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PREFACE

The aim of this research is to determine factors affecting workplace deviance among manufacturing employees in Malaysia. The topic of our research project is “Determinants of Workplace Deviance among Manufacturing Employees in Malaysia”. The reason of choosing manufacturing industry to conduct our study is because this industry provides significant contribution to Malaysia’s economic growth. In addition, we have also found out some of the problems faced by manufacturing industry such as poor work performance, declining productivity, high accident rates and others.

In order to achieve the objectives, there are four independent variables used to conduct our research which are perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. The low perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice will lead to high workplace deviance behaviours which in turn cause harmful effect to the industry’s performance and productivity. In a nut shell, this research provides better insight of factors affecting workplace deviance behaviours among manufacturing employees in Malaysia.
ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study is to examine workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. We have proposed a few hypotheses to examine the relationship between independent variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) and dependent variable (workplace deviance). We have also provided the literature review and proposed conceptual framework for this study.

In this research, we focus on identify the significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. We also aim to identify significant relationship between organizational justice and workplace deviance. Our target respondents are employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. We have collected and analysed data in order to get the result. The result shows that perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are significantly correlated with workplace deviance. In short, employers in manufacturing industry should consider perceived organizational support and organizational justice in order to prevent workplace deviance issues.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to find out the factors affecting workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. Workplace deviance is important in manufacturing industry in which it can affect the organizational productivity and effectiveness. This research is to examine research questions and accomplish research objective to identify the relationship between dependent variable and independent variables. This chapter covers discussions on research background, problem statement, research objectives and questions, hypotheses, significance of the study, chapter layout and conclusion.

1.1 Background of Study

The problem of workplace deviance has been occurring widely in most organizations around the world in the recent years (Appelbaum, 2006). Most of the employees practice workplace deviance towards their co-workers or employers nowadays. According to the research done by Northwestern National Life Insurance Company (1993), it stated that more than 2 million employees were physically attacked at work and about 6 million of employees were threatened, and nearly 16 million were harassed by others every year. Workplace deviance is harmful to organizations’ financial condition due to the annual estimated expenses that incurred to solve workplace deviance issues are amounted to millions dollar among U.S. organizations (Case, 1998). For example, in United States of America, the wrongdoings of employees who engage in workplace deviance and delinquency cause organizational losses ranging from US$6-200 billion annually (Shamsudin,
In addition, United States Department of Commerce reported that around a third of U.S. organizational bankruptcies are caused by workplace deviance (Marasi, Bennett, & Budden, 2018).

Workplace deviance is a negative behavior of saboteur which intends to disrupt, damage or subvert an organization’s business for individual purpose and these acts include destroying property, embarrassment, harming other employees and customers, destructing working relationship, creating unfavorable publicity and delaying productions (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schiminke, 2002). Workplace deviance can be defined as voluntary behavior and intention to violate an organization’s norm that influences the well-being of an organization and/or the members of an organizations and harm the organizational functioning (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Organizational norms involve a basic moral standard and other traditional community standards such as rules and procedures, formal and informal company policies (Feldman, 1984). Workplace deviance might violate organizational norms because it is also known as misbehavior (Vardi & Weitz, 2004), counterproductive behavior (Sackett & Devore, 2002), workplace incivility and antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997).

In addition, employers, employees or both of them are always the potential victims of workplace deviance (Adeoti, Shamsudin, & Wan, 2017). Workplace deviance may vary along a continuum of seriousness, from the minor actions such as leaving early and embarrassing co-workers, to a more severe action such as theft and destroying organization’s property (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). According to Bennett and Robinson (2000), workplace deviance is defined as occupational crime that includes absenteeism, misuse of time at work, stealing company’s asset, sharing company confidential information, performing unsafe and unethical behavior, late to work, corporate sabotage, consuming drug and alcohol, spreading rumor and providing poor quality of work (Vardi & Wiener, 1996; Appelbaum, Laconi, & Matousek, 2007). If an employee takes an action that violates the major rules and
regulations of company, the particular action may be considered as workplace deviance (Spector & Fox, 2002).

The initiative to solve workplace deviance issue is essential to organization’s productivity, organization’s financial condition, organization’s reputation, employees’ well-being, employees’ performance, employees’ productivity, interrelationship between and among colleagues, and so on and so forth. Workplace deviance brings a lot of drawbacks towards organizations especially for their human capitals. The existence of workplace deviance affects the interactions between and among employees, work units, department, division and intra-organization which may lead to organization’s failure (Gabcanova, 2011). For example, when workplace deviance takes place in a department, the members will become frustrated to work as team and corporate cohesively. When this happens, error may occur and that error may be passed from one department to another department due to organizational interdependency. Finally, the whole organization is trapped by mistakes that cannot be undone.

Human capitals are known as one of the most valuable assets of an organization (Stambor, 2006). This is because employee is the one who operates and runs the businesses on a daily basis (Vaynerchuk, 2016). They contribute their efforts, knowledge, expertise and skills which directly affect organizational success (Mayhew, 2018). Thus, it is important to address workplace deviance where organizations should take actions to avoid their employees become the instigators and victims of workplace deviance. Organizations should manage their employees properly and try their best to avoid workplace deviance since it also affects organization’s profitability and productivity (Rodriguez, 2017).

Moreover, workplace deviance also brings significant implications towards psychological well-being of employees (Aizat & Rahim, 2008). From psychological perspective, those who are the victims of workplace deviance will
experience feelings of frustration, desire for revenge and anger (Sathappan, Omar, Ahmad, Hamzah, & Arif, 2006). Besides that, those who are threaten by incivility and verbal harassment will experience low morale, develop stress-related issues and have greater tendency to resign from the organizations (Bowling & Gruys, 2010). According to Penny and Spector (2002), the victim will feel job stress, frustration and dissatisfaction due to the act of their co-worker’s workplace deviance. Workplace deviance will also negatively affect their mental and physical health which directly influences their motivation and productivity at work (Bowling & Beehr, 2006). They are more likely to leave the organization because they feel insecure at work, undergo physical and psychological agony, lost work time and suffer from low self-esteem (Griffin & Kelly, 2004).

Workplace deviance issue can also harm the development of an organization (The World Bank, 2017). For instance, corruption will tarnish company’s reputation, damage customer trust and investor confidence which directly affect organization’s performance. Decreased productivity, stress-related problems, declining employees’ performance, absenteeism and deteriorating employees’ morale are the consequences of workplace deviance (Henle, 2005). The consequences of workplace deviance are very detrimental to organizations. For example, organizations are responsible for paying maintenance cost whenever they faced the problem of lost or damaged property (Aquina, Galperin, & Bennett, 2004).

Furthermore, workplace deviance has been a critical issue across the world, the impacts of workplace deviance are totally out of control where it exists in nearly 95% of organizations around the world (Henle, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2005). According to Chirasha and Mahapa (2012), 75% of employees practice workplace deviant behaviors such as vandalism, voluntary absenteeism, fraud and theft. In Pakistan, 82% of public organization employees are always late to work without prior permission, 90% of them have taken longer break more than acceptable range and 66% of them would leave offices earlier than others (Bashir, Nasir, & Bashir, 2012). In United States, around 33% to 75% of employees have engaged in
workplace deviant behaviors such as vandalism, unexcused absenteeism, theft, personal aggression and sabotage (Chen, Fah, & Jin, 2016). Based on the study of Betty Dukes, he mentioned that 1.6 million female employees of Wal-Mart have experienced sexual harassment (Jim, Venegas, & Rosemary, 2001).

On the other hand, the World Bank Group stated that corruptions will be a major challenge to both of its objectives which are ending extreme poverty by 2030 and boosting shared prosperity for the poorest 40% of citizen in developing nations (The World Bank, 2017). In addition, it also stated that the $1.5 trillion paid by businesses and individuals for bribes each year is about 2% of global GDP and 10 times the value of overseas development assistance. According to the study of Global Corruption Barometer in Asia Pacific, the nations with the highest corruption rates are India (69%), Vietnam (65%), Thailand (41%), Myanmar (40%), Pakistan (40%), and Cambodia (40%) (Satar, 2017). Moreover, approximately three-quarters of employees had stolen at least once from their organizations and the financial costs associated with it have been more than US$50 billion each year (Coffin, 2003). Lastly, the retailers in United States has lost US$15.1 billion per year because of internal theft and the number of such theft is raising every year until today (Muafi, 2011).

