

Workplace Deviant Behavior: Does Employee Psychological Job Demand and Lack of Job Resources Influence Employee Workplace Deviant Behavior?

Ili Nabila Norsilan¹

Zoharah Omar¹

Aminah Ahmad²

1 *Jabatan Pemajuan Profesional dan Pendidikan Lanjutan*

Fakulti Pengajian Pendidikan

Universiti Putra Malaysia

43400 Serdang, Selangor.

2 *Institut Pengajian Sains Sosial*

Universiti Putra Malaysia

Putra InfoPort

43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor.

ABSTRAK

Employee deviance has received increasing attention in the past decade. Past research have reported that work environment related factors such as organizational support, supervisory support, role conflict, and job demand were associated with deviant behavior. The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between job demand (psychological job demand), and job resources (social support), and employee workplace deviant behavior. This study adopts a cross-sectional correlation study design. A total of 315 employees were selected using cluster sampling technique participated in this study. Data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire using the drop and collect method. Data were analyzed using descriptive analysis (mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution) to describe the demographic profile and study variables. Correlation and regression analysis was performed to test the relationship between psychological job demand, and social support, and employee workplace deviant

behaviors. The result revealed that lack of social support has significant positive influence on employee workplace deviant behavior. The findings suggest that lack of job resources such as social support may drive employees to engage in deviant work behavior. However, high job demand experienced by employees does not drive them towards engaging in deviant work behavior.

Keywords: psychological job demand, job resources, social support, Job Demand Resources model, workplace deviant behavior.

INTRODUCTION

Employee deviance has received increasing attention in the past decade (Fagbohunge, Akinbode, & Ayodeji, 2012). Different names were given to describe employee workplace deviant behavior such as counterproductive behavior (Bennet & Robinson, 2000), workplace aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1998), antisocial behavior (Robinson & Kelly, 1998), organization misbehavior (Thompson & Ackroyd, 1999), and organizational incivility (Miner, Settles, Pratt-Hyatt, & Brady, 2012). Employee workplace deviant behaviors can include behaviors such as absenteeism, withdrawal, withholding effort at work, sexual harassment, unethical decision making, not following manager's instructions, intentionally slowing down the work cycle, arriving late to work, vandalism, rumor spreading and corporate sabotage (Bennet & Robinson, 2000). Employee workplace deviant behavior has far reaching effects on organizations and its members. Such behaviors will not only affect organizational productivity and may lead to financial loss, but may also have negative social and psychological impact on employees (McCardle, 2007). In the U.S., it was estimated that approximately \$6 to \$200 billion loss annually due to employee workplace deviant behavior (Brown & Mitchell, 2010). Besides financial loss, KPMG Malaysia Fraud, Bribery, and Corruption Survey 2013 reported almost

70% of employee lost their morale and productivity due to unethical behavior that occur at their workplace.

Many antecedents, internal and external factors, were found to have influence on employee workplace deviant behaviors. One such external factors reported was work environment such as organizational support, supervisory support, role conflict, and job demand were reported to be associated with deviant behavior (Balducci, Schaufeli, & Fraccaroli, 2011). In this study, we focused on job demand and job resources which have been suggested as work environment factors that contribute to employee workplace deviant behavior (Tuckey, Chrisopoulos & Dollard, 2012). Past researcher has found that job demand can increase employees' strain that will eventually cause stress and depression (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). An increase in job demand often contributes to major effect on employee well-being. This is because; high job demand may exert employee pressure as they are faced with excessive work overloads, time pressure and emotional demands. Employees will feel tired and faced with emotional depletion, which may lead them to act contrary to organizational norms (Deery, Iverson, and Walsh, 2002).

Past study has shown that pressure from job demand can increase employees' burnout which may result in many forms of employee workplace deviant behavior (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). This is due to the high effort needed by employees to accomplish the demands that they are not able to cope with, thus eliciting negative responses such as depression and stress; which finally leads them to negative behaviors. However, there are little empirical studies conducted on work-related stressors such as job demand and its influence on employee negative behavior (Fransson et al., 2012). Many studies on job demand have focused on its influence on work engagement (Clark & Loxton, 2012; Kumar & Sia, 2012; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Moreover, most studies using the Job Demand, Job Resources Model (JD-R) have rarely used the

model to explain the behavioral correlates of job stress (Balducci, Schaufelli & Fraccaroli, 2011).

