

The influence of HR practices and job satisfaction on interpersonal deviance in the workplace

FARIDAHWATI MOHD SHAMSUDIN, CHANDRAKANTAN SUBRAMANIAM, AND SUBRAMANIAM SRI RAMALU

Abstract

We examined the influence of human resource practices on interpersonal deviance at work through job satisfaction. A survey was carried out among 372 manufacturing employees of various occupational levels in manufacturing companies in the northern region of Malaysia. We collected data by distributing questionnaires to participants, with the assistance of human resource department. We asked them to indicate how often they know whether any of their workmates engaged in different types of interpersonal deviance. Regression analysis showed that human resource practices of job description, employment security, and internal career opportunities have significant relationships with interpersonal deviance. Hierarchical regression indicated that the dimensions of job satisfaction have a direct relationship with interpersonal deviance. The dimensions also mediated the relationship between human resource practices and interpersonal deviance. Implications to managers and practitioners are discussed.

Keywords: HR practices, job satisfaction, interpersonal deviance, Malaysia, organizational effectiveness

Received 16 August 2013. Accepted 1 April 2014

Organizations are increasingly concerned with the prevalence of aggressive behaviour, bullying, harassment, and incivility at work. A study on 412 'Best Employer' organizations in China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Korea, and Singapore by Yeung and Griffin (2008) revealed that 77% of 116,986 participants reported that they had experienced incivility in the workplace 'in the last year'. Organizations in the United States are also reported to have problems with mistreatment of individuals at work, which is increasingly becoming a common issue (Pearson & Porath, 2005; Porath & Pearson, 2010). As aggressive behaviour, bullying, harassment, and incivility are essentially directed or targeted at individuals within or outside the organization, Robinson and Bennett (1995) referred to them as interpersonal deviance. Specifically, interpersonal deviance is defined as deviant behaviours directly harmful to other individuals within the organization (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). In their review, Bartlett and Bartlett (2011) emphasized the need for organizations to address hostile behaviours because they bring adverse impacts on the organization and its members. They noted that such behaviour has been found to reduce productivity, increase recruitment costs, lower employee morale, increase lawsuits owing to wrongful dismissal, and damage reputation. Employees may also lose their concentration, become stressed, and quit their job, as a result (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011).

OYA Graduate School of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, Malaysia
Corresponding author: faridah@uum.edu.my

Studies on interpersonal deviance have generally focused on individual factors such as personality (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Ménard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011). Other situational or contextual factors in the organization such as abusive leadership or supervision (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007; Tepper, Carr, Breaux, Geider, Hu, & Hua, 2009; Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2009), lack of justice (Parzefall & Salin 2010; Ménard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011), and lack of organizational trust (Celik, Turunc, & Begenirbas, 2011) have also been found to influence interpersonal deviance. However, to date, limited studies have considered human resource (HR) practices, another important facet of work environment (Robbins & Judge, 2010), in affecting interpersonal deviance. This is despite the understanding that HR practices can shape one's attitude and behaviour at work (Robbins & Judge, 2010). Well-implemented HR practices are argued to create conditions where employees become highly involved in their organization and work hard to accomplish the organization's goals (Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Wood & de Menezes, 1998). Furthermore, according to field theory (Lewin & Carthwright, 1951), the environment surrounding an individual determines his/her behaviour. It is therefore reasonable to speculate that interpersonal deviance that occurs in a work setting may be influenced by the work environment.

Past studies have shown that the link between HR practices and work-related outcomes is not direct but purported to be mediated by some processes or mechanisms (Wright, Gardner, & Moynihan, 2003). Several scholars (Gardner, Moynihan, Park, & Wright, 2001; Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003) recommended future studies to consider examining a possible mediating mechanism because the empirical evidence seems to indicate a weak effect of HR practices on work outcomes such as turnover, a form of deviant behaviour, and firm performance.

In the present study, we considered job satisfaction as a potential mediating mechanism in the HR-interpersonal deviance, thus filling the gap in the literature. We propose to assess the mediating effect of job satisfaction because separate studies showed that favourable HR practices enhance job satisfaction (Poon, 2004; Petrescu & Simmons, 2008; Širca, Babnik, & Breznik, 2012), and that job satisfaction is related to negative work outcomes (Hausknecht, Hiller, & Vance, 2008; Singh & Loncar, 2010; Wang & Yi, 2011). By combining these two distinct streams of research, we theorized the linkage of HR practices–job satisfaction–interpersonal deviance. By doing so, we hope to enhance our theoretical understanding on the dynamics and mechanisms of job satisfaction in explaining the effect of HR practices on interpersonal deviance.

Towards this end, we organized this paper as follows: the next section deals with the relevant literatures on interpersonal deviance and deviant workplace behaviour leading towards hypotheses development. Then, a brief method of how we carried out the study is offered. Next, we present the results obtained from the data collected. Finally, we discuss the findings in relation to the literature.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Interpersonal deviance

According to Robinson and Bennett (1995), there are two types of deviant behaviour at work: deviant behaviour targeted at the organization and deviant behaviour targeted at individuals. While the former is referred to as organizational deviance, the latter is known as interpersonal deviance. Examples of organizational deviance include employee theft, absenteeism, and tardiness. Instances of interpersonal deviance include behaviours such as making fun of others, playing mean pranks, making racial slurs, cursing others, and being rude.

In this study, we focused on interpersonal deviance because this behaviour occurs on a daily basis (Pearson & Porath, 2005), often trigger an emotional reaction to the victim such as anger (Phillips & Smith, 2004), which can lead to stress (Perguson & Barry, 2011). Henle, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz

(2005) reported that targets of interpersonal workplace deviance tend to experience work-related stress symptoms such as psychological and physical pain and other negative work outcomes such as high turnover, low morale, and decreased productivity. In their study to develop and validate uncivil workplace behaviour measure among 368 adult employees in Australia, Martin and Hine (2005) demonstrated that victims of workplace incivility are likely to report low job satisfaction, low levels of psychological well-being, health dissatisfaction, high level of psychological distress, and high level of work withdrawal.

