738, p < 0.007, β = 0.212) and interpersonal justice (t = -2.575, p < 0.011, β = -0.199). It should be noted that the beta coefficients found in this analysis are very small, and therefore, they should be interpreted with caution (Field, 2009). Based on the largest beta coefficient obtained and the largest t value, it was therefore concluded that negative affectivity contributed to the highest variance in organizational deviance as compared to interpersonal justice. The variable that was excluded from the model is job satisfaction. The regression model denotes that the higher the employees' negative affectivity

and the lesser the employees' interpersonal justice, the most likely that employees will engage in organizational deviance at the workplace. This regression model also shows that negative affectivity and interpersonal justice explain 7.4% of the variance in organizational deviance (F = 6.268, p < 0.01). The negative affectivity alone explains 3.5% of the variance, while interpersonal justice only explains 3.9% of the variance in employees' organizational deviance. Given these patterns of the findings, we found no support for H_02 and H_06 for organizational deviance; however, we found support for H_04 for organizational deviance.

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This paper sought to investigate the factors related to person and environment in predicting WD among employees working in the private sector. In this study, negative affectivity was included as the person factor and job satisfaction as well as interpersonal justice as the environment factors. Six research hypotheses were posed in relation to the relationships between the study variables.

TABLE 4
Multiple stepwise linear regressions on organizational deviance

| | Unstandardized coefficients | | Standardized coefficients | t | Sig |
	B	Std error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.759	.255		10.802	.0001
Negative Affectivity	.249	.091	.212	2.738	.007
Interpersonal justice	-.170	.066	-.199	-2.575	.011

Note: R=0.272; R^2=0.074; Adj. R^2=0.062; F=6.630; p=0.011

The findings concluded that employees' WD was predicted by both person (negative affectivity) and environment factors (interpersonal justice). However, job satisfaction was not found to have contributed to employees' WD. Nevertheless, this study has shown that the person factor remains as the most explanatory power in explaining the phenomenon of employees' WD.

Meanwhile, the causes of WD behaviour have been studied at many different levels, such as the individual and the organizational levels. This study showed that at the individual level, WD behaviour could not be attributed by personality traits alone. Thus, this study highlighted the contribution of the interactionist perspective, i.e. a combination of personality traits and workplace situation (Peterson, 2002), by integrating these variables in its research framework. The findings of this study are consistent with the past WD findings that individual disposition exerts a strong influence on employees' workplace behaviour (e.g., Appelbaum & Shapiro, 2006; Aquino et al., 1999; Goh, 2006). Individuals with high negative affectivity are most likely to demonstrate deviant behaviour, and this is probably

because they are in jobs that are more prone towards deviant behaviour. Individuals working in different types of industries are exposed to different working contexts and organizational procedures. Appelbaum and Shapiro (2006) highlighted that employees with negative affectivity personality tend to have negative attitudes and feelings against their customers, organization, job, and even themselves across all situations. Moreover, they are most likely to feel anxiety when interacting with people (Appelbaum & Shapiro, 2006).

This study also supports the findings of the studies by Aquino et al. (1999), Colquitt et al. (2001b), and Ambrose et al. (2002), whereby interpersonal justice was found to contribute to both interpersonal and organizational deviances. This is probably due to the role of interpersonal justice that occurs in situations that are interpersonal in nature (such as interactions with colleagues or superiors). When the level of interpersonal justice, as perceived by the individuals, was lower such as when individuals perceived unfair interpersonal treatment from their supervisors or superiors, the tendency of the individuals to conduct WD would be higher

(Aquino *et al*., 2004).

However, the result for job satisfaction in the current study is inconsistent with the findings of some previous WD studies (e.g., Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Zhang *et al*., 2006; Mulki *et al*., 2006; Crede *et al*., 2007) which found that job satisfaction was significantly correlated with organizational and interpersonal deviances. The explanation for the insignificant result for job satisfaction in this study is probably due to the fact that most of the respondents were satisfied with their working conditions; therefore, enhanced their job satisfaction in the organization. Satisfied employees would contribute their efforts and assist the organization to reach its desired goals and objectives (Mulki *et al*., 2006).