In Malaysia, issues of workplace deviance have been widely discussed and it is one of the most frequent topics of reports in newspaper (Aizzat & Rahim, 2011). For instance, there are a lot of cases concerning about poor work attitude (New Straits Time, 2005), dishonesty (New Straits Time, 2005), fraud (Utusan Malaysia, 2004), social and moral problems (New Straits Times, 2009), employee turnover (Anonymous, 2010), industrial accidents, bribery (New Straits Times, 2015) and falsification of medical certificates (Aizat & Rahim, 2008). Besides that, Tan Sri Mohd Sidek Hassan (2009), who is the former Chief Secretary of the Malaysia government, said that the number of workplace deviance cases involving public sector employees is increasing. For instance, there were 3383 workplace deviance cases happened in 2008 compared to 2159 workplace deviance cases happened in
2007. In short, various forms of workplace deviance cases practiced by employees in public service organizations had raised by 36.2% in 2008 compared to 2007 (Aizat & Rahim, 2008).

Awais (2006) pointed out that the common forms of workplace deviant behavior in Malaysia organizations includes saying something hurtful, making fun of someone at work, taking longer breaks and spending longer time fantasizing. In addition, the issues of workplace deviance are not only explored by the local media but they are also examined by various respective government agencies. For example, Labor Department, National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and Social Security Organization (SOCSO) had mentioned the severity of workplace deviance in Malaysia (Shamsudin & Rahman, 2006). Moreover, the existence of a variety of workplace deviant behavior among Malaysian employees has been indicated in the Industrial Law reports from year 2000 to 2009 (The Malaysian Current Law Journal, 2000-2009). The Malaysian Labour Department has also been received few cases of workplace deviance such as use of abusive language, sabotage, assault, fight at work, harassment and threat. According to Shamsudin and Rahman (2006), Labour Department has not provided any official statistics on the phenomenon of workplace deviance. This is because most of the companies are unwilling to provide details of negative incidences at their workplaces (Alwi, Aizzat, & Rahim, 2016) as they want to protect their company’s image (Atkinson, 2002).

According to the study of Global Corruption Barometer (GCB), corruption is pervasive and prevalent among employees in Malaysia’s organizations (Satar, 2017). The Corruption Rank of Malaysia has increased from 2016 (55th) to 2017 (62th), it reached the highest record since 1995 (Trading Economics, 2018; The Straits Times, 2018). Besides that, according to the local survey that was conducted by Kommen Prufen Meckern Gehen (2004), an international audit, tax and advisory professional firm, it stated that 83% of the Malaysian public and private companies exercised a serious form of workplace deviance which is known as fraud.
Furthermore, the workplace sexual harassment issues in Malaysia are considered severe but the government does not take any legal actions on it. Hence, there is a lot of civil society groups requesting for a Sexual Harassment Act in order to protect employees of Malaysia. The Women, Family and Community Development Ministry pointed out that sexual harassment will reduce the productivity and quality of working life and threaten the well-being of working men and women (Brown, 2018).

Furthermore, employee theft and absenteeism which are considered as workplace deviant behavior have also become severe issues in Malaysia. For instance, according to Global Retail Theft Barometer, it mentioned that the shrinkage of retail in Malaysia was 1.5%, the 12th highest among 42 nations surveyed in year 2010. In Malaysia, there are 22.3% of employees commit theft at workplace and it costs the organizations almost US$52 million annually (Moothy, Somasundaram, Arokiasamy, Nadarajah, & Marimuthu, 2011). Besides that, based on the research of 2017 Malaysia’s Healthiest Workplace by AIA Vitality, it shown that Malaysian employees’ loss 67 days a year to absenteeism and the average annual cost of absenteeism per organization is approximately RM2.7 million (New Straits Times, 2017).

In conclusion, workplace deviance is a common organizational issue worldwide (Leweherilla, 2017). Although it is a common issue, the consequences of workplace deviance are severe and this is definitely not an easy task for organizations to tackle the issue. This is because workplace deviance issues range from minor to severe. It is challenging for the organizations to recognize the minor destructive behaviour. However, once the organizations suffer the consequences, often the issue already emerges from minor to severe and it is too late and costlier to the organizations to solve the severe issue. Although workplace deviant behaviour is practiced by small number of employees in an organization, it still can cause a large impact and significant financial losses to an organization. To solve workplace deviance issue, an organization should determine the factors that drive workplace deviance and take
the corrections action immediately. In order to identify the factors that affect employees to practice workplace deviant behaviour in manufacturing industry in Malaysia, this research was conducted for the wellbeing of employees, organizations and nations.

1.1.1 Manufacturing Industry in Malaysia Context

Manufacturing industry has contributed critically to the Malaysia’s economy in terms of the country’s total employment, GDP, job creation and total exports (Yusoff & Salleh, 2013). Based on the data from Department of Statistics Malaysia, in 2017, manufacturing industry has grown continuously as its sales has increased by 13.6% (Rm65.9 billion) compared to previous year (The Star Online, 2017). Manufacturing industry is also known as the “engine of growth” of Malaysia’s economic performance (Dogan & Koi, 2010). Manufacturing includes the production of goods by utilizing equipment, raw material, labor and machines (Surbhi, 2015). Industrial design and engineering are closely related to manufacturing that aims to boost Malaysia’s economy (Chang, 2012). Manufacturing industry can be divided into two main groups which are the resource-based industries and non-resource-based industries. Resources-based industries can be defined as industries that involve in downstream processing and manufacturing of the nation’s “primary industries” such as mineral products and agro-industry (Ahmad, 1990). According to Third Industrial Master Plan (2006-2020) (Ministry of International Trade and Industry, 2006), resources-based industries includes industries of wood-based, food processing, oil-palm-based, petrochemicals, rubber-based and pharmaceuticals. On the other hand, electrical and electronics, medical devices, transport equipment, textiles and apparel, machinery and equipment, and metals industries are categorized as non-resource-based industries. Both of the industries are equally well-developed in Malaysia. In
addition, petroleum products, textile and apparel, electronics, electrical machinery and appliance, wood and wood products, chemical and plastic products, and iron, steel and metal products are all the major manufacturing industries in Malaysia.

The macro-policy changes in the Malaysian industrialization process will influence the development of Malaysia labor market. During the beginning of 1970 until early of 1980s, the labor displacement period in mining and agriculture was the source of employment expansion in manufacturing industry. The largest employer sector of Malaysia from year 2001 to 2010 was manufacturing industry and thus this industry should greatly pay attention with respect to workplace deviance problems. On the other hand, based on Statistic Tables 2016/2017 (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2016) the number of employment in manufacturing industry in 2015 is the second largest which amounted to 2,322.7 million persons and it has contributed 16.5% of total employment in Malaysia. Moreover, Cushman and Wakefield had ranked Malaysia as the world’s top manufacturing location in term of new suitability index (Business Circle, 2014). If the manufacturing industry neglects the employee’s workplace deviance behavior, it will bring significant detrimental consequences to them (Aizzat & Rahim, 2011). Therefore, there is a need for investigation in order to predict the factors that affect the workplace deviance in Malaysia manufacturing industry.

According to the 2016 industry ranking report that was done by Tiny Pulse (2017), they found that manufacturing industry was ranked as 11th happiest industry while consumer products and services industry is the happiest industry. Tiny Pulse received over 500,000 survey responses from over 60,000 employees in 13 industries in order to get the result. The main reason that causes employees in manufacturing industry to be unhappy is because of their colleagues and team members. For example, one of the unhappy
employees in manufacturing industry sees their team as an obstacle to overcome because their supervisor treats him unfairly compared with his colleagues. His colleagues have limited knowledge and skills and take low level of responsibility to work compared to the unhappy employee, but his colleagues get more average pay than him, thus, he felt that the organization had mistreated him (Chiu & Peng, 2008). Workplace deviance can also be caused by psychological contract and abusive supervisions, the employees in manufacturing industry have higher probability of facing these issues in the workplace compared to other industries (Nasurdin, Ahmad, & Razalli, 2014).

The main objective of this research project is to figure out the factors that affect the workplace deviance in Malaysia manufacturing industry. We have selected four independent variables which are perceived organization support, procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice to study on how these factors will affect workplace deviance in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

1.2 Problem Statement

Workplace deviant behaviours such as drug use, theft, sexual harassment and sabotage of equipment can harm organizational productivity and thus industry’s performance (Norsilan, Omar, & Ahmad, 2014). According to 11th Malaysia Plan for year 2016 to 2020, a new vision emerged where the government targets to increase the productivity of manufacturing industry by using two strategies which are automation and workforce skill improvement (Economic Planning Unit, 2016). Under this plan, the manufacturing industry is important to country’s GDP growth in which it is expected to increase by 5.1 percent per year and contribute 22.5 percent to Malaysia’s GDP. Despite the government’s commitment to the vision,
the performance of manufacturing industry has declined since the past few years. Hence, there is an urgent need to conduct research on what is the problem faced by the industry.