Interpersonal deviance can range from minor to major, depending on the degree of harm it inflicts on others (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). While spreading rumours is generally considered minor, physical violence is major. Because of the different varieties and forms of interpersonal deviance, ranging from minor to major, interpersonal deviance can be regarded as an umbrella term that covers all types of behaviours directed at other individuals that threaten the well-being of the organization or its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Concepts such as workplace incivility, bullying, aggression, harassment, and interpersonal mistreatment may well fall within the interpersonal deviancy umbrella, as they involve harming the targets, either verbally or physically (Ménard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011). Though these constructs are theoretically distinct from each other owing to the degree of injury they cause to the target or victim (Ménard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011), they are exhibited intentionally to cause harm (Naimon, Mullins, & Osatuke, 2013). For example, bullying, defined as 'a situation in which one or more persons systematically and over a long period of time perceive themselves to be at the receiving end of negative treatment' (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007: 735), is intended to 'bring mental anguish to a person or a group of people' (Naimon, Mullins, & Osatuke, 2013: 93) as they have difficulty defending themselves (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007). Abusive verbal acts are generally committed to humiliate an individual that can reduce or destroy self-worth (Ménard, Brunet, & Savoie, 2011).

With the advancement of information and communication technology in particular the internet, interpersonal deviance does not only occur offline (i.e., face-to-face) but also online. Scholars now begin to investigate cyber incivility, defined as communicative behaviour exhibited in computer-mediated interactions that violate workplace norms of mutual respect (Lim & Teo, 2009), as a new form of interpersonal deviance at work (Giumetti, McKibben, Hattfield, Schroeder, & Kolwaksi, 2012). Receiving hate emails is an example of such behaviour.

While there is rich literature on specific type of interpersonal deviance such as workplace bullying, sexual harassment, workplace violence, and workplace incivility, literature on general interpersonal deviance is scant. As such, wherever possible, we use the general literature on workplace deviance or on specific type of interpersonal deviance to develop our hypotheses.

Hypothesized relationships: Main effects

HR practices and interpersonal deviance

Generally, HR practices refer to activities conducted by an organization to manage its HR with the objective to fulfil both the organizational and employee goal (Guest, 1997; Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 2009). Although HR practices have been labelled differently in different studies, the core HR practices applied in organizations appear to be staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, and compensation and benefit management. There appears to be overwhelming evidence that indicates a positive link between HR practices and employee outcomes such as employee performance, satisfaction, and commitment (Gould-Williams, 2003; Wright, Gardner, & Moynihan, 2003; Poon, 2004; Petrescu & Simmons, 2008; Širca, Babnik, & Breznik, 2012) as well as withdrawal behavioural reactions such as absenteeism and turnover (Hausknecht, Hiller, & Vance, 2008; Singh & Loncar, 2010; Wang & Yi, 2011). But empirical evidence on the contribution of HR practices to interpersonal deviance is sparse. One such study was by Arthur (2011), who investigated the effect of HR systems on

interpersonal deviance at the organizational level of analysis. Using a basic ability–motivation–opportunity performance model, he posited that organizations with programmes directed towards promoting internal labour market (i.e., long-term employment, internal development, and promotion practices) are expected to be negatively related to organizational interpersonal deviance by impacting both the propensity (ability) and motivation of employees to engage in interpersonal deviance. He found support that HR systems characterized by greater use of internal labour markets are associated with lower frequencies of reported interpersonal deviance behaviours than those that rely on external labour markets. In his study, managers of various organizations across the United States were asked to indicate the organization-level frequency of four interpersonal deviant behaviours – sexual harassment, verbal and written threats, bullying, and incivility, occurred at their establishment ‘over the past year’. While managers are an important source of information, their knowledge may not be accurate as most of the time such behaviours are either not reported (Edwin, 2009; Langton, 2012) or largely go unnoticed (Deblieux, 2003).

The effects of HR practices on general workplace deviance were investigated by Shamsudin, Subramaniam, and Ibrahim (2011) among manufacturing employees in Malaysia. They demonstrated that job description, job security, performance appraisal, and internal career opportunities were negatively related to workplace deviance. Applying social exchange theory, they postulated that when an organization implements HR practices well, this creates a sense of obligation for employees to reciprocate in a good manner (Gouldner, 1960; Wright & Kehoe, 2008). Conversely, when HR practices are seen to be not well implemented, employees will return such ‘favour’ by engaging in deviant behaviour. Tessema and Soeters (2006) found that favourable HR practices enhance employee competence, satisfaction, and role clarity. As a result, employees could contribute better towards the accomplishment of organizational goals. Salin (2008) found that the adoption of ‘sophisticated’ HR practices, defined as the use of employee attitude surveys, formal appraisal systems or development discussions, performance-based pay, and formal training, were able to prevent workplace bullying from occurring in Finnish municipality. Similar finding was reported in an earlier study by Zapf and Gross (2001). They observed that organizational intervention is critical to resolve the problem of workplace bullying and facilitate successful coping of victims. Alshuaibi, Shamsudin, and Subramaniam (2013) found that performance appraisal and career development were able to predict cyberloafing, defined as employees’ non-work-related use of company provided email and the internet while working (Henle & Blanchard, 2008).

Even though the limited evidence indicates that HR practices are linked to reduced workplace deviance, some scholars argue that the poor implementation of HR practices may actually exacerbate it (Klein, 1996; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Salin, 2003). For instance, performance evaluation that gives more emphasis on quantity rather than quality of production may enhance workplace bullying because of increased competition and reduced group cohesion (Klein, 1996). In this context, workplace bullying is committed to discipline or punish employees or team members who are deemed to have violated established production norms (Neuman & Baron, 1998). D’Cruz and Noronha (2010) argued that HRM generally tends to side with the management, leaving the bullied victims to defend their case on their own. In other words, HR practices may create an environment where workplace bullying remains unchallenged and is allowed to flourish (Lewis & Rayner, 2003).

While HR practices may be responsible in exacerbating interpersonal deviance at work such as workplace bullying, some scholars argue that instances of interpersonal deviance can be reduced when those practices are well implemented (Woodrow & Guest, 2014). This is because when implemented well, HR practices such as performance appraisal, reward, and disciplinary systems can serve as an organizational formal control system (de Lara, Tacoronte, & Ding, 2006) in addition to being a preventive intervention strategy. Hence, based on these arguments and the empirical evidence presented earlier, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: HR practices would be negatively related to interpersonal deviance.

Job satisfaction and interpersonal deviance

Job satisfaction is one of the most widely studied work-related attitudes in the fields of industrial and organizational psychology (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction is defined as 'a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences' (Locke, 1976: 1304).