In terms of job resources, the JD-R model argues that job resources such as social support, organizational justice and career opportunities are regarded as motivational processes which may lead to positive outcomes (Balducci et al., 2011). In the JD-R model, job resources are treated as independent process from job demand, i.e. job demand may engender negative outcomes meanwhile job resources promote positive outcomes such as directly assist an employee to perform their job and to be psychologically engaged with their work (Brough et al., 2013). From the model, it was not clear whether lack of job resources may directly lead to negative outcomes. The JD-R model tend to focus on the buffering role of job resources that might off-set the effect of job demand (Balducci et al., 2011; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Several scholars (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thoits, 1985) have previously argued that lack of social support, which is considered as part of job resources (Balducci et al., 2011), or changes in support over time are stressors in themselves which may lead to negative outcomes whether or not other stressful circumstances occur. Schaufeli, Bakker and Rhenen (2009) have also reported that decrease in job resources such as social support predicted psychological burnout over time suggesting a direct link between social support and negative outcomes. Moreover, past studies have also reported that lack of organizational justice, which is also a component of job resources, may lead to counterproductive work behavior (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). In this study, therefore, we seek to examine the negative outcomes of lack of job resources.

Hence, the objective of this study is to describe the prevalence of employee workplace deviance and to determine the influence of job demand (i.e. psychological job demand) and lack of job resources (i.e. lack of social support) on employee workplace deviant behavior.

Job Demand and Job Resources

Demand is the “degree to which the environment contains stimuli that require effort, attention, and response” (Jones & Fletcher, 1996 p.34). It refers to the things that need to be done. In terms of working environment, job demand specifically refers to physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and psychological effort and associated with certain costs and which in the long run may potentially give rise to health problem (Balducci et al., 2011; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Job demand is an important element in shaping employee behavior (Jong & Hartog, 2007). High job demand may increase employees’ physiological and psychological effects including employees’ burnout (Demerouti, Bekker, Nacheiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Employees will experience stress when they are faced with excessive job demand because excessive job demand beyond skills and resources of the employees will increase employee job stress and burnout which eventually enhance their negative behavior (Tepper et al., 2009) In this study, we focused on psychological job demand which refers to employees being required to perform their task rapidly by working hard and fast that may result in work conflict

Job resources refer to those physical, physiological, social, or organizational aspects of the job such as social support, organizational justice and career opportunities (Balducci et al., 2011) that may facilitate in achieving work goals, attenuate job demands and/or stimulate personal growth and development (Balducci et al., 2011). From this definition, social support is regarded as one form of job resources. Social support refers to the belief that one is valued, cared for, and loved by others in a social network such as family members, friends, co-workers, relatives, and neighbours (Ruiz, Prather, & Kauffman, 2013; Thoits, 1985). In the context of work environment, social support refers to the social environment of employee workplace environment such as good relationship with supervisor and co-workers, and conducive workplace

environment (Sanne, Torp, Mykletun, & Dahl, 2005). It refers to the overall levels of helpful social interaction available on the job from both co-workers and supervisors (Sundin, Hochwalder, Bildt, & Lisspers, 2007). In this study we focus on lack of social support which means lack of good relationship and helpful social interactions with superiors and co-workers, and a non-conducive work environment. Social support may take a negative form when there is no support or lack of support given (Antonucci, 1985).

Workplace Deviant Behavior

Workplace deviant behavior refers to any behaviors that are contrary from organizational norms and harms organizational productivity (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Even the smallest form of negative behavior such as taking longer breaks during lunchtime can be considered as workplace deviant behavior because it deviates from organizational norms and affects productivity. Norms refer to employee expected behavior, language and action that are allowed in their working organization.