Workplace deviant behaviours such as not complying with laws and regulations can increase accident rate (Adhikari, 2015). In 2017, an average of 43 severe industrial accidents and occupational diseases incidents was reported daily (The Sun Daily, 2018). The number of industrial accidents has increased by 6% from 31,314 cases in 2016 to 33,319 cases in 2017. In response to the problem, Tan Sri Dr Aseh Che Mat, the chairman of SOCSO, has granted RM5, 804, 007.50 to a total of 32 selected institutions and non-governmental organisations to conduct 704 accident prevention programmes. The medical expenses spent by SOCSO on industrial accidents have increased from RM 4,222,000 in 2015 to RM 4,252,000 in 2016. Moreover, according to data from Department of Occupational Safety and Health, there was a total of 3635 accidents reported in 2017. Among the industries, manufacturing industry recorded the highest number of accidents (59.92%), followed by agriculture, forestry and fishery (14.36%), construction (6.60%), finance, insurance, real estate and business services (4.02%), transport, storage and communication (3.36%), hotels and restaurants (3.14%), utilities (2.86%), wholesale and retail trades (2.67%), public services and statutory authorities (1.82%) and mining and quarrying (1.27%). This indicates that employees in manufacturing industry are prone to higher accidental risks (Halim, Said, & Said, 2012). One of the potential causes of high industrial accident rate in manufacturing industry is negligence or non-compliance of industry law and regulation which is considered as a kind of workplace deviant behaviour (Rahman, 2008). Thus, it is important to conduct research on manufacturing industry to investigate whether the industry is facing workplace deviance problem.
As mentioned above, deviant behaviours can cause errors and thus increase the risk of accidents (Hoffmann & Larison 1999; Adhikari 2015). Workplace deviant behaviours such as alcohol and drug use on works have high tendency of causing severe accident (Ramchand, Pomeroy, & Arkes, 2009). Alcohol and drug use can affect a person’s job performance and even harm the safety of that person, other workers or the customers. According to data from National Anti-Drug Agency (NADA) of Malaysia, the number of drug abusers has increased from 20,887 persons in 2013 to 25,922 in 2017 where there were 465 drug abusers from manufacturing industry in 2017. Since 2010, the National Anti-Drug Agency has taken efforts to tackle this issue where the agency has made changes to the existing rehabilitation programs. The drug abusers are given the opportunity to get treatment at rehabilitation centres without being prosecuted or prison (Bonn, Cai, Hoang, Khairuddin, & Qiu, 2015). According to Nyameh, Teru, Titus, and Yakubu (2013), drug abuse is a serious problem that affects a country’s economy and development process. In addition, drug abuse is associated with high turnover intention, poor work performance, low productivity, low level of positive contextual performance and high level of counterproductive behaviours (Frone, 2004; Lehman & Simpson 1992). Thus, workplace deviance issue should be addressed as fast as possible to ensure the country’s future growth and development.
Moreover, there is a positive relationship between workplace deviance and turnover intention (Dufur, Hoffmann, & Huang, 2007; Asif, Hassan, & Mehar 2018). The consequences of workplace deviance include increasing absenteeism, declining employee morale, deteriorating employee’s performance and increasing financial costs (Muafi, 2011). According to the data from Department of Statistics Malaysia, the total salaries and wages of manufacturing employees have increased by 8.4% from RM 5959.9 million in 2015 to RM 6461.0 million in 2016. Despite the increasing trend of salary level, the number of employees involved in manufacturing industry has decreased by 0.2 percent from 1,030,484 persons in 2015 to 1,028,301 persons in 2016. The result is out of expectation as there is a negative relationship between salary and employees’ turnover rate (Chepchumba, 2017). As the salary level increased from 2015 to 2016, the number of employee is expected to increase as well. Thus, it is important to investigate what is going on in manufacturing industry.

According to Rahman, Ferdausy, and Karan (2012), there is a significant relationship between workplace deviance and job performance indicators such as quantity, quality, employee’s efficiency, work standard and accuracy of work. The performance of manufacturing industry has declined where the industry productivity has decreased by 2.2 percent from RM 106,054 in 2015 to RM 103,713 in 2016 (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2018). The sales value of manufacturing industry has also decreased by 2.4 percent from RM 109,286.9 million in 2015 to RM 106,648.3 million in 2016. Given the contribution of manufacturing industry to Malaysia’s economy, it is important to conduct research on this industry.

As mentioned before, we have found some indications and symptoms of workplace deviance issue such as increasing accident rate, increasing turnover rate, declining work performance and deteriorating industry’s productivity happen in manufacturing industry. Since manufacturing industry is a vital industry that contributes to the economic growth of the country, we decide to conduct research on this industry. We have chosen perceived organizational support and
organizational justice as our independent variables in this research. The reason why we choose perceived organizational support as independent variable is because we found that employers in Malaysia do not really consider the welfare and well-being of their employees. According to Ang (2016), 91% of human resource department in Malaysia were found to plan their benefits programmes without a clear strategy or tactic. In addition, there were 34% of staff have resigned from work because of the relationship with their supervisor. Furthermore, according to data from Randstad Employer Brand Research, 34.58% of the employees in Malaysia are looking forward to leave their companies. The primary reasons of their leaving are poor salary and benefits, lack of career progression and lack of appreciation from management. These evidences indicate that those employees perceive a low organizational support from organization where the organizational support can be referred to both tangible reward (salary) and intangible reward (recognition). On the other hand, the reason of choosing organizational justice as independent variable is because we found that organizational justice exerts significant influence on workplace deviance. This is because when employees perceive fairness in their working places, they will develop positive working behaviour, otherwise it will bring negative consequences to the organization. If organizational justice is not perceived by employees, injustice may happen, the consequences include sabotage, theft, workplace aggression and other form of workplace deviance (Mccardle, 2007).

Last but not least, the gap of this research is that there are a lot of researchers do the workplace deviance researches in public service organizations and voluntary sectors. However, there are no researchers conduct workplace deviance research in manufacturing industry. Given the problems faced by the manufacturing industry such as high accident rate, increasing turnover rate, declining productivity and others, we decide to conduct workplace deviance research on this industry.
1.3 Research Objective

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of conducting this study is to identify the factors affecting workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this research are to:

1. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

2. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

3. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

4. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.
5. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between the four variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) in explaining the variances of workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

1.4 Research Questions

1. Is there a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?

2. Is there a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?

3. Is there a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?

4. Is there a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the four variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) in explaining the variances of workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?
1.5 Hypotheses of Study

1.5.1 Hypothesis One – Perceived Organizational Support

H₀: There is no significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

1.5.2 Hypothesis Two–Distributive Justice

H₀: There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

H₂: There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.
1.5.3 Hypothesis Three- Procedural Justice

H₀: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

H₃: There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

1.5.4 Hypothesis Four-Interactional Justice

H₀: There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

H₄: There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.
1.5.5 Hypothesis Five

H_0: The four variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) are not significant in explaining the variances of workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?

H_5: The four variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) are significant in explaining the variances of workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?