Within the literature on interpersonal deviance, job satisfaction is primarily treated as one of the workplace outcomes (e.g., Merkin, 2008; Pseekos, Bullock-Yowell, & Dahlen, 2011; Glaso & Notelaers, 2012) and *not* as an antecedent. We argue that in the context of the present study, job satisfaction may reduce interpersonal deviance, following the definition of Locke. As well-implemented HR practices can induce a positive emotional experience of employees, they will be less likely to manifest such feeling in negative behaviour (Wong & Law, 2002). Even though studies that looked into the effect of job satisfaction on general workplace deviance and specifically on interpersonal deviance are almost non-existent, we propose a theoretical link by invoking social exchange theory (Levinson, 1965; Gould, 1979) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960).

Social exchange theory predicts that individuals who perceive that they are receiving unfavourable treatment are more likely to feel angry, vengeful, and dissatisfied. Consistent with the norms of reciprocity, when individuals are dissatisfied with the organization, they may reciprocate with negative work behaviours such as withholding effort, arriving late at work, taking longer break times, leaving early, and so forth.

Based on a meta-analysis of 25 studies and a sample size of 6,106, Dalal (2005) reported a correlation coefficient of 0.28 between overall job satisfaction and measures of deviant behaviour. Furthermore, in a recent repeated-measures (longitudinal) field study, Judge, Scott, and Ilies (2006) found that employees reported engaging in more deviant behaviours on days when they are less satisfied with their jobs, compared with days when they are more satisfied. Logic would dictate that there would be a significant inverse relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal deviance. Based on the reasoning above, we hypothesize a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal deviance. Therefore we propose that:

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction would be negatively related to interpersonal deviance.

HR practices and job satisfaction

There is overwhelming evidence that indicates a significant positive relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction (Bradley, Petrescu, & Simmons, 2004; Poon, 2004; Petrescu & Simmons, 2008; Širca, Babnik, & Breznik, 2012). Gould-Williams (2003) studied the effect of bundle of HR practices on behavioural outcomes (e.g., workplace trust, job satisfaction, commitment, effort, and perceived organizational performance). Using data of 191 workers in UK's local government employees, they indicated that HR practices positively affect job satisfaction, which subsequently leads to heightened effort, intention to remain, and organizational performance.

Consistent with psychological climate theory (James, Hater, Gent, & Bruni, 1978; Koys & DeCotiis, 1991), good HR practices set conducive work conditions and environment that make employees feel satisfied and motivated towards the accomplishment of their job performance (Lee & Wu, 2011), which subsequently determines their behavioural responses at work.

Drawing from above empirical evidence, we propose the following:

Hypothesis 3: HR practices would be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesized relationships: Mediated effects

We hypothesize that HR practices influence interpersonal deviance through job satisfaction. According to Becker, Huselid, Pickus, and Spratt (1997), HRM practices operate to enhance

employee skills, capability, and motivation, resulting in behavioural outcomes such as creativity, productivity, and discretionary effort, which are expected to contribute to organizational performance. In line with this contention, previous research has shown that HR practices are distal variables that influence behaviours through the mediating effects of proximal motivation processes (e.g., Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Haines, Jalette, & Laros, 2010; Huselid & Becker, 2011; Jiang, Lepak, Hu, & Baer, 2012). Scholars also seem to agree that HR practices and policies do not directly shape employee attitudes and behaviour; rather there exists a generative mechanism that explains how those practices are able to influence them (e.g., Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Huselid & Becker, 2011). We argue that HR practices can predict interpersonal deviance because they influence individuals' attitudinal reactions to their job (Tessema & Soeters, 2006), which, in turn, affects employees' level of engagement in deviant behaviour. Following Locke (1976) definition that job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences, we propose that well-implemented HR practices can produce such affective response. Hence, we postulate that:

Hypothesis 4: Job satisfaction mediated HR practices-interpersonal deviance relationships.

METHOD

Research sample and data collection procedures

We carried out a survey among manufacturing employees of various occupational levels in various manufacturing companies in the northern region of Malaysia. We collected data by distributing questionnaires to participants. Before we distributed the questionnaires, we solicited permission from by the management of various companies to facilitate us with the data collection process. We informed the participants that they could choose to mail the complete survey to us (addressed envelopes were provided) or pass it to the HR department for later collection. We told the participants that their responses would not be disclosed to the management although we had obtained their approval to conduct the study. To secure participation, we informed the participants that their anonymity would be guaranteed. By doing so, we ensured that the objectivity of the responses given was not suspect. We distributed the questionnaires with the assistance of HR department of the companies. The questionnaire took ~ 20 min to complete.

We distributed a total of 400 self-reported questionnaires. After 2 months of data collection, we received 372 questionnaires either by mail or by personal collection, yielding a response rate of 93%. All returned questionnaires were valid for final data analysis. The profile of the participants is as follows: more than half were male (74.7%), were married (62.5%), and Malays (90.8%). The majority of them had high school diploma or certificate (82.8%) and were non-executive employees (73.1%). The mean age of the respondents was 30.79 years and the mean length of service was 6.97 years.

Measures

Interpersonal workplace deviance

We measured interpersonal workplace deviance by 5 items developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000). We chose this instrument because it has been widely employed in previous studies that investigated interpersonal deviance and it has good psychometric properties. For instance, Shao, Resick, and Hargis (2011) reported a reliability of 0.85 of this instrument and Liao, Joshi, and Chuang (2004) indicated a reliability of 0.83. Instead of using self-reported measures, we asked the participants to indicate, while in the job, how often they know any of their workmates, who, for example, 'Made fun of someone (other workmates, guests, etc.) while at work', 'Said something

hurtful to someone while at work', 'Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work', and 'Played a mean prank on someone at work'. We used a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 = 'never' to 5 = 'all the time' to measure the variable. We decided to ask the participants to report their workmates' interpersonal deviance for several reasons. First, we acknowledge that self-reported measures, especially of negative behaviour, are prone to criticisms centred on social desirability biases as respondents may attempt to 'fake good', thus biasing the results (Sackett & Harris, 1984; Sackett, Bums, & Callahan, 1989). Second, we wish to reduce common method variance common in behavioural research (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Furthermore, we believe that using a third party to report interpersonal deviance at work is valid because victims tend not to report cases of harassment and bullying at work owing to potential intimidation and harassment (Langton, 2012) and tend to resort to friends or other family members for support (Cortina & Magley, 2003). Finally, according to Arthur (2011), research has shown that data on workplace deviance frequencies reported by supervisors and co-workers in an organization are similar to those collected from self-reports.