Many researchers have defined workplace deviant behavior in different terms. However, these terms may be used to represent workplace deviant behavior because these terms describe the behavior by means of similar definition and characteristics. Other terms such as workplace incivility (Estes, 2008), counterproductive behavior (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), organizational misbehavior (Thompson & Ackroyd, 1999), dysfunctional behavior (Jaworski & Young, 1992), and cyber loafing (Lim, 2002) have been used in studies describing employee workplace deviant behavior. Workplace incivility for instance, has been defined as improper manners that is contrary to organizational norms with unclear intention to harm the target such as calling someone with improper names or insult others (Miner et al., 2012). The other term of workplace deviant behavior for instance counterproductive behavior, refers to negative behavior exerted intentionally by individuals

to harm the target and include behaviors such as theft and sabotage (Penney & Spector, 2005). In general, these terms have similar definitions and characteristics with workplace deviant behavior which emphasize on negative behaviors that deviate from organizational norms and harms organizational productivity.

In the typology of workplace deviant behavior by Robinson and Bennett (1995), it is suggested that deviant behavior can be divided into two major dimensions which are 1) interpersonal vs. organizational deviant and 2) minor vs. serious deviant. The first dimension represents the target of the deviant behavior which can be categorized into interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. Interpersonal deviance is deviant behavior that has been committed directly towards individual employee such as abuse and rudeness (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). Organizational deviance on the other hand refers to deviant behavior that violate from organizational norms which can bring harm to organization such as stealing from organization, leave work early, and wasting resources (Berry, Ones, and Sackett, 2007). The second dimension describes the severity of the deviant behavior based on the seriousness of the deviant behavior. Minor deviant behavior refers to less serious deviant behavior such as showing favoritism, gossiping others, and intentionally works slower, whereas serious deviant behavior refers to more serious and severe behavior such as such as sabotaging equipments, sexual harassment, and endangering other employees (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). By combining these two dimensions, deviant behavior can be categorized into four quadrants which are political deviant, personal aggression, production deviant, and property deviant. Each of the quadrants is unrelated to another quadrant.

The first quadrant is a production deviant which refers to minor organizational deviant behavior that affects the quality and quantity of employees' work for instance, behavior that wasting time and organizational resources such as leaving work

early, late to work, or work for personal matters (Hollinger and Clark, 1982). The second quadrant is a property deviant which refers to any serious deviant behavior that damaging organizational assets or property without permission such as theft, sabotage company equipment, and fraud (Peterson, 2002). On the third quadrant is a political deviant which has been defined by Robinson and Bennet (1995) as a minor interpersonal deviant behavior that involve of social interaction that puts others at political or personal disadvantages such as gossiping others, and showing favoritism. The fourth quadrant is a personal aggression which refers to serious form of interpersonal deviant behavior that involve of behaviors that are violent and aggressive such as sexual harassment, rape, and physical contact harms (Litzky, Eddleston, & Kidder, 2006) .

In this study, we included cyber loafing as part of production deviant because the consequences from this activity that may lead to decrease employee and organizational productivity (Blanchard & Henle, 2008). Moreover, cyber loafing was added to measure employee workplace deviant behavior because it was recently identified as a new form of workplace deviant behavior that arises along with technological advancement in workplace (Blanchard and Henle, 2008). Cyber loafing refers to any non-work related internet usage activities by employees during working hours for their personal purpose (Lim, 2002). Cyber loafing activities such as play online games, read non-work related email, write or read non-work related blog were considered as employee workplace deviant behavior because these activities were deviate from organizational norms and wasting time which will eventually affects organizational productivity. Past research also found that cyber loafing resulted in unproductive employees because employees tend ignore their tasks and responsibilities when they are involved in cyber loafing (Askew, 2012).

Theoretical Framework

This study utilizes the Job Demand-resources model (JD-R model) by Demerouti, Bekker, Nacheiner, & Schaufeli (2001) and further extended by (Balducci et al., 2011) to explain the direct linkages between job demand, job resources and workplace deviant behavior and used the direct hypothesis (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thoits, 1985) to explain the direct linkages between social support and employee deviant work behavior.