1.6 Significance of Study

The aim of this research is to study the dimensions and determinants of workplace deviant behaviour among employees in Malaysia’s manufacturing industry. The research findings are not only able to expand knowledge and increase awareness of workplace deviance among employees, organizations and government but also affect the nation’s economic performance. In addition, this research also provides inputs to organizations to identify the workplace deviance related issues which help them to address the workplace deviance issues more effectively. Since the workplace deviant behaviours may put employees’ safety at risk, it is important to identify ways to address the issues. For example, workplace deviant behaviour such as noncompliance of industry regulation may cause accidents which may put the employees’ life at risk. It is expected that this research will help policy makers and practitioners to reduce occurrences of workplace deviance behaviors. There was a lot of workplace deviance studies conducted in Malaysia, however, there are not many studies of this topic conducted in manufacturing industry. Thus, this research also provides additional information for other researchers.
1.6.1 Employee perspective

Workplace deviant behaviour affects employees’ job performance. According to Rahman, Ferdausy and Karan (2012), workplace deviance is one of the factors that influences employees’ performance. The results from the research showed that there is a negative correlation between workplace deviance and job performance. It indicates that the higher the workplace deviance, the lower the job performance. Specifically, avoiding workplace deviant behaviour also leads to high employees’ job performance since employees are more motivated to work in a safe working environment. The main implication of the study is that the existence of deviant workplace behaviour is a prior indication of poor job performance; therefore, preventive actions should be taken to minimize it. Thus, avoiding workplace deviant behaviour is a way for organization to improve the employees’ job performance. In addition, workplace deviance does not only harm employees’ physical wellbeing but also psychological health. Specifically, workplace deviance affects employees’ emotional intelligence. According to Kim, Lee, and Yim (2017), workplace deviant behavior is one of the factors that harms employees’ emotional intelligence. The results from the research showed that there is a negative correlation between workplace deviant behavior and emotional intelligence. It indicates that the greater the workplace deviant behavior exists in the workplace, the lower the emotional intelligence. On the other hand, restricting the workplace deviant behavior also works on greater employees’ emotional intelligence.
1.6.2 Organization’s perspective

It is important to study workplace deviance since it will directly affect the organizational performance and productivity. Employees are one of the most important assets of the organization since they are the one who decide the organization’s success and competitiveness. Employers are responsible for providing a safe environment for their employees as well as ensuring their employees receive fair treatment from other colleagues. According to Alias, Rasdi, Ismail, and Samah (2013), in organization with low workplace deviance, employees are more motivated and productive. Since the organization is dependent of employees, it is important to avoid workplace deviance among the employees. Organizations that face workplace deviance issues normally suffer from poor reputation and negative corporate image. For example, when an employee of an organization is found committed fraud, the public will perceive that organization in a negative manner and lose confidence and trust of the organization.

1.6.3 Future researcher perspective

This study is able to provide more information for the future researchers who are interested in the concept of workplace deviant behaviour. In the past two decades, there are academicians started to realize the importance of workplace deviance to organizations. Therefore, they started to study the concept of workplace deviance (Yıldız & Alpkan, 2015). In this case this paper will be useful for those who is investigating the concept of workplace deviance. As this paper provides a theoretical framework regarding the study of workplace deviance, future researchers can use this paper as a reference for their studies. There are a lot of factors that induce the workplace deviant behavior; however, this paper provides a more detailed
explanation which concern on the impact of perceived organizational support and organizational justice to the workplace deviant behaviour. Thus, this paper can provide additional information to the future researchers who are interested in the study of how perceived organizational support and organizational justice affect the workplace deviance in organization.

1.7 Chapter Layout

Chapter 1: Introduction

The first chapter discusses about the factors affecting workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. This chapter consists of research background, problem statement, research objectives, research questions, hypotheses and significance of the study. Chapter layout and conclusion will be discussed afterwards.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In chapter 2, the literature review provides insights to the topic by reviewing the related journal articles. This chapter also consists of review of relevant theoretical models, proposed theoretical/conceptual framework, hypotheses development and conclusion. The theoretical framework is to hypothesize the relationship between dependent and independent variables.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This part consists of all the research design and how the research data is collected. This chapter focuses on research method which includes sample size, data collection method, types of measurement scales and method of analysis.
Chapter 4: Research Result

This chapter presents the analysis of the questionnaire which is reported in the form of charts and table through the application of Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The result will be analysed and discussed in detail.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter presents the overall conclusion of the research. It includes summary of statistical analysis, discussion of major findings and implication of the study. The limitations of the study will be indicated in this chapter and recommendation will be given for upcoming study.

1.8 Conclusion

In a nutshell, chapter 1 depicts our research background that consists of the research briefing on the factors affecting workplace deviance in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. It also discusses the problem statement, research questions and objectives of our study. Moreover, this chapter provides the guidance and serves as a fundamental for us to proceed to the next chapter. Besides that, this chapter allows the readers to gain a basic understanding of variables about the factors affecting workplace deviance in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter is started with overview of dependent variable (workplace deviance) and independent variables (perceived organizational support and organizational justice). The relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational justice with workplace deviance are explained based on the support and evidence from literature review. Besides, theoretical framework and hypotheses development are included in this chapter. Chapter summary will be written in last part to conclude this chapter.

2.1 Review of Literature

2.1.1 Dependent variable: Workplace Deviance

Workplace deviant behavior is a voluntary behavior that is practiced by employees who have the intentions to violate the workplace norms and threaten the well-being of the organizations or its organizational members, or both (Bennett & Marasi, 2016). Workplace deviance occurs when the employees are lacking the motivation to conform to the norms, rules and regulations or the organization has motivated the employees to violate the rules and regulations in the workplace in which the violation can be harmful to the organization and its members. From the prior research of workplace deviance, there are two aspects of workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett,
1995). First, employees engage in workplace deviance behaviors intentionally and they are not committing workplace deviance by opportunities. Second, workplace deviance represents a significant inconsistency with the workplace norms. Workplace norms include all the workplace standards that are expected to be performed by the employees and any moral standards that prescribed in both formal and informal ways such as organization’s rules and regulations, policies and procedures (Feldman, 1984).

Workplace deviant behavior is also referred to the expressive motivation for the employees to express their anger, stress, pressure and even unfavorable treatment received from others (Lee & Allen, 2002). The employees may practice this behavior toward their co-workers, subordinates, and the organizations. Reciprocity theory can also be taken into account when the prior researchers discuss on the workplace deviant behavior (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). The reciprocity theory explains that behaviors exchange between people in term of positive and negative behavior. When the employees receive negative treatments from the organization or the co-workers, they may response to the situation by treating the organization or co-workers in the same way (Alias, Rasdi, Ismail, & Samah, 2013).

There are few terms used in other literatures which are almost similar to workplace deviant behavior. First, workplace incivility is also a deviant behavior even the employees who commit the actions have low intention to cause harm toward other employees in the workplace and their actions have little impact to the targets (Norsilan, Omar, & Ahmad, 2014). However, those actions will contribute to the workplace deviant behaviors such as the absenteeism, reciprocal action with negative intention toward others and etc. Second, organizational misbehavior is referred to employees who are intentionally violating the organization’s rules and regulations in the
workplace (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). It is also known as organizational dysfunctional behavior which can bring harm to the organization, its members and stakeholders. Third, there is a newer form of the workplace deviant behavior which is known as cyber loafing. This behavior is related to any activities in the workplace which includes engaging in non-work-related activity such as using the company’s internet to perform personal matters (Lim, 2002). Cyber loafing also includes sending non-work-related email, downloading the non-work-related resources and online shopping. This type of non-work-related activity is detrimental to organization’s productivity and financial resources since these activities consume employees’ working times and waste the company’s resources.

From the prior researches that were done by the other researchers, the typology of the workplace deviance is using multidimensional scaling to differentiate and identify the two dimensions of the workplace deviance (Norsilan, Omar, & Ahmad, 2014). The two dimensions are type of envisaged target and severity of the deviant behavior. First, types of envisaged target are both the interpersonal deviance and organization deviance (Palo & Chawla, 2015). Interpersonal deviance is defined as the deviant actions directed toward the organizational members. It includes actions that cause harms to the co-worker or any behaviors that are considered as rude to others. Organization deviance is defined as the deviant action directed toward the organization. It includes actions such as stealing company’s resources and performing badly with intention. Second, the severity of the deviant behavior measures the seriousness of the offense and it ranges from minor offense to serious offense.
There are four types of workplace deviance that generated from two dimensions (envisaged target and severity of the deviant behavior). The four types of workplace deviance are production deviance, property deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression.

First, production deviance is a minor behavior that is detrimental to the organization’s productivity such as punctuality problem, wasting company’s resources, absenteeism issues and withholding effort (Tuclea, Vranceanu, & Filip 2015). This behavior is caused by the employee’s
negative feeling toward the organization. Cyber loafing is also one of the production deviance examples as the employee may be less productive due to the internet usage.

Second, property deviance is a serious behavior that can cause harmful effects to the organization such as the sabotage organization’s property, stealing the company’s property and reporting a fake working hour to the organization (Gruys, 1999). This type of workplace deviance behavior has significant negative consequence toward the organization as the organization has to bear more unfavorable costs which are not necessary.