HR practices

We used a 23-item instrument of Delery and Doty (1996) to measure a range of HR practices on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = 'strongly disagree' to 5 = 'strongly agree'. We asked participants to indicate their level of agreement (or disagreement) with regards to the HR practices in their organization on items such as, 'The job description for this job contains all of the duties performed by individual employees', 'Performance appraisals are based on objective, quantifiable results' and 'Job security is almost guaranteed to employees in this job'. The internal consistency reliability coefficient for these scales has been reported to range from 0.64 to 0.80 (Delery & Doty, 1996).

Job satisfaction

We employed the instrument of Schnake (1983) that consists of 7 items. We asked participants to indicate their level of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with regard to item such as, 'How satisfied are you with the fringe benefits you receive', 'How satisfied are you with the chances you have to do something that makes you feel good about yourself as a person', and 'How satisfied are you with the friendliness of the people you work with'. We used a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 = 'very dissatisfied' to 5 = 'very satisfied' to measure all items. Previous study has reported the internal consistency reliability coefficients for these scales ranging from 0.64 to 0.86 (Schnake, 1983).

RESULTS

We ran factor analysis with principle component analysis employing an orthogonal varimax rotation to ascertain the validity of the measures of HR practices, job satisfaction, and interpersonal deviance. We used the criterion by Igarria, Iivari, and Maragah (1995) to identify and interpret factors in that each item should load 0.50 or greater on one factor and 0.35 or lower on the other factor. With respect to HR practices, we found a four-factor solution that explained 67.90% variance, as shown in Table 1. We found that the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.841 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 1,544.494$, $p < .01$), indicating sufficient intercorrelations for the factor analysis. Job description explained 38.41% variance, employment security 10.59%, result-oriented appraisal 9.78%, and internal career opportunity 9.13%.

With respect to job satisfaction, factor analysis yielded a two-factor solution, which explained 66.034% variance, as shown in Table 2. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.803 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 872.286$, $p < .01$), indicating sufficient

TABLE 1. FACTOR ANALYSIS OF HR PRACTICES

Human resource practices items	Components			
	1	2	3	4
Factor 1: Job description				
1. Superiors keep open communications with employees in this job	0.658	0.282	0.179	0.150
2. The duties of this job are clear defined	0.850	0.086	0.119	0.166
3. This job has an up-to-date job description	0.837	0.140	0.105	0.194
4. The job description for this job contains all of the duties performed by individual employees	0.762	0.130	0.222	0.080
Factor 2: Employment security				
1. Employees in this job can expect to stay in the organizations for as long as they wish	0.251	0.709	0.197	0.162
2. It is very difficult to dismiss an employee in this job	0.046	0.765	0.182	0.098
3. Job security is almost guaranteed to employees in this job	0.183	0.737	0.048	0.112
Factor 3: Result oriented appraisal				
1. Performance is more often measured with objective quantifiable results	0.219	0.161	0.871	0.153
2. Performance appraisals are based on objective, quantifiable results	0.229	0.114	0.886	0.119
Factor 4: Internal career opportunities				
1. Employees in this job who desire promotion have more than one potential position they could be promoted to	0.127	0.206	0.205	0.650
2. Extensive training programs are provided for individuals in this job	0.343	0.128	0.164	0.623
3. Employees in this job will normally go through training programs every few years	0.080	0.062	0.018	0.856
Eigenvalue	4.609	1.271	1.173	1.095
Percentage of variance explained = 67.904%	38.408	10.593	9.775	9.128
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin = 0.841				
Bartlett’s test of sphericity $\sim \chi^2 = 1,544.494$; $df = 66$; significance = .000				

The bold value indicates that these items are mutually inclusive to form a construct and that they are mutually exclusive from the other constructs.

TABLE 2. FACTOR ANALYSIS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Human resource practices items	Components		
	1	2	α
Factor 1: Satisfaction with tangible rewards			0.772
1. How satisfied are you with the fringe benefits you receive	0.745	0.131	
2. How satisfied are you with the chances you have to learn new things	0.688	0.309	
3. How satisfied are you with the amount of pay you get	0.793	0.121	
4. How satisfied are you with the chances you have to do something that makes you feel good about yourself as a person	0.775	0.176	
Factor 2: Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships			0.822
1. How satisfied are you with the friendliness of the people you work with	0.131	0.827	
2. How satisfied are you with the respect you receive from the people you work with	0.210	0.843	
3. How satisfied are you with the way you are treated by the people you work with	0.231	0.834	
Eigenvalue	3.334	1.289	
Percentage of variance explained = 66.034%	47.626	18.408	
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin = 0.803			
Bartlett's test of sphericity $\sim \chi^2 = 872.286$; $df = 21$; significance = .000			

TABLE 3. FACTOR ANALYSIS OF DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR

Workplace deviance items	Factor loading
	1
1. Made fun of someone (other workmates, guests, etc.) while at work?	0.763
2. Said something hurtful to someone while at work?	0.825
3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work?	0.760
4. Cursed at someone at work?	0.882
5. Played a mean prank on someone at work?	0.903
Percentage of variance explained (%)	68.676
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin	0.832
Bartlett's test of sphericity $\sim \chi^2$	1,055.942
df	10
Significance level	.000

intercorrelations for the factor analysis. We then labelled the two factors as satisfaction with tangible rewards and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. While the former explained 47.63% variance, the latter 18.41%.

While for interpersonal deviance, factor analysis yielded a single factor solution explaining 68.676% variance, as shown in Table 3. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.832 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 1,055.942$, $p < .01$).