The JD-Rs model identifies job demand as potentially damaging job characteristics, and job resources as protective factors, that can be used to promote employee well-being. Balducci, Schaufeli and Fraccaroli (2011) have extended the JD-R model by including counterproductive work behavior as a behavioral manifestation of stress. They assert that counterproductive work behavior is an outcome of health impairment process that leads to negative outcomes. The main proposition of this model is the risk of employee stress increasing as a result of high job demand. Increase in job demand may elicit negative employee behavior such as depression and anxiety because high effort is needed in order to cope with the job demand. Moreover, employees with high job demand may have not enough time, skills or resources to complete their task. All of these will result in employees experiencing stress and burnout; which in turn may lead to various types of negative outcomes including workplace deviant behavior. Stress, depression, and burnout may result in incompetency to complete the task; which will subsequently lead to engagement in workplace deviant behavior. In sum, the JD-R model explained that an increase in job demand will result in employee stress which in turn, influences employee to engage in negative behavior.

Consistent with the JD-R model, past research has found that job demand may contribute to workplace deviant behavior. For example, Fox & Spector (2006) found that job

related factors such as role conflict and job demand influence workplace deviant behavior. This is due to the feeling of being threatened by excessive job demand experienced by employees (Rodell & Judge, 2009). Furthermore, frustration at work and organizational factors such as work overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity has been identified as work stressors that lead to employee workplace deviant behavior (Fox & Spector, 2006). In conclusion, job demand is an organizational factor that can arouse employee stress which is manifested by employees engaging in workplace deviant behavior.

In addition, past research have also reported that employees will experience stress when they are faced with excessive job demand which eventually reduces their emotion and feeling to perform their job (Edmondson, 2008). Other research has also found that work overload, job demand and work conflict that goes beyond skills and resources of employees will increase employee job stress; hence resulting in them engaging in deviant workplace behavior (Tepper et al., 2009). Past research have also revealed that increase in job demand and work overload can lead employee to feeling exhausted and stressed, hence causing them to be involved in deviant behavior (Sanne et al., 2005). Balducci et al. (2011) found that job demand to be associated with deviant workplace behavior. This is because employees who are under stress will eventually have difficulty in social interaction. Besides, high workloads are also found to have a relationship with negative emotion and behaviors (Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002). When job demand is high, employees will face difficulty to complete their task. This difficulty will contribute to negative feelings and emotions, which finally triggers their negative behavior. Golparvar et al., (2012) described that increases in job demand may lead to employee negative emotion and eventually result in them engaging in negative behavior. Besides, other recent researcher also found that work overload and job demand that go beyond the skills and resources available will increase job stress and lead to workplace deviant

behavior (Jaarsveld, Walker, & Skarlicki, 2010). Based on these considerations, we hypothesized that:

Hypothesis: Job demand will be positively related to workplace deviant behavior.

The JD-R model suggest that job resources such as social support play an extrinsic motivational role, because work environments that offer many resources foster the willingness to dedicate one's efforts and abilities to the work task (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2005; Bakker, van Veldhoven, & Xanthopoulou, 2010). In such environments it is likely that the task will be completed successfully and that the work goal will be attained (Bakker et al., 2010). On the other hand, when resources are limited, for instance when there is little work-related social support, employee may experience greater stress and frustrations at work. As a result employee may not be willing or dedicated to put much effort and abilities to the work task. According to Tuckey, Chrisopoulos, and Dollard (2012), stress and frustration that arises from working under stressful conditions may be projected down the line in the form of negative interpersonal behaviors directed at other employees.

In support for the direct effect hypothesis between social support and employee deviance, Thoits (1985) argued that emotional support which originates from interpersonal relationship helps sustain well-being. Since most interpersonal relationships can be characterized as role relationships, Thoits (1985) suggest that emotional support is obtained from ongoing role relations. Role relationships provide security, sense of belonging, self-esteem, and a sense of comparative mastery, and each of these self-referent factors has positive affective consequences. Conversely, when a person possessed few roles or loses roles, perceives or receives negative evaluations from role partners or observes his/her relative inadequacy in role performance (each types of stressful circumstances), or in other words perceives lack of emotional support, their senses of security, belonging, and comparative will decrease and

negative feeling states will result. Thiots (1985) argues that if these conditions and responses persist it will produce disturbances which may have subsequent influences on role behaviours. Based on these considerations, we hypothesized that:

Hypothesis: Lack of social support will be positively related to workplace deviant behavior.