Third, political deviance occurs when the employees put others in a political disadvantage position through the engagement in the social interaction (Norsilan, Omar, & Ahmad, 2014). Normally, the political deviance is practiced by employees through actions such as gossiping with other employees, showing favoritism toward employees, blaming other coworkers for any mistakes and a non-beneficial competition among the employees. Victims who are affected by the political deviance may display negative attitudes and behaviors such as absenteeism and intentionally do things wrong.

Lastly, personal aggression is a serious behavior that is harmful to other individuals in the workplace (Norsilan, Omar, & Ahmad, 2014). Employees who engage in this personal aggression usually commit an aggressive or hostile act toward other employees in the workplace. Examples of personal aggression are sexual harassment, actions that endanger other employees and verbal abuse directed toward other employees.

This typology of the workplace deviance can be served as a classification of the workplace deviant behavior which is according to the workplace climate.
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(Appelbaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007). The management can solve the workplace deviance issue by looking into this typology and provide the appropriate action. This typology can tell the companies what action they should take in order to solve the problem.

In short, the concept of workplace deviance as mentioned by authors such as Robinson & Bennett (1995), and Bennett & Marasi (2016) has explained how the workplace deviance can bring negative consequences to the workplace. As we read through these journal articles, we also agreed on the points that workplace deviance can bring the negative consequences to the workplace such as increasing absenteeism, declining work performance and others. Thus, workplace deviance should be a topic that the companies’ management team should focus on.

2.1.2 1st Independent Variable: Perceived Organizational Support

According to Caesens, Stinglhamber, Demoulin, and Wilde (2017), perceived organizational support is defined as employees’ general perceptions of how organizations value their contributions and cares about their welfares. Organizations that value their employees will always give the employees approval, treat the employees with respect and provide employees with pay and promotion opportunities. Moreover, perceived organizational support also means the organization will provide assistance to the employees when it is necessary to perform the works and overcome stressful state (Eisenberger & Rhoades, 2002).
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Perceived organizational support is a crucial part of the social-exchanged relationship between employees and employers (Yoeung, Sinsen, Roem, Loy, & Ros, 2017). In social-exchanged theory, employees assume that their extra efforts will be reciprocated with moral and material awards. They seek employment as a trade of the efforts and loyalty for a tangible reward or benefit from the organization (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015). They expect their efforts will be exchanged for a good pay, rank, job enrichment, or other rewards. Thus, it can be concluded that based on norm of reciprocity, perceived organizational support produces a sense of responsibility of employees to the organization and this responsibility also enhances employees’ affective commitment to the organization (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001). On the other hand, for employees who work hard and put extra efforts into their works but do not receive a good pay or other rewards, workplace deviance may happen in order to attract the organizations’ attention.

According to Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011), perceived organizational support is important as it will lead to three categories of outcome which are good attitude toward the organization and work, favorable behavioural outcomes, and employees’ well-being. Organizational support theory explains how perceived organizational support link to these three categories of outcomes. First, organizational support theory states that because perceived organizational support offers tangible and intangible rewards to employees, they feel a sense of responsibility to care about the organizational wellbeing and assist the organization to achieve its targets. Second, the theory mentions that perceived organizational support reveals to employees that those who increase their work efforts will be rewarded (Yoeung, Sinsen, Roem, Loy & Ros, 2017). It enhances the employees’ positive attitudes and behaviors towards the organization since it assures the employees that the efforts they put into the organizations will be rewarded. Lastly, perceived organizational support can satisfy some socio emotional needs of employees such as the
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need for esteem, affiliation, emotional support and approval (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015). This led to the employees’ self-enhancement process where they will develop positive attitudes and better well-being in the workplace. Once the employees feel that their organizations have taken care of their welfare, the workplace deviance in that organizations will be reduced. The employees will have good attitudes or manners to perform in their workplace instead of involving in workplace deviance to harm the organizations’ image. In addition, according to Panatik, Tan, Rahman, and Rajab (2015), when employees’ socio emotional needs are satisfied, the employees will have higher satisfactions and less likely to involve in destructive behaviors.

Furthermore, a high perceived organizational support means that increase in the employees’ performances, efforts and rewards have been taken into consideration by the organization. For instance, by acknowledging the employees’ contribution to the assigned task, it can help to enhance their self-estees and satisfy their needs for approval and self-esteem. According to Ferris, Brown, and Heller (2009), when employees perceive support given from organization, they will have a higher self-esteem and perceive themselves as important to the organization. In turn, it reduces their intention to engage in workplace deviant behaviors such as theft and taking a longer break.

In contrast, low perceived organizational support reflects dissatisfaction of the relationship between employees and organization due to the employees’ performance and efforts are not well compensated (Epitropaki & Martin, 2013). There is also a reciprocity norm applied which means that the employees will withhold their efforts when they do not receive any compensation or appreciation. For those employees who have low level of perceived organizational support, they are more likely to behave defiantly (Liu & Ding, 2012). According to Eder and Eisenberger (2008), perceived
organizational support decreases the employees’ involvement in workplace deviance particularly for work group withdrawal and individual withdrawal.

In short, perceived organizational support is important to the both organization and employees’ wellbeing. This is because employees’ perception of organizational support will affect their contributions and efforts to the organization. When the employees perceive a high level of organizational support, they will contribute their efforts to the organization. On the other hand, when the employees perceive a low level of organizational support, they will withdraw their efforts or even engage in workplace deviant behaviour which is detrimental to the organization.

2.1.3 2\textsuperscript{nd} Independent Variable: Organizational Justice

Justice research can be dated back to 1960s which aimed to investigate the propositions about the distribution of payment and other work-related rewards. According to Adam (1963), research on justice initiated with an intention of investigating the fairness of the outcome which is referred to distributive justice. There are a lot of organizational justice researches, the purpose of these researches is to gain a better understanding on employees’ perceptions of fairness within organizations (Greenberg, 1987; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Baldwin, 2006; Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007).

According to Greenberg (1987), organizational justice refers to employees’ perception about organization’s fairness and their responses towards the perceptions. Employees’ perception of fairness can actually affect employees’ attitudes and behaviors which in turn influence their
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motivations, productivities and performances. Organizational injustice such as unfair treatment can cause employees to display workplace deviant behaviors such as theft, withdrawal, resistance, vandalism and sabotage (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Bus, Review, & Dar, 2017).

As time passes by, organizational justice does not only include fairness of outcome but other aspects. According to Baldwin (2006), organizational justice is defined as the degree to which employees perceive fairness about rewards, procedures, policy, rules and treatment received in the organization. Justice in organizations extends to both financial and non-financial rewards. Examples of organizational injustices are unequal pay, unequal opportunities for promotion, arbitrary dismissal, unfair treatment from supervisors and so on. According to Pan, Chen, Hao, and Bi (2018), when the employees perceive a low level of organizational justice, they will become dissatisfied and display negative emotions which then lead to negative consequences to the organizations.

According to Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gilliland (2007), organizational justice is defined as individual judgment about the ethical and moral standards of managerial action. Organizational justice also refers to organization’s practices and policies that are consistent with ethical standards, religion and or law (Yean & Yusof, 2016; Pekurinen, Valimaki, Virtanen, Salo, Kivimaki, & Vahtera, 2017). Adhering to justice demands an organization to consider the perspective of its employees. In addition, justice is subjective and descriptive in which it does not relates to objective reality but rather personal evaluation of decisions, practices and treatment received within an organization (Greenberg, 1987; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilliland, 2007; Yadav & Yadav, 2016). Thus, it is vital to understand the employees’ perspectives before an organization forms its justice mechanisms. When employees perceive their organizations are unfair to them, they may display negative feelings such as
resentment, frustration, mistrust and job dissatisfaction which lead them to conduct deviant behaviors toward their organizations and colleagues (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998).

Although different researchers define the components of organizational justice in different ways, most of the justice researchers stated that employees perceive organizational fairness based on three major components which are outcomes, processes and interpersonal treatment. The three dimensions of organizational justice are distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. According to Mccardle (2007), when employees perceive one of these components as unfair, they may have negative workplace attitudes such as demotivated, frustration, job dissatisfaction and aggression which lead to deviant behaviors toward other employees and organization.

The emergence of organizational justice was started by the idea of distributive justice (Adams, 1963). Distributive injustice perception occurs when an individual perceives the outcomes received as unfair, for instance, lack of pay raise, promotions, or training opportunities. Later, the studies on organizational justice were extended to include researches on procedural justice. Procedural justice is concerned with the fairness of distribution rules on rewards, punishments, opportunities and promotions (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The last dimension of organizational justice, interactional justice is concerned with the fairness of treatment a person receives during the interactional process (Bies & Moag, 1986).