Table 4 presents the means, internal reliability value (Cronbach's α), and intercorrelations of the variables. We obtained Cronbach's α s for the measures of 0.84 (job description), 0.67 (employment security), 0.86 (result-oriented appraisal), 0.63 (internal career opportunities), and 0.89 (interpersonal deviance). Measures of internal career opportunities and employment security were found to be lower than 0.70; however, according to Nunnally (1978), Cronbach's α above 0.60 is acceptable for

TABLE 4. CORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MAIN VARIABLES

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Job description	3.53	0.72	(0.84)						
Employment security	3.28	0.69	0.44**	(0.67)					
Result-oriented appraisal	3.48	0.78	0.42**	0.36**	(0.86)				
Internal career opportunities	3.31	0.68	0.51**	0.41**	0.38**	(0.63)			
Satisfaction with relationship	3.18	0.72	0.54**	0.51**	0.43**	0.50**	(0.81)		
Satisfaction with rewards	3.67	0.68	0.48**	0.23**	0.22**	0.31**	0.43**	(0.87)	
Workplace deviance	2.07	0.70	-0.26**	-0.25**	-0.17**	-0.26**	-0.23**	0.37**	(0.89)

Notes: Coefficient α s are presented along the diagonal.

** $p < .01$.

research purpose. As depicted in Table 4, most participants agreed that HR practices are important as indicated by the high mean values. Low to moderate intercorrelations between the main variables were found, thus eliminating the possibility of multicollinearity, a situation where the independent variables are found to have high correlation between them (>0.75), which can be a serious violation in multiple regression analysis.

Hypothesis testing

Main effects

Table 5 depicts the results of the test for hypothesized main effects. Support for H1 requires a significant negative relationship between HR practices and interpersonal deviance. This hypothesis is partially supported, as the result indicated that only three HR practices are significantly related to interpersonal deviance. HR practices of job description ($\beta = -0.13$), employment security ($\beta = -0.14$), and internal career opportunities ($\beta = -0.13$) are negatively related to interpersonal deviance ($p < .05$). Result-oriented appraisal ($\beta = -0.01$, $p > .05$) is not significantly related to interpersonal deviance.

Support for H2 requires a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal deviance. This hypothesis is fully supported, as the result indicated that satisfaction with tangible rewards ($\beta = -0.23$) and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships ($\beta = -0.37$) are negatively related to interpersonal deviance ($p < .05$).

Support for H3 requires a significant positive relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction. Result indicated that only job description ($\beta = 0.43$, $p < .05$) is found positively related to satisfaction with tangible rewards dimension. As for satisfaction with interpersonal relationships, we found all four HR practices to be positively related: job description ($\beta = 0.27$), employment security ($\beta = 0.26$), result-oriented appraisal ($\beta = 0.15$), and internal career opportunities ($\beta = 0.19$), at $p < .05$. Hence, it is fair to conclude that H3 is partially supported for the dependent variable involving satisfaction with tangible rewards and is fully supported for satisfaction with interpersonal relationships.

Mediated effects

Support for the mediation hypothesis requires the following conditions: the independent variable must significantly impact the mediating variable in the first step; the independent variable must significantly impact the dependent (criterion) variable in the second step; and in the third step, the mediator variable must impact the dependent (criterion) variable, and at the same time the impact of the independent variable on the dependent must either become insignificant (total mediation) or

TABLE 5. MEDIATING EFFECTS OF JOB SATISFACTION ON HR PRACTICES AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR

Independent variables	Dependent variable				
	Step 1		Step 2	Step 3	
	Satisfaction with rewards (Model 1A)	Satisfaction with relationship (Model 2A)	Deviant behaviour (Models 1B, 2B)	Deviant behaviour (Model 1C)	Deviant behaviour (Model 2C)
Predictors					
Job description	0.43**	0.27**	-0.13*	-0.00	-0.12
Employment security	0.000	0.26**	-0.14*	-0.13*	-0.13*
Appraisal	0.000	0.15**	-0.01	-0.12	-0.01
Internal career	0.09	0.19**	-0.13*	0.10	-0.12
Mediator					
Satisfaction with rewards				-0.23**	
Satisfaction with relationship					-0.37*
R^2	0.23	0.44	10.4	0.17	10.4
Adjusted R^2	0.22	0.43	0.1	0.16	0.01
F	25.201	64.830	9.571	13.875	7.682

become significant but the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable would be reduced in size (partial mediation) (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Mediation of satisfaction with tangible rewards: In order to examine the mediating influence of satisfaction with tangible rewards dimension, we performed a hierarchical regression analysis by following the steps suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986). In the first step, we entered HR practices as the independent variables and satisfaction with tangible rewards as the dependent variable. We found a significant influence of HR practices on satisfaction with tangible rewards ($F = 25.201, p = .001$). HR practices explained 23.3% of the total variance in satisfaction with tangible rewards. We found job description dimension of HR practices only to be positively related to satisfaction with tangible rewards ($\beta = 0.43, p < .001$). The significant result fulfilled the requirement for first step in the mediating test.

The second step involved running regression analysis with interpersonal deviance as the dependent variable while the HR practices entered as the independent variables. Result indicated a significant influence of HR practices on interpersonal deviance ($F = 9.571, p = .001$). HR practices explained 10.4% of the total variance in interpersonal deviance. Job description was found significantly related to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = -0.13, p < .05$). The significant result found fulfilled the second step for mediating test of satisfaction with tangible rewards with job description as the independent variable and interpersonal deviance as the dependent variable.

The final step involved running another regression where we entered HR practices and satisfaction with tangible rewards as the independent variables, and interpersonal deviance as the dependent variable. Satisfaction with tangible rewards ($\beta = -0.23, p < .05$) was found significantly related to interpersonal deviance in step 3 (see Table 5). The independent variable of job description in step 3 became insignificant ($\beta = 0.00, p > .05$) when the mediating variable of satisfaction with tangible rewards was entered into the regression equation (see models 1A, 1B, and 1C in Table 5). As the β value for job description decreased and became insignificant, we can say that satisfaction with tangible rewards fully mediates the relationship between job description and workplace deviance, following Baron and Kenny's (1986) recommendation. We also run the Sobel (1982) z test (not shown here) to test whether the mediator (satisfaction with tangible rewards) carries the influence of job description on interpersonal deviance. We found significant result at $p < .05$.

Mediation of satisfaction with interpersonal relationships: We employed a similar procedure in testing the mediating effect of satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. In step 1, we entered HR practices as the independent variable and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships as the dependent variable. We found a significant influence of HR practices on satisfaction with interpersonal relationships ($F = 64.830, p = .001$). HR practices explained 44% of the total variance in satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. Job description ($\beta = 0.27$), employment security ($\beta = 0.26$), result-oriented appraisal ($\beta = 0.15$), and internal career opportunities ($\beta = 0.19$) were found to be positively related to satisfaction with interpersonal relationships at $p < .05$. The significant result found fulfilled the requirement for the first step in the mediating test.