METHOD

Research design, sampling, and data collection

This study adopted a descriptive correlational research design. The participants in this study were 315 employees from 11 private organizations in Klang Valley. The selections of the respondents were based on cluster random sampling by job category. Respondents were chosen by their job categories which comprises of four job categories namely, managerial, supervisor, professional and supporting staff group.

The study sample comprises of 42% males and 58% females. About 76.3% of the respondents were Islam, 12.8% Buddha, 4.5 % Hindu, and only 0.6% of the respondents were Atheist. In terms of education level, almost half of the respondents (49.5%) held a bachelor degree, followed by SPM holder (22.4%), certificate holder (10.2%), and only (4.2%) of the respondents have masters degree. Most of the respondents were executive (40.3%), followed by support staff group (35.7%), supervisor (12.8%), and manager (11.2%).

Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to respondents as a medium of the data collection. The questionnaire consists of two languages which are English and Malay languages. The questionnaires were handed over to the representative of human resources officer who was responsible to distribute the questionnaires to the study respondent selected according to their job category. A total of 390 questionnaires

were distributed by using a drop-and-collect method. However, only 78.5% (315) of the respondents completed the questionnaires.

Instrument

Job demand. Job demand was measured using the Job Demand-Control Support Questionnaire (DCSQ) developed by Sanne et al. (2005). A total of 5-items comprising of psychological job demand was assessed using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (very often). Items that measure psychological job demand assess employee psychological demands requirement in performing their tasks such as “does your job require you to work very fast?”, “does your job require you to work very hard?”, and “do you have sufficient time for all your work tasks?”. The reliability for job demand instruments in the present study was 0.751 which is considered as reliable

Social support. Social support was assessed using the DSCQ instrument (6 items) developed by Sanne et al. (2005) using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (very often). We reversed the items into negative statements to signify lack of social support. For example respondents were asked to assess their working environment in social context such as “There is lack of good collegiality at work”, “I don’t get along well with my supervisors”, and “I don’t get along well with my co-workers”. Cronbach alpha was .868.

Workplace Deviant Behavior. Employee workplace deviant behavior was assessed using 24 items developed by past researchers. These items were combined from 15 items of the classical measurement of workplace deviant behavior by Bennett and Robinson (2000), and 9 items measuring cyber loafing developed by Blanchard and Henle (2008). Workplace deviant behavior items measurement by Bennett and Robinson (2000) were originally consist of 23 items. Using face validity by asking the employees from the private sector, 15 items out

of 23 items were considered as relevant in Malaysian setting. From a total 15 items, 3 items measure interpersonal deviant, and 12 of the items measure organizational deviant such as “come late to work without permission”, “made fun someone at work”, “dragged out work in order to get overtime”, “neglected to follow my boss's instructions”, “worked on a personal matter during working hours”, and “taken property from work without permission”. Examples of the items that were considered as not relevant in Malaysia context which have been excluded in this study were “drink alcohols or taking drugs”. Respondents were asked to answer on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (very often) to indicate the frequency in which they engage in each behavior.

For cyber loafing, a total of 9 items adapted from Blanchard & Henle (2008) and Lim (2002) was used in this study. Examples of the items were “received, send, and check non-work-related email”, “browsing non-work related website”, “shop online for personal goods”, “download movies and music”, and “writing and reading blogs”. These items were measured by 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (very often). Reliability for employee workplace deviant behavior was 0.957 which shows high reliability.

Data analysis

Descriptive analysis such as mean, standard deviation, and percentage were used to determine the level of job demand, social support and workplace deviant behavior. Besides, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether there is a significant relationship between job demand and workplace deviant behavior. This study also used Multiple Linear Regression analysis to predict the influence of job demand on employee deviant behavior.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive analysis of psychological job demand, social job demand, and workplace deviant behavior

Table 1 indicates the level of psychological job demand, social job demand, and workplace deviant behavior. Data transformation has been made from mean of psychological job demand, mean of social job demand, and mean of workplace deviant behavior into three level which are low level, moderate level, and high level. For level of psychological job demand, result shows that most of the respondents recorded 67.3% to have moderate level of psychological job demand. On the other hand, lack of social support shows that most of the respondents recorded 66.0% to have low level of social job demand. It can be conclude that, most of the respondents are in low level of social job demand. Workplace deviant behavior indicates the high percentage of 85.1% in low level of WDB.