This study contributed to WD literature by examining both situational and individual factors on WD using data based on a non-western context. Organizations should play a vital role in their attempt to curb WD. Therefore, organizations should have a clear understanding of the disciplinary rules governing the workplace, such as the organizational policy on WD. The rules and regulations will send strong messages to employees who act defiantly, i.e. they will be punished accordingly. In addition, WD policy should also be made clear and transparent to all levels of employees. Training programmes and updated policy manual related to WD would be avenues in which WD policy can be made transparent.

As mentioned above, individuals having high negative affectivity will frequently experiencing negative emotion, and without effective control mechanisms, they will be more likely to commit deviant. In addition, the management should balance their emphasis by demonstrating high concern for people and productivity. High concern for people will alleviate high levels of interpersonal justice in the organization, which then help to reduce the occurrence of WD among employees.

Despite all the efforts and mechanisms provided to prevent WD, organizations should be able to integrate all the efforts from all parties involved, such as employees, employers and policy makers. It is the responsibility of each entity in the organizations to play his/her role in developing, promoting and obeying strategies and the rules of the organizations. In addition, Neuman and Baron (1998) suggested that personal screening, pre-employment testing, and carefully structured job interviews can assist in preventing WD by identifying potential offenders even before they enter the organizations. Organizational effort should also be given to the development of a human centred workplace culture based on respect, tolerance, team work, equal opportunity and support. Besides that, organizations should provide assistance and support to all employees and also ensure that employees are aware of these support systems. The supports cover their personal as well as professional matters.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In this study, the authors were aware of

several factors that might have limited or affected the overall results. It is important to highlight that the study was based on a sample taken from only one occupational sector of private organizations. Therefore, caution needs to be taken when generalizing the findings to other sectors or to other types of occupation, such as the public organizations. Other than that, the accuracy of the data is largely dependent on the respondents' honesty in revealing their true experiences of WD. The respondents may have felt constrained to honestly express their perceptions of deviance because of their feelings of uncertainties with regard to confidentiality.

FUTURE STUDIES

Further studies are needed to clarify other personality variables (e.g., the Big Five) and other situational variables (e.g., other dimensions in organizational justice, such as procedural justice and distributive justice) that may have significant impacts on WD. Other groups of variables that may have potential in predicting WD are job-related variables (e.g., work stressors and job characteristics) and socio demographic variables (e.g., race and work shift). A different approach of study, such as a qualitative study, may also generate more fruitful findings because such studies may uncover other factors that contribute to WD as well as other dimensions of WD, apart from the organizational and interpersonal factors. Finally, future studies should also consider examining the interaction effect between personality and situational variables and their impact on WD.

REFERENCES

Abdul Rahman A. R., & Aizat M. N. (2008). Trust in organizational and WD behavior, the moderating effect of locus of control. *International Journal of Business*, *10*, 211-235.

Abdul Rahman, A. R. (2008). Predictors of WD behavior in Malaysia. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.

Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *59*, 947-965.

Appelbaum, S. H., & Shapiro, B. T. (2006). Diagnosis and remedies for deviant workplace behaviors: Causes, impacts, and solutions. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, *9*(2), 14 -20.

Appelbaum, S., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant behaviors: causes, impacts and solutions. *Corporate Governance, 7*, 586-598.

Aquino, K., Galperin, B., & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *34*, 1001–1029.

Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: a proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 1073-1091.

Awanis, K. I. (2006). *The relationship between deviant behavior among Mara employees in northern Malaysia and its predictors*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.

Aznira, A. Z. (2006). *Emotional intelligence and WD behavior*. (Unpublished Master Thesis dissertation) Universiti Sains Malaysia,

Malaysia.

Bennett, R. J., Aquino, K., Reed II, A., & Thau, S. (2005). The normative nature of employee deviance and the impact of moral identity. In S. Fox and P.E. Spector. (Eds.), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets* (pp. 107-125). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of WD. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 349-360.

Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. Lewicki, M. Bazerman, & B. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *35*, 307-311.

Bruck, C. S., Allen, T. D., & Spector, P. E. (2002). The relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A finer-grained analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *60*, 336-353.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001a). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 386-400.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001b). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 425-445.