The second step involved running regression analysis with interpersonal deviance entered as the dependent variable while HR practices entered as the independent variable. We found a significant influence of HR practices on interpersonal deviance ($F = 9.571, p = .001$). HR practices explained 10.4% of the total variance in deviant behaviour. Job description was found to be negatively related to interpersonal deviance ($\beta = -0.13, p < .05$). In addition, employment security ($\beta = -0.14$) and internal career opportunities ($\beta = -0.13$) were found to be negatively related to interpersonal deviance at $p < .05$. The significant result found fulfilled the second step in the mediating test of satisfaction with interpersonal relationships.

The final step involved running another regression where we entered HR practices and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships as the independent variables, and interpersonal deviance as the dependent variable. Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships ($\beta = -0.37, p < .05$) was found to be significantly related to interpersonal deviance in step 3 (see Table 5). The independent variable of job description ($\beta = -0.12, p > .05$) and internal career opportunities ($\beta = -0.12, p > .05$) in step 3 became insignificant when the mediating variable of satisfaction with interpersonal relationships was entered into the regression equation (see models 2A, 2B, and 2C in Table 5). Employment security ($\beta = -0.13, p < .05$), however, was found to be significant and the β value decreased in size compared with what was found in step 2. Hence, we can say that satisfaction with interpersonal relationships fully mediates the relationship between job description, internal career opportunities, and interpersonal deviance, as proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). But satisfaction with interpersonal relationships was found to partially mediate the relationship between employment security and interpersonal deviance. This is because the β value for employment security decreased but still remained significant after the inclusion of the mediator. We also performed the Sobel (1982) z test (not shown here) to test whether the mediator (satisfaction with interpersonal relationships) carries the influence of job description, internal career opportunities, and employment security to interpersonal deviance. We found significant result at $p < .05$. Based on the mediation results for satisfaction with tangible rewards and interpersonal relationships, we can conclude that H4 is partially supported.

DISCUSSION

Regardless of their nature, interpersonal deviance is costly to organizations and detrimental to employees' quality of work life. Hence, there is keen interest in understanding its antecedents. Though limited in number, prior studies have established the linkages between HR practices and interpersonal deviance (e.g., Arthur, 2011; Shamsudin, Subramaniam, & Ibrahim 2011), between HR practices and job satisfaction (Petrescu & Simmons, 2008; Sirca, Babnik, & Breznik, 2012), and between job satisfaction and deviant behaviour (Dalal, 2005; Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006). These two separate lines of studies have provided insights into the role of HR practices and job satisfaction in predicting interpersonal deviance at the workplace, and lay a foundation for the present study to investigate the interrelationships among these variables in a single framework.

The present study contributes in several ways to understanding interpersonal deviance at work. First, the results of regression analysis on the main effects showed that HR practices of job description, employment security, and internal career opportunities have significant relationships with interpersonal deviance, which appear to be consistent with the findings in prior research (e.g., Arthur, 2011; Shamsudin, Subramaniam, & Ibrahim, 2011).

Second, the findings also contribute to the literature by showing that both satisfaction with tangible rewards and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships are related to interpersonal deviance. This means that individuals who are satisfied are less likely to engage in interpersonal deviance at work. While researchers like Mount, Ilies, & Johnson (2006) studied general job satisfaction in relation to deviant behaviour, the present study extends their work by examining two distinct, yet related dimensions of job satisfaction namely satisfaction with tangible rewards and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships.

Our study contributes to theory by demonstrating the joint relationships among HR practices, job satisfaction, and interpersonal deviance. An important finding here is that the dimensions of job satisfaction not only have a direct relationship with interpersonal deviance, but they also mediate the relationship between relevant HR practices and interpersonal deviance. Specifically, satisfaction with tangible rewards fully mediates the relationship between job description and interpersonal deviance and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships fully mediates the relationship between job description, internal career opportunities, and interpersonal deviance. In addition, satisfaction with

interpersonal relationships partially mediates the relationship between employment security and interpersonal deviance. The full mediation suggests that HR practices influence job satisfaction, which in turn leads to interpersonal deviance. Understanding how employees evaluate their jobs is an important step to explain the mechanism through which HR practices influence interpersonal deviance at work. As for the partial mediation, the finding demonstrates that in addition to indirect influence on interpersonal deviance, HR practices also have direct influence on it, indicating a rather weak mediation effect of job satisfaction on the HR practices-deviant behaviour relationship.

In sum, the findings are important for managers as they show that good HR practices are able to contribute to an employee's positive assessment of his/her job, which manifests in reduced interpersonal deviance. Hence, implementing good HR practices that allow employees to grow within the organization and to develop social relations are beneficial to reduce interpersonal deviance.

Managerial implications

The findings have important practical implications to HR managers. As contended by Woodrow and Guest (2014), for HR practices to facilitate in the accomplishment of employee performance, they should be effectively implemented. In particular, the HR practices need to be implemented in such a way that they could reduce interpersonal conflict and deviance at work.

With regards to job description, for instance, HR managers should clearly define duties, roles, and responsibilities of individual employees and have up-to-date job description. In today's dynamic and fast-paced work environment where roles tend to be blurred as employees strive to accomplish their job performance, conflict among workers tend to occur. As interpersonal conflict is a precursor to interpersonal deviance (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013), it is imperative that managers clarify what employees are expected to do, especially when the job requires that employees work interdependently and use their discretion to accomplish the task (Jagoda, 2013). It has been demonstrated that when employees are not clear of their role at work, they will feel stressed and may engage in deviant behaviour at work, as a result (Chen & Spector, 1992).

Another HR practice managers need to be concerned with is providing employees with internal career opportunities, as they have been shown to affect interpersonal deviance. According to Maslow's theory, people are motivated to work when they are given opportunities to develop themselves. As career growth has a motivational function, managers can use internal career opportunities as a way to reduce interpersonal conflict and deviance at work. By communicating clearly that career growth is tied with good performance and behaviour, employees will be discouraged from engaging in negative behaviours at work since doing so may jeopardize their chances to develop their career.