Last but not least, when individuals face multiple unfair incidents, their tendencies to seek for revenge and other negative behaviors such as absenteeism, theft and dishonesty increase (Folger & Skarlicki, 1998). For instance, employees experience a higher level of resentment, anger or
frustration when both the outcomes and procedures are perceived as unfair (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). While multiple injustice events can stimulate intense behavioral responses, the perception of one type of injustice can be reduced by perceptions of other type of fairness. According to Greenberg (1993), employees who perceive the outcome as fair will not respond even if they receive unfair personal treatment. In addition, according to the studies done by Folger and Konosky (1989), when the supervisors adopt fair performance appraisal procedures, the employees will feel satisfied with the pay received regardless of the amount of pay, in other word, they perceive the amount of pay received as fair.

2.1.4 3rd Independent Variable: Distributive Justice

According to Adams (1963), the concept of equity theory is an antecedent for organizational justice and distributive justice, where the initial concept of organizational justice and distributive justice was derived from. Distributive justice is defined as the fairness associated with the decision making of distribution of resource within the organization (Yean & Yusof, 2016). Similarly, distributive justice principle can be used in the allocation of financial and non-financial resources such as compensation for the employee and praises. The resources distributed can be in tangible or intangible form, in this case tangible form refers to financial resources such as salary, while, intangible form refers to nonfinancial resources such as the praise given by manager to their subordinates. Organizations should compensate their employees accordingly. For instance, they should compensate those who have attained the organizational goal or performance target and not to compensate those who do not achieve the goal or target. In this case, distributive justice is achieved when the employees notice their efforts and rewards are evaluated equally. In other words, they have received something in return that is equal to their contribution.
In addition, distributive justice has primarily been studied from equity theory perspective. Based on the equity theory, there are three rules for employer to attain fair distributive justice which are rule of equity, equality and allocations based on need. Other than that, these rules can also be used by employees to assess and decide whether or not their outcomes are fair (Steiner, Traban, Hatponstahl, & Fointiat, 2006). In this case, the issue of unequal and or unfair distribution of resources can be eliminated if the employer takes these three approaches into consideration when distributing resources.

Equity allocation is a fair allocation that pays individuals in accordance with their contributions. According to Adam’s equity theory, people tend to assess their perceived rewards relative to their perceived contributions and then compare the efforts and allocations against that of a referent. Outcome or reward in a work context is wages, promotions and career opportunities that an employee receives, while input or contribution includes education, experience and effort of an employee (Baldwin, 2006). Besides, inequitable outcome allocation arouses perception of injustice and can cause dissatisfaction of employee over the violation of distributive justice norms.

Equality allocation stress on all members of the group should receive the same share regardless of their individual contribution. The goal of equality allocation is to maximize group harmony and maximize productivity. In this case, equality allocation approach is most common among the close and communal group. Equality allocation is opposed to the equity allocation, it is preferable in the situation when allocating something negative such as budget cuts. This is because when everyone are necessary to share the suffering outcome, they prefer to suffer by the same amount or percentage (Goncalo & Kim, 2010).
Need allocation is implemented when outcome is provided on the basis of perceived scarcity. However, need allocation has been less widely studied in the organizational science, even though some of the profit-making firms make at least some use of this allocation method. In addition, family leave policy is one of the examples which leaves are allocated to those who need them. Family leave policy is only for people with particular needs such as child care or elder care (Cropanzano & Molina, 2015).

In conclusion, there are various studies that have examined the influence of fair treatment to employees on organizational variables. According to Satisfaction and Organ (2015); Deluga (1994), and Morrison (1994), they agreed that the fair outcomes to employees will increase job satisfaction, improve relationships between supervisors and their subordinates and encourage organizational citizenship behavior, therefore benefiting the organization. In contrast, Pan, Chen, Hao, and Bi (2018)suggested that employees may respond to perception of unfair distribution with a range of negative behavioral responses such as theft, withdrawal, resistance, vandalism, sabotage and reduction of positive behavior.

2.1.5 4th Independent Variable: Procedural Justice

Procedural justice is defined as the perception of fairness toward the procedures and processes that are used to allocate resources or decision making (Partlin & Darcy, 2007). Other than that, procedural justice focuses on the fairness of the decision process that results in a certain outcome (Baldwin, 2006). In addition, according to Baldwin (2006), individuals may accept any unfavorable outcome if their perceptions toward the process of distribution are fair.
According to Baldwin (2006), there is a higher chance that people perceive procedural justice if they are given more opportunities to voice up their opinions and participate in the discussion during the decision making process. This voice up process is not only applied in the discussion process, however it can also be applied in the daily working interaction or causal interaction between and among supervisors and subordinates. The parties who are granted with opportunities to express their ideas or opinions would like to have a positive thinking which they may be able to increase the probability to generate a favorable outcome (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The voice up function also plays an essential role in status identification where the organizational members perceive each other’s importance (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

Other than the voice up theory, there are few characteristics that determine the quality of the procedural justice (Partlin & Darcy, 2007). These characteristics can affect the perception of the fairness during the process of decision making. The first characteristic is consistency which means the allocation of resources or decisions should be the same toward the person regardless of the time or situation. The second characteristic is neutrality. This characteristic explains that any decisions should be made based on the fact, truth and correct information rather than based on personal feeling or the interest of the decision maker. The third characteristic is accuracy. The decision made should be based on the timely and right information. The fourth characteristic is correctability, people should have the rights to appeal or have the ill-revised process toward the decision made when they have a disagreement with the decision made. The fifth characteristic is representativeness which illustrates that decision made should take all the parties affected into considerations. Lastly, the sixth characteristic is morality and ethicality (Leventhal, 1980). For example, demographics factors such as age, gender and nationality should not affect the decision making.
The prior researchers have found out that if the authority parties emphasize a high degree of procedural justice, the people will have higher acceptance toward the result; the more cooperative the behavior of the authorities, the higher the outcome satisfaction (Beijersbergen, Dirkzwager, Eichelsheim, Vanderlaan, & Nieuwbeerta, 2015). This has showed that the importance of the procedural justice in a company which may generate better workplace as compared to those authorities who did not treat their subordinates in a way consistent with procedural justice. In short, when the employees perceive unfairness of the process or any dissatisfactions toward the process that involves decision making, it will increase the probability of commitment of workplace deviant behavior by the employees (Hemdi & Nasrudin, 2006).

2.1.6 5th Independent Variable: Interactional Justice

Interactional justice is the perception of equity in the relationship between supervisors and employees (Bies & Moag, 1986). Bies and Moag (1986) stated that employees are not only assessing the processes and results, they are also examining the justice of interpersonal treatment they receive. In addition, Rizvi, Barry, and Rauf (2017) proposed that fairness is not only concerned with the formal procedures and policies of the organization but supervisor is also a significant source of fairness. A lot of researchers have emphasized the supervisors’ treatment towards their employees. The “treatment” is expressed by the information of the message given by the supervisors as well as by the manner of their behaviors toward employees such as respect, courtesy (Taylor, 2001), or the method of applying the procedures and policies (Bies, 2001). Bies (1987) mentioned that perceptions of fairness of employees tend to be higher when they were treated with respect and dignity and when data and information were shared.
and acceptable explanations were provided regarding distribution of significant resources.

The term “interactional justice” has been identified by Bies and Moag (1986) as the degree of sensitivity of employees towards the superiority of interpersonal treatment they obtain while performing the organizational processes. They have determined four principles of interpersonally fair procedures which are truthfulness, respect, propriety of questions and justification. Truthfulness, respect and propriety of question are dealing with the pattern of the communication when interaction is happening while justification is dealing with eliminating any discontent under an unfair procedure. First, truthfulness includes two elements which are dishonesty and candidness. It means that the organizations must provide accurate and realistic information to their employees because employees are expecting organization treated them in a forthright manner. Besides that, the explanations given by supervisor should be honest, frank and open. Second, respect means the discourteous or insult behaviors of the organization should be avoided because employees are expected to be treated respectfully and politely. Third, the propriety of questions means that questions should not be valued inappropriately by their very nature and employees should not express prejudicial statements. Lastly, justification is dealing with negative results and injustice treatment. The real reasons behind all decisions must be clearly explained to employees since it may be an alternative to rectify an unfair situation with an appropriate justification. A sense and feeling of anger or dissatisfaction with injustice can be minimized by providing appropriate explanation or apology (Bies & Shapiro, 1988). According to Trevino and Weaver (2001), they suggested that if employees do not receive an appropriate explanation, they will suspect whether they have been treated in according with a socially fundamental expectation for justice procedures in human interaction.
There are various theoretical frameworks that explain how interactional injustice would lead to workplace deviance such as leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and reciprocal relationship. Leader-member exchange theory is defined as the quality of the supervisor-employee relationship and it assumes that leaders tend to build up a special relationship with each employee (Graen & Scanjura, 1987). Employees’ perception of interactional justice enables the development of high-quality leader-member exchange (Spector & Charash, 2001). If employees are treated fairly by their leaders, they will attempt to reciprocate something positive to their organizations (Gouldner, 1960). According to Uhl-Bien, Graen, and Scandura (2000), interactional justice plays an important role to leader-member exchange because interactional justice helps to develop trust, respect and mutual obligation between interactions of leaders and employees. Based on several empirical researches, employees with a positive interactional justice perception towards their leaders are more likely to develop close relationship with their leaders (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). In short, leader-member exchange will affect employee’s perception of interactional justice that can lead to workplace deviance (Son, Kim, & Kim, 2014).