Crede, M., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., Dalal, R. S., & Bashshur, M. (2007). Job satisfaction as mediator: An assessment of job satisfaction's position within the nomological network. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 515-538.

Data Asas Melaka. (2010). Portal Rasmi Kerajaan Negeri Melaka. Retrieved on 24 March 2011, from http://www.melaka.gov.my/bm/muat-turun/21-data-asas-melaka-2010.html.

Elangovan, A. R., & Shapiro, D. L. (1998). Betrayal of trust in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 547-566.

Endler, N. S., & Magnusson, D. (1976). Toward an interactional psychology personality. *Psychological Bulletin, 83*, 956-974.

Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, *28*, 1-11

Faridahwati, M. S. (2006). Organisational Misbehavior. *Akademika, 69*, 57-82

Faridahwati, M. S. (2003). WD among hotel employees: An exploratory survey. *Malaysian Management Journal, 7*, 17-33.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS - and Sex, Drugs and Rock 'n' Roll (3rd edition)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Giacalone R. A., & Greenberg J. (1997). *Antisocial Behaviour in Organisations*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Goh, A. (2006). *An attributional analysis of counterproductive work behavior (cwb) in response to occupational stress*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Florida, United States.

Hair, J. F., Tatham, R., Anderson, R., & Black, W. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Henle, C. A. (2005), Predicting WD from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *17*, 247-63.

Hollinger, R., & Clark, J. (1982). Employee deviance: A response to the perceived quality of the work experience. *Work and Occupations*, *9*, 97-114.

Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*. Gainesville, FL: Florida State University, Cooperative Extension Service.

Kommen Prufen Meckern Gehen Forensic. (2004). *Fraud Survey 2004*. KPMG International, Amsterdam.

Krau, E. (2008). Work, creativity, inventions and society. *Man and Work*, *16*, 45-54.

Magnusson, D. (1990). Personality development from an interactionist perspective. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 193–224). New York: Guilford Press.

Malaysia. (2010). *Tenth Malaysia Plan 2011-2015*. Putrajaya: The Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department.

Mazni, A., Tong, Y. K., & Hishamuddin, I. (2008). *Human Resource Manager's Perspective on workplace violence, and its prevention mechanisms*. Symposium conducted at the National Management Conference. Universiti Darul Iman, Trengganu.

McCardle, G. J. (2007). *Organizational justice and WD: The role of organizational structure, powerlessness, and information salience*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando.

Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1992). *Blowing the whistle: The organizational and legal implications for companies and employees*. New York: Lexington.

Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson, & N. S. Endler (Eds.). *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology* (pp. 333-352). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mulki, J. P., Jaramillo, F., & Locander, W. B. (2006). Emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance: Can the right job and a leader's style make a difference? *Journal of Business Research*, *59*, 1222–1230.

Norhayati, Z. (2006). *Occupational stress and WD behavior*. (Unpublished Master Thesis dissertation). Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24*, 391-419.

Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *17*, 47-61.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007). *Organizational behavior (12th Ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, Pearson: Prentice Hall.

Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 349-60.

Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2002). *Counterproductive behaviors at work*. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology: Personnel psychology* (pp. 145–164). London: Sage.

Smithikrai, C. (2008). Moderating effect of situational strength on the relationship between personality traits and counterproductive work behavior. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *11*, 253-263

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox, & P. E.Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151–174). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. London, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063-1070.

Zauwiyah, A., & Mariati, N. (2008). The control environment, employee fraud and counterproductive workplace behaviour: An empirical analysis. *Communications of the IBIMA, 3*, 145–153.

Zauwiyah, A., & Hasmida, J. (2009). *Employees' attitudes towards cyberloafing in Malaysia*. Proceedings of 12th International Business Information Management Association (p. 409-418). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Zhang, S., Chen, X.P., & Chen, G. Q. (2008). *Interpersonal and collective group identities: Differential contribution to business security.* Research Paper sponsored by CIBER. Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from http://www7.gsb.columbia.edu/ciber/sites/default/files/09Zhang(1).pdf.