In addition to career immobility owing to interpersonal deviance, managers can also use employment security to leverage their position. Delery and Doty (1996) argued that organizations providing higher degree of job security convey a clear message that the organization has a long-standing commitment to its workforce. It was found that when people feel that their job is secure, they are more motivated to work, and less likely to engage in deviant behaviour (Reisel, Probst, Chia, Maloles, & König, 2010). Hence, the ability of an organization to secure employment of its employees will reduce poor and negative behaviours at work.

Limitations

There are several limitations of the study. First, though self-reported measures are often used to indicate deviant behaviour experienced by employees, we believe that peer reported measure is also valid to gauge the extent of interpersonal deviant behaviour demonstrated by employees at work, as mentioned earlier. However, a singular assessment has its inherent biases and weaknesses

(Sackett & Harris, 1984; Podsakoff et al., 2003) it is suggested that future research should include assessment from multiple sources including peers, subordinates, and superiors to provide a comprehensive picture of deviant behaviour.

Second, although the results of our model provide a useful, parsimonious framework for other researchers to build on, ours is underspecified. For example, perceptual variables that could moderate some of the relationships were not included in this study. One area of research that appears to be relevant to understanding deviance behaviour is organizational justice, that is, employees' perception of unfairness at work (e.g., Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006). Research shows that different justice perceptions among employees are related uniquely to variables of interest in this study namely job satisfaction and deviance behaviour (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Further, Judge, Scott, and Ilies (2006) found interpersonal justice influences workplace deviance through job dissatisfaction. Hence, although we believe that individuals' perception towards organizational HR practices and work experiences (job satisfaction) play a central motivational role in explaining employees' engagement in deviance behaviour, perceptual variables such as organizational justice and organizational commitment may also play an important explanatory role. In addition to perceptual variables, certain situational variables may also influence HR practices–job satisfaction–deviant behaviour relationships such as leadership style, corporate culture, and ethical climate. We recognize that the inclusion of perceptual and situational variables may be useful for future researcher to examine.

Further, a cross-sectional study design as opted in this study restricts the ability to prove a cause–effect relationship. Our aim was to develop and test a parsimonious model that was grounded in both theory and previous research. Our results showed that the hypothesized model is a plausible explanation for the joint relationships of HR practices and job satisfaction on deviant behaviour. However, owing to the cross-sectional nature of our data, caution must be exercised when inferring causal relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on the manuscript.

References

- Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 99–118.
- Alshuaibi, A., Shamsudin, F. M., & Subramaniam, C. (2013). Do human resource management practices matter in reducing cyberloafing at work: Evidence from Jordan. *Journal of WEI Business and Economics*, 2(2), 1–11.
- Arthur, J. B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 670–687.
- Arthur, J. B. (2011). HR system characteristics affect the frequency of interpersonal deviance in organizations? The role of team autonomy and internal labor market practices. *Industrial Relations*, 50(1), 30–56.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
- Bartlett, J. E., & Bartlett, II M. E. (2011). Workplace bullying: An integrative literature review. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(1), 69–84.
- Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., Pickus, P. S., & Spratt, M. F. (1997). HR as a source of shareholder value: Research and recommendations. *Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 39–47.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360.

- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 410–424.
- Bradley, S., Petrescu, A., & Simmons, R. (2004). *The impacts of human resource management practices and pay inequality on workers' job satisfaction*. Paper presented at the Western Economic Association 79th Annual Conference, June 29–July 3, 2004, Vancouver, Canada.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 15*, 280–299.
- Celik, M., Turunc, O., & Begebirbas, M. (2011). The role of organizational trust, burnout and interpersonal deviance for achieving organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 3*(2), 179–189.
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*, 177–184.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analysis of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 425–445.
- Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2003). Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 8*(4), 247–265.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241–1255.
- D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2010). Protecting my interests: HRM and targets' coping with workplace bullying. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(3), 507–534.
- Deblieux, M. (2003). Stopping sexual harassment before it starts: A business and legal perspective. Retrieved from <ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/GU/training/StoppingSexualHarassmentBeforeItStarts.pdf>.
- de Lara, P. Z. M., Tacoronte, D. V., & Ding, J. M. T. (2006). Do current anti-cyberloafing disciplinary practices have a replica in research findings? A study of the effects of coercive strategies on workplace internet misuse. *Internet Research, 16*(4), 450–467.
- Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(4), 802–835.
- Edwin, B. M. (2009). *Nature and effects of sexual harassment of teachers in special and regular secondary schools in central province, Kenya*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Gardner, T. M., Moynihan, L. M., Park, H. J., & Wright, P. M. (2001). Beginning to unlock the black box in the HR firm performance relationship: The impact of HR practices on employee attitudes and employee outcomes (CAHRS Working Paper #01–12). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies. <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/75>
- Giumetti, G. W., McKibben, E. S., Hatfield, A. L., Schroeder, A. N., & Kowalski, R. M. (2012). Cyber incivility@work: The new age of interpersonal deviance. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15*(3), 148–154.
- Glaso, L., & Notelaers, G. (2012). Workplace bullying, emotions, and outcomes. *Violence and Victims, 27*(3), 360–377.
- Gould, S. (1979). An equity-exchange model of organizational involvement. *Academy of Management Review, 4*, 53–62.
- Gould-Williams, J. (2003). The importance of HR practices and workplace trust in achieving superior performance: A study of public-sector organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*(1), 28–54.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*(2), 161–178.
- Guest, D. E. (1997). Human resource management and performance: A review and research agenda. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 8*(3), 263–276.
- Haines, V. Y., Jalette, P., & Larose, K. (2010). The influence of human resource management practices on employee voluntary turnover rates in the Canadian non governmental sector. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review, 63*, 228–246.
- Hausknecht, J. P., Hiller, N. J., & Vance, R. J. (2008). Work-unit absenteeism: Effects of satisfaction, commitment, labor market conditions, and time. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(6), 1223–1245.
- Henle, C. A., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2005). The role of ethical ideology in workplace deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 56*, 219–230.