Table 1: level of job demand psychological, job demand social, workplace deviant behavior.

Variables	<i>f</i>	%	Mean	<i>Sd</i>
Level of job demand				
1.00 (low job demand)	7	2.2	4.55	.77
2.00 (moderate job demand)	212	67.3		
3.00 (high job demand)	96	30.5		
Level of lack of social support				
1.00 (high social support)	208	66.0	2.60	.96
2.00 (moderate social support)	99	31.5		
3.00 (low social support)	8	2.5		

Level of workplace deviant behavior (WDB)				
1.00 (low WDB)	268	85.1	2.12	.99
2.00 (moderate WDB)	40	12.7		
3.00 (high WDB)	7	2.2		
Total	315	100.0		

Relationships between psychological job demand, lack of social support, and workplace deviant behavior

A correlational analysis was performed to test the relationship between job demand ($M=4.56$, $SD=0.77$) and lack of social support ($M=2.60$, $SD=0.96$) with workplace deviant behavior ($M=2.12$, $SD=0.1$) as shown in Table 2. For an alpha level of .05, results of the correlation show that there is a low positive significant relationship between lack of social support and workplace deviant behavior $r(315) = 0.164$, $p = 0.002$. This indicates that when lack of social support increases, employee workplace deviant behavior also will increase. However, the result shows no significant relationship between job demand and workplace deviant behavior $r(315) = .103$, $p = .069$.

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation, and inter-correlations for study variables

	M	SD	1	2	3
Job demand	4.55	.77	1		
Lack of social support	2.60	.96	-.084	1	
Workplace deviance	2.12	.99	.103	.164**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

We proceed with multiple linear regression analysis to examine the influence between the variables. Since only lack of social support was found to be significantly correlated with workplace deviance, we only tested the influence of this relationship. Table 3 indicates that lack of social support significantly predicts workplace deviant behavior ($\beta=0.17$, $t = 2.94$; $p < 0.05$). The result revealed lack of social support explained 4.0% of the variance in employee workplace deviant behavior.

Table 3: Regression analysis on job demand and workplace deviant behavior

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	
	<i>B</i>	SE	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>
(Constant)	1.67	.16		10.34
Lack of social support	.17	.06	.16	2.94

NOTE: $R=.201$; $R^2= .040$; $F= 6.584$; $P=.002$.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The above analysis shows that only lack of social support has relationship with employee workplace deviant behavior. Besides, it was found that lack of social support not only has a relationship with employee workplace deviant behavior, but it also can predict employee workplace deviant behavior. Employees who experience lower social support will commit more workplace deviant behavior but not employees who have high psychological job demand. Lack of social support is an important element that can influence employee behavior. Lack of social support will lead to employee stress and finally effect their occupational health and well-being. A stressful working environment with less social support can arouse employee stress which may develops a negative pattern in employee

behavior (Bowling & Beehr, 2006). Literature argued that social support is important for employees in order for them to cope with their work task and environment (Ven, Tooren, & Vlerick, 2013). Support from colleagues, supervisors and good workplace surroundings are crucial in order to provide employees with conducive workplace environment to perform their task. Past research have reported that lack social support can lead to negative outcomes because; lower social support from workplace environment will increase employee high strain which eventually enhance employee stress (Pelfrene, Vlerick, Kittel, Mak, Kornitzer, & Backer, 2002). In this study, psychological job demand was found to be not important in determining employee workplace deviant behavior. Hence, the JD-R hypothesis on the linkages between job demand and negative outcomes was not supported in this study.

There were some limitations in this study. Firstly, this study tested the main effect of job demand and job resources and did not test the buffering effect of job resources on job demand. Secondly, this study was conducted involving employees in selected private companies. Hence, we are not able to conclude that we will have the same result for employees in the public sectors. This is because the difference in culture and norms in every sector may affect different result from this study. Thirdly, we only studied job demand as a factor in predicting workplace deviant behavior. However, many other factors in literature are found to be the predictor of workplace deviant behavior.