According to Greenberg (1993), he suggested that there are two dimensions of interactional justice which are informational justice and interpersonal justice. Informational justice is defined as the accuracy and quality of received information, while the interpersonal justice refers to the quality of interpersonal interactions between supervisor and employees such as truthfulness, dignity and respect (Roy, Bastounis, & Poussard, Interactional Justice and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Role of Negative Emotions, 2012). According to Aquino, Galperin, and Bennett (2004), the perception of interactional justice is significantly related to employee’s tendency to perform workplace deviant behaviors since interactional justice focuses on the relationship between hierarchical superiors and their subordinates. Therefore, employee’s behavior is
significantly shaped by interactional justice (Greenberg & Alge, 1998; Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006; Skarlicki & Folger, 2004).

In addition, the extent of employee’s perception of interpersonal justice would trigger deviant behaviors such as moral outrage, anger and resentment. For instance, employees who have been treated unfairly may involve in retaliation against their employers or experience more insomnia (Greeberg, 1993). Daily routine interpersonal meetings that happen frequently in an organization make interpersonal justice more appropriate and psychologically meaningful to employees compared to other types of justice (Bies, 2005). In the workplace, employee’s reactions and predictions about their direct supervisor are important determinants of interpersonal justice (McCardle, 2007). The overall fairness of the organization is directly influenced by the perceptions of interpersonal justice; therefore, it will also affect how individuals think about the unfair treatment (Derek, Scott, Aditi, & Sabrina, 2010).
2.2 Review of Relevant Theoretical Models

2.2.1 Perceived Organizational Support

Figure 2.2 Conceptual framework: Perceived organizational support and workplace deviance in the voluntary sector.


The model above shows the relationship between perceived organizational support and three dimensions of workplace deviance which are interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance and inter-organizational deviance. The aim of this study was to extend the workplace deviance hypothesis into voluntary sector and to investigate the correlation between perceived organizational supports and workplace deviance. A total sample of 346 volunteers was included in emergency relief services in Malaysia in this study. The measurement of perceived organizational support was adopted from Eisenberg and his colleagues (1986). While the measurement of workplace deviance was adopted from Robinson and Bennett (2000). The result showed that the relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance is significant. There is a negative
relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. The end of this study concluded that perceived organizational support is negatively related to the three dimensions of workplace deviance which are interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance and inter-organizational deviance.

There are many researchers study the relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. Moreover, the research conducted by Khan, Kanwal, & Shoaib (2015) was aimed to investigate how perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support affect workplace deviance. In order to test the relationship in this study, the researchers have distributed 800 set of questionnaires to the front line employees from 8 prime banks in Pakistan. Eventually, the research has showed that there is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. The research study also indicated that high support from the bank management will reduce antisocial behavior at work.
2.2.2 Organizational Justice

Figure 2.3 Conceptual framework: Relationship between Organizational Justice Perception and Engagement in Deviant Workplace Behavior


The model above shows the relationship between three dimensions of organizational justice which are distributive, procedural and interactional justice and four dimensions of deviant workplace behavior which are production, property, political and personal aggression.

The purpose of this study was to find out the impact of three dimensions of organizational justice upon four dimensions of deviant workplace behavior, as well as the overall association between organizational justice and deviant workplace behavior. In addition, 33 employees who work in supporting divisions such as HR division, finance division, academic bureau and library in Faculty of Economics of the University of Indonesia have participated in this study. The measurement of organizational justice perception is adopted from Moorman and Lim (2002). The measurement of deviant workplace behavior is adopted from Robinson and Peterson (2002).
This study revealed that perception of organizational justice is associated with deviant workplace behavior. The result showed that procedural, distributive and interactional justice is significant negatively related to deviant workplace behavior, especially the interactional justice has the strongest relationship. This is because of interactional justice has a stronger impact than distributive and procedural justice, to negative emotions, intent to leave and intent to reduce works (Syabani, M.I & Sobri, 2011). In addition, the study also revealed that employees are concerned whether their supervisors have enacted organizational procedures properly and fairly. However, the employees’ perception regarding the fairness of organizational procedure is not that intense as interactional justice. Moreover, the relationship between distributive justice and deviant workplace behavior is moderate. In short, from the result, we have found that organizational justice perception plays important role to the existence of deviant workplace behavior.
2.3 Proposed Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

According to several researchers, the most two common factors that cause workplace deviance are perceived organizational support and organizational justice. A conceptual framework is proposed based on the literature review and researches done by other researches. Figure 2.3 shows two independent variables which affect the workplace deviance in Malaysia manufacturing industry which are perceived organizational support and organizational justice. There are 3 dimensions of organizational justice which are distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.
2.4 Hypotheses Development

2.4.1 Relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and Workplace Deviance

According to the study conducted by Lim, Chan, and Teh (2015), they have examined the relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. The result showed that perceived organizational support is negatively related to workplace deviance. Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004) also found that there is a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. This is because when employees believe their efforts are supported by the organization, they will less likely to withhold their efforts and engage in workplace deviant behaviors (Appiah, 2015). In contrast, when employees have a low perceived organizational support, they will more likely to withhold their efforts as well as engage in workplace deviance.

In addition, the study of Panatik, Tan, Rahman, & Rajab (2015) also showed that perceived organizational support is negatively related to workplace deviance among the employees. Employees who have a high level of perceived organizational support will less likely to engage in interpersonal deviance. According to Eder and Eisenberger (2008), the study investigated the manufacturing employees of electronics and appliances store in United State, they have found that the higher the perceived organizational support, the lower the workplace deviance.

Furthermore, based on the study of Khan, Kanwal, and Shoaib (2015), they have mentioned that there is a negative relationship between workplace
deviance and perceived organizational support. In other words, when the employees realize that the support from the management is low, they may involve in the antisocial behaviors such as harassment, discrimination, interpersonal violence as well as whistle-blowing. One of the reasons why perceived organizational support is low is due to the organization does not give opportunities to the employees to make their own decisions. Therefore, the employees will think that their opinions, suggestions and interests are not important to the organizations which in turn engage in workplace deviance.

According to Liu and Ding (2011), stated that the higher the perceived organizational support, the lower the likelihood of workplace deviance. Workplace deviant behavior such as verbal abuse or sharing offensive joke may cause harm to the individual as well as organization. They concluded that perceived organizational support will affect interpersonal deviance more compared to organizational deviance. This study encourages more researchers to bring out the full understanding about the relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance.

**Hypothesis One**

H\(_0\): There is no significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance.

H\(_1\): There is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance.
2.4.2 Relationship between Distributive Justice and Workplace Deviance

The study on the effects of organizational justice on workplace deviance which is conducted by Faheem and Mahmud (2015) in public sector hospital in Pakistan showed that there is strong negative relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance. This is because of the employees’ perception of unfair outcomes will increase the occurrence of deviant behavior at workplace (Adams, 1963). When employees perceive distributive injustice, the organization and the supervisor, or both, will be their first target to blame. Therefore, organization and supervisors normally are the victims who counter with the employees’ retaliatory actions.