- Henle, C., & Blanchard, A. (2008). The interaction of work stressors and organizational sanctions on cyberloafing. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(3), 383–400.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 635–672.
- Huselid, M. A., & Becker, B. E. (2011). Bridging micro and macro domains: Workforce differentiation and strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 37, 421–428.
- Igbaria, M., Iivari, J., & Maragah, H. (1995). Why do individuals use computer technology? A Finnish case study. *Information and Management*, 5, 227–238.
- Jagoda (2013). Five actions managers can take to reduce workplace conflict. Retrieved from <http://www.conflicttango.com/five-actions-managers-can-take-to-reduce-workplace-conflict/>.
- James, L. R., Hater, J. J., Gent, M. J., & Bruni, J. R. (1978). Psychological climate: Implications from cognitive social learning theory and interactional psychology. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 783–813.
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264–1294.
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 126–138.
- Klein, S. M. (1996). Work pressure as a determinant of work group behavior. *Small Group Research*, 27(2), 299–315.
- Koys, D. J., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1991). Inductive measures of psychological climate. *Human Relations*, 44(3), 49–58.
- Langton, L. (2012). Victimization not reported to the police, 2006–2010. Special Report: National Crime Victimization Survey, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/vnrp0610.pdf>.
- Lee, F-H., & Wu, W-Y. (2011). The relationships between person-organization fit, psychological climate adjustment, personality traits, and innovative climate: Evidence from Taiwanese high-tech expatriate managers in Asian countries. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(15), 6415–6428.
- Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9, 370–390.
- Lewin, K., & Cartwright, D. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Lewis, D., & Rayner, C. (2003). Bullying and human resource management: A wolf in sheep's clothing?. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace* (pp. 370–382). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Liao, H., Joshi, A., & Chuang, A. (2004). Sticking out like a sore thumb: Employee dissimilarity and deviance at work. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(4), 969–1000.
- Lim, V. K., & Teo, T. S. (2009). Mind your E-manners: Impact of cyber incivility on employees' work attitude and behavior. *Information & Management*, 46(8), 419–425.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Martin, R., & Hine, D. (2005). Development and validation of the Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 477–490.
- Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: Role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims*, 22(6), 735–753.
- Ménard, J., Brunet, L., & Savoie, A. (2011). Interpersonal workplace deviance: Why do offenders act out? A comparative look on personality and organisational variables. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 43(4), 309–317.
- Merkin, R. S. (2008). The impact of sexual harassment on turnover intentions, absenteeism, and job satisfaction: Findings from Argentina, Brazil and Chile. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 10(2), 73–91.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159–1168.
- Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 591–622.
- Naimon, E. C., Mullins, M. E., & Osatuke, K. (2013). The effects of personality and spirituality on workplace incivility perceptions. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 10(1), 91–110.

- 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(3), 391–419.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B. A., & Wright, P. M. (2009). *Human resource management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Parzefall, M.-R., & Salin, D. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to workplace bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 63, 761–780.
- Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences, and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for 'nice'? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19, 7–18.
- Perguson, M., & Barry, B. (2011). I know what you did: The effects of interpersonal deviance on bystanders. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(1), 80–94.
- Petrescu, A. I., & Simmons, R. (2008). Human resource management practices and workers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(7), 651–667.
- Phillips, T., & Smith, P. (2004). Emotional and behavioural responses to everyday incivility: Challenging the fear/avoidance paradigm. *Journal of Sociology*, 40, 378–399.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879–903.
- Poon, J. M. L. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 33(3), 322–334.
- Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2010). The cost of bad behaviour. *Organizational Dynamics*, 39, 64–71.
- Pseekos, A. C., Bullock-Yowell, E., & Dahlen, E. R. (2011). Examining Holland's person-environment fit, workplace aggression, interpersonal conflict, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Employment Counselling*, 48(2), 63–71.
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S.-L., Maloles III, C. M., & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour, deviant behaviour, and negative emotions of employees. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 40(1), 74–91.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2010). *Organizational behaviour* (14th ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Sackett, P. R., Bums, L. R., & Callahan, C. (1989). Integrity testing for personnel selection: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 491–528.
- Sackett, P. R., & Harris, M. M. (1984). Honesty testing for personnel selection: A review and critique. *Personnel Psychology*, 32, 221–245.
- Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, 56(10), 1213–1232.
- Salin, D. (2008). The prevention of workplace bullying as a question of human resource management: Measures adopted and underlying organizational factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 24(3), 221–231.
- Schnake, M. E. (1983). An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 791–807.
- Shamsudin, F. M., Subramaniam, C., & Ibrahim, H. (2011). HR practices and deviant behaviour at work: An exploratory study. *International Proceedings of Economics Development & Research*, 16, 13–17.
- Shao, P., Resick, C. J., & Hargis, M. B. (2011). Helping and harming others in the workplace: The roles of personal values and abusive supervision. *Human Relations*, 64(8), 1051–1078.
- Singh, P., & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and turnover intent. *Industrial Relations*, 65(3), 470–490.
- Širca, N. T., Babnik, K., & Breznik, K. (2012). *The relationship between human resource development system and job satisfaction*. Paper presented at the Management, Knowledge and Learning International Conference, 20–22 June, 2012, Celje, Slovenia.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. California: Sage.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological methodology* (pp. 290–312). Washington DC: American Sociological Association.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, S. M., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behaviour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80–92.

- Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, *109*, 156–167.
- Tessema, M. T., & Soeters, J. L. (2006). Challenges and prospects of HRM in developing countries: Testing the HRM–performance link in the Eritrean civil service. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *17*(1), 86–105.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R. J., Mitchell, M. S., & Marrs, M. S. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*, 79–92.
- Wang, S., & Yi, X. (2011). It's happiness that counts: Full mediating effect of job satisfaction on the linkage from LMX to turnover intention in Chinese companies. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *6*(3), 337–356.
- Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(3), 243–274.
- Wood, S., & de Menezes, L. (1998). High commitment management in the UK: Evidence from the Workplace Industrial Relations Survey, and Employers' Manpower and Skills Practices Survey. *Human Relations*, *51*(4), 485–515.
- Woodrow, C., & Guest, D. E. (2014). When good HR gets bad results: Exploring the challenge of HR implementation in the case of workplace bullying. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *24*(1), 38–56.
- Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M., & Moynihan, L. M. (2003). The impact of HR practices on the performance of business units. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *13*(3), 21–36.
- Wright, P. M., & Kehoe, R. R. (2008). Human resource practices and organizational commitment: A deeper examination. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *46*(1), 6–20.
- Yeung, A., & Griffin, B. (2008). Workplace incivility: Does it matter in Asia? *People and Strategy*, *31*(3), 14–19.
- Zapf, D., & Gross, C. (2001). Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *10*(4), 497–522.