Since this study showed that lack of social support plays an important role as a predictor of workplace deviant behavior, initial concern should be taken by organization to provide work related support at work place. Organizations should be able to provide employees with a conducive and supportive work environment to enhance employees feeling of security, sense of belonging, self-esteem, and a sense of comparative master, which in turn avoids employee negative behavior. Besides, organizations can also show their support by

providing employees with training in order to help them complete their tasks.

REFERENCE

- Thompson, P. & Ackyord, S.(1999). *Organizational misbehaviour*. Sage.
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of management review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- Antonucci, T. (1985). Social Support: Theritical Advances, Recent Findings and Pressing Issues. In I. G. Sarason & B. R. Saraon (Eds.), *Social Support: Theory, Research and Applications* (pp. 21–38). Dordrecht, Netherland: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- 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(7), 1073–1091.
- Askew, K. L. (2012). *The Relationship Between Cyberloafing and Task Performance and an Examination of the Theory of Planned Behavior as a Model of Cyberloafing*. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The crossover of burnout and work engagement among working couples. *Human Relations*, 58(5), 661–689.
- Bakker, A. B., van Veldhoven, M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2010). Beyond the Demand-Control Model. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(1), 3–16.
- Balducci, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Fraccaroli, F. (2011). The job demands – resources model and counterproductive work behaviour : The role of job- related affect. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(4), 467–496.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *The 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.
- Blanchard, A. L., & Henle, C. A. (2008). Correlates of different forms of cyberloafing: The role of norms and external locus of control. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(3), 1067–1084.
- Brough, P., Timms, C., Siu, O., Kalliath, T., O'Driscoll, M. P., Sit, C. H., Lu, C. (2013). Validation of the Job Demands-Resources model in cross-national samples: Cross-sectional and longitudinal predictions of psychological strain and work engagement. *Human Relations*, 66(10), 1311–1335.
- Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(4), 583-616.
- Clark, D. M. T., & Loxton, N. J. (2012). Fear, psychological acceptance, job demands and employee work engagement: An integrative moderated meditation model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(8), 893–897.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, Social Support and the Buffering Hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(2), 330–357.
- Deery, S., Iverson, R., & Walsh, J. (2002). Work relationships in telephone call centres: understanding emotional exhaustion and employee withdrawal. *Journal of Management studies*, 39(4), 471-496.
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of innovation management*, 10(1), 41-64.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(3), 499.
- Edmondson, D. R. (2008). *Emotional exhaustion and its role in service sabotage among boundary spanners*. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.
- Estes, B. (2008). Integrative literature review: workplace incivility: impacts on individual and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7(2), 218–240.
- Fagbohunbe, B. O., Akinbode, G. a., & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviours: an empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(5), 207–221.

- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior in response to job stressors and organizational justice: some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291–309.
- Fransson, E. I., Nyberg, S. T., Heikkilä, K., Alfredsson, L., Bacquer, D. D., Batty, G. D., Kivimäki, M. (2012). Comparison of alternative versions of the job demand-control scales in 17 European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1), 62.
- Golparvar, M., Kamkar, M., & Javadian, Z. (2012). Moderating effects of job stress in emotional exhaustion and feeling of energy relationships with positive and negative behaviors: job stress multiple functions approach. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 4(4), 99–112.
- Grandey, A. A., Tam, A. P., & Brauburger, A. L. (2002). Affective States and Traits in the Workplace: Diary and Survey Data From Young Workers. *Motivation and Emotion*, 26(1), 31–55.
- Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and Informal Social Controls of Employee Deviance*. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 333-343.
- Jaworski, B. J., & Young, S. M. (1992). Dysfunctional behavior and management control: an empirical study of marketing managers. *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 17(1), 17–35.
- Jones, F., & Fletcher, B. C. (1996). Taking work home: A study of daily fluctuations in work stressors, effects on moods and impacts on marital partners. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69(1), 89-106.
- Kumar, R., & Sia, S. K. (2012). Employee engagement: explicating the contribution of work environment. *Management and Labour Studies*, 37(1), 31–43.
- Lim, V. K. (2002). The IT way of loafing on the job: cyberloafing, neutralizing and organizational justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(5), 675-694.
- Litzky, B. E., Eddleston, K. A., & Kidder, D. L. (2006). The good, the bad, and the misguided: How managers inadvertently encourage deviant behaviors. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1), 91-103.

- McCardle, J. G. (2007). *Organizational justice and workplace deviance: The role of organizational structure, powerlessness, and information salience*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida.
- Miner, K. N., Settles, I. H., Pratt-Hyatt, J. S., & Brady, C. C. (2012). Experiencing incivility in organizations: the buffering effects of emotional and organizational support. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(2), 340–372.
- 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.
- Pelfrene, E., Vlerick, P., Kittel, F., Mak, R. P., Kornitzer, M., & Backer, G. D. (2002). Psychosocial work environment and psychological well-being: assessment of the buffering effects in the job demand–control (–support) model in BELSTRESS. *Stress and Health, 18*(1), 43–56.
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(7), 777–796.
- Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(1), 47–61.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal, 38*(2), 555–572.
- Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(6), 658–672.
- Rodell, J. B., & Judge, T. A. (2009). Can “good” stressors spark “bad” behaviors? The mediating role of emotions in links of challenge and hindrance stressors with citizenship and counterproductive behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1438–1451.
- Ruiz, J., Prather, C. C., & Kauffman, E. E. (2013). Social Support. In M. D. Gellman & J. R. Turner (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of*

Behavioral Medicine (p. 1844). New York, NY: Springer New York.

- Sanne, B., Torp, S., Mykletun, A., & Dahl, A. A. (2005). The Swedish demand-control-support questionnaire (DCSQ): Factor structure, item analyses, and internal consistency in a large population. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 33*(3), 166–74.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(3), 293–315.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Rhenen, W. V. A. N. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 893–917*.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?. *Journal of vocational behavior, 68*(3), 446-460.
- Sundin, L., Hochwalder, J., Bildt, C., & Lisspers, J. (2007). The relationship between different work-related sources of social support and burnout among registered and assistant nurses in Sweden: a questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 44*(5), 758–69.
- 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 Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 156–167.
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 261-289.
- Thoits, P. A. (1985). Social support and psychological well-being: Theoretical possibilities. In *Social support: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 51-72). Springer Netherlands.
- Tuckey, M. R., Chrisopoulos, S., & Dollard, M. F. (2012). Job demands, resource deficiencies, and workplace harassment:

- Evidence for micro-level effects. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 19(4), 292–310.
- Van de Ven, B., van den Tooren, M., & Vlerick, P. (2013). Emotional job resources and emotional support seeking as moderators of the relation between emotional job demands and emotional exhaustion: a two-wave panel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(1), 1–8.
- Van Jaarsveld, D. D., Walker, D. D., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2010). The Role of Job Demands and Emotional Exhaustion in the Relationship Between Customer and Employee Incivility. *Journal of Management*, 36(6), 1486–1504.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Dollard, M. F., Demerouti, E., Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Schreurs, P. J. G. (2007). When do job demands particularly predict burnout?: The moderating role of job resources. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(8), 766–786.

Ψ JURNAL PSIKOLOGI

MALAYSIA

Bilangan/Number 28 (2)

ISSN 0127-8029

2014

**Haikal Anuar Adnan, Asmawati Desa, Wan Shahrazad Wan Sulaiman,
Mohamad Irwan Ahmad & Daniella Maryam Mokhtar**
Emotional Intelligence and Religious orientation among Secondary School
Students

**Nasrudin Subhi, Mohd Radzi Tarmizi A Halim, Ezarina Zakaria &
Salinan Nen**
Pengaruh Homofobia Dalaman terhadap Perkahwinan Lelaki Gay

Ili Nabila Norsilan, Zoharah Omar & Aminah Ahmad
Workplace Deviant Behavior: Does Employee Psychological Job Demand
and Lack of Job Resources Influence Employee Workplace Deviant
Behavior?



Jurnal Psikologi Malaysia
(*Journal of Malaysian Psychology*)