As distributive justice focuses on the fairness of an outcome, it is important to predict those actions that are effective in restoring equity. According to Hollinger and Clark (1983), distributive justice has effects on deviance such as theft. In addition, they found that the employees are more likely to engage in acts of theft, as a mechanism to correct their perceived injustice especially when the employees feel being exploited by the organization. According to Michael (2010), a researcher of a study of sabotage in the workplace, he revealed that the induction of employees to engage in sabotage behavior is to restore equity. The study showed that distributive injustice is the main source of the deviant behavior induction. Moreover, research on pay systems has found that employee reaction to pay inequity triggers deviant behavior by targeting the organization, such as property theft (Maria & Maureen, 2007). In short, distributive justice is suggested to have implications for employees’ workplace deviance behavior.
Hypothesis Two

H₀: There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance.

H₂: There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance.

2.4.3 Relationship between Procedural Justice and Workplace Deviance

Existence of procedural justice can help employees to perceive fairness during the process of decision making and employees who perceive procedural justice are easier to accept the unfavorable result than those who did not perceive procedural justice during the process. When the employees perceived unfairness during the process, they may commit the workplace deviant behaviors such as violating workplace norms or committing actions that are harmful to others (Hemdi & Nasrudin, 2006; Faheem & Mahmud, 2015). Thus, it is important for organizations to look into the perception of procedural justice of the employees in order to avoid the workplace deviant behavior.

According to Baig and Ullah (2017), they have developed a research on workplace deviance in non-government sector in Pakistan and they found that procedural justice is strongly associated with the workplace deviance which means that the more the employees perceive procedural justice in the workplace, the less likely they will engage in workplace deviant behavior. Perception of unjust procedures will increase organizational conflict and hinder collaboration. In turn, procedural injustice can cause the employees
not to comply with organizational policies which is a predicament of compliance with formal rules (De Lara & Verano-Tacoronte, 2007).

According to the Hemdi and Nasrudin (2006), they have developed a research on the workplace deviance in the hotel industry and they have proved that the workplace deviant behavior of employees is significant and negatively affected by the procedural justice. Procedural injustice happens because employees unable to correct the unjust procedures and it may cause them to retaliate against those individuals who gain advantages from unjust procedures or against those who are accountable for adopting those procedures. In another research, it also stated that there is a negative relationship between workplace deviance and procedural justice (Bennet & Robinson, 2000). Perception of inequity and procedural injustice can lead to workplace deviant behavior such as theft (Greenberg, 1990). These behaviors may have the intentions to get even with the organization or to retaliate those who cause the injustice to happen.

**Hypothesis Three**

Hₐ: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance.

H₃: There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance.
2.4.4 Relationship between Interactional Justice and Workplace Deviance

Among distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice, the researchers had identified that the interactional justice plays a significant role in the emergence of workplace deviance (Nadisic, 2008). This is because the components of interactional justice are more dominant in the daily working environment than the components of distributive and procedural justice. For instance, employees evaluate the organizational exchanges on the basis of interactional justice rather than on the basis of distributive and procedural justice. The results also disclosed that interpersonal concerns are more prominent to individuals especially when they judge the equality of the outcomes or structural characteristics of practice. Bies (2005) has proved that low perceived interactional justice is the strongest predictor of deviance behaviors in the workplace. He also verified that the dimension of interactional justice will enable the mechanism of external blame attribution because the sources of justice such as hierarchical superior and colleague are very easy to recognize.

Moreover, in the study of Van Yperen, Hagedoom, Zweers, and Postma (2000), they mentioned that the perception of low interactional justice is associated with the engagement in verbal violence between supervisor and employees and therefore increases the deviance behavior. Furthermore, the interactional justice also acts as the main cause of sabotage, the actions of sabotage are not only affecting the employees but also affecting the organization as a whole (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002). They obtained the result from a content analysis of over 100 sabotage reports that completed by employees. These outcomes proved that the nature of interactional justice is related to various forms of workplace deviance.
According to Greenberg and Alge (1998), they suggested that inequality treatment is a dominant social influence on workplace deviance. Interpersonal justice is also known as the equality of the treatment an employee perceives in the enactment of proper procedures or in the clarification of those procedures. When the supervisors treat their employees with respect and exactly explain the reason for their decisions, interpersonal justice is adopted (Na-Ting & Cherng, 2012). Based on the cross-cultural research of Mikula, Petri, and Tanzer (1989), they realized that perceived violations of interpersonal justice was the most significant types of unfairness that reported by respondents, thus, they identified that these perceptions may exercise the strongest influence in workplace deviance. Employees who perceive mistreatment and abusive supervision have a high tendency of disturbing colleagues, being late to work and being less productive (Bowles & Gelfand, 2009).

**Hypothesis Four**

H$_0$: There is no significant relationship between international justice and workplace deviance.

H$_4$: There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance.
2.5 Conclusion

In a nutshell, this chapter discusses all relevant literature on the dependent variable which is workplace deviance and independent variables which are perceived organizational support, organizational justice, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. It provides an insight to the research topic in predicting the factors affecting workplace deviance. Therefore, after the proposed framework and research hypotheses have been created, research methodology will be proceeded in the following chapter which is chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

Research methodology is a process of carrying out the procedures for illustrating, describing, and forecasting phenomena (Rajasekar, Philominathan, & Chinnathambi, 2013). This chapter includes research design, data collection methods, sampling design, research instrument, construct measurement, data processing and data analysis. Furthermore, the research design will be discussed in the following part followed by the explanation of data collection methods.

3.1 Research Design

Research design is a comprehensive planning process that aims to increase the understanding of the topic by collecting and analyzing the data (Abutabenjeh & Jaradat, 2018). A research design includes processes such as data collection, measurement, and analysis of data in order to answer the research questions.

The research comprises two different major types which are qualitative and quantitative research. Qualitative method is used for exploring the idea which helps the researchers to gain an understanding of root cause, opinions and motivations. In contrast, quantitative research is used to generate numerical data that can be transformed into statistics by quantifying the problem. This research is quantitative research because it focuses on statistical, mathematical, or numerical analysis of data. Our research involves the numerical measurement in which we use statistics to sum up the findings by distributing the questionnaire to our respondents.
In addition, there are three categories of research which are exploratory research, descriptive research and causal research. Exploratory research is used to study a problem that has not been defined yet. It helps researchers to have a better understanding about the problem. Descriptive research is used to describe the characteristics of the variables of interest in a situation (Sekaran, 2003). Causal research is used to test the hypothesis about the cause-and-effect relationship.

In this research, causal research is used to investigate the factors that affecting the workplace deviance. We tend to determine the cause-and-effect relationship in this research. We would like to identify whether change in organizational justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and perceived organizational support will cause a change in workplace deviance. In short, the causes are organizational justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and perceived organizational support while the effect is workplace deviance.

### 3.2 Data collection methods

Data collection methods are important in a research methodology project which it will affect the result and validation of the research methodology project. There are two types of data collection method which are primary data collection method and secondary data collection method. Both data collection methods are important to the research and both of them provide different insights to the research.
3.2.1 Primary data collection method

Primary data collection method focuses on the data collection which is first-hand to the research project. This data collection method is fast and accurate where the researchers collect the data by directly contacting the respondents (Driscoll, 2011). The researchers develop their own questionnaire and make the observation on the respondents where during that time the researchers will have face to face contact with the respondents. There is an important distinction between the involvement and non-involvement of a researcher in the completion of a questionnaire. The researcher can provide full guidance to the respondents during the completion of the questionnaire or the questionnaire can also be done by the respondent without the guidance of the researcher. Furthermore, the combination of both ways is also available where the respondent fills up the questionnaire by oneself and the researcher provides the guidance only if the respondent requests for it (Beukenhorst & Kerssemakers, 2012).

There are few methods of collecting and gathering primary data such as survey, observation and face to face interview. In this research methodology project, we are developing the questionnaire and distribute to the respondents to collect and gather the primary data.

3.2.2 Secondary data collection method

Secondary data collection means collection and gathering of data which has been analyzed by the prior researchers (Herron, 1989). A researcher who uses secondary data collection method will adopt or collect the primary data that was collected and analyzed by another researcher (Boslaugh, 2007). The secondary data is collectable through the journal article, book and any other
research methodology project of other researchers. The secondary data can give a professional insight to the researchers. This method is also less costly and convenient to the researchers where they can get access to the secondary through online.

In this research, we are utilizing the database that provided by Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman to get access to the prior research or journal article that has been done by other researchers. However, some of the data have outdated and thus they cannot be used in this research.

3.3 Sampling Design

In this research project, the sampling design involves target population, sampling frame and sampling location, sampling elements, sampling technique and sampling size.

3.3.1 Target Population

The first step of sampling design is to select the target population in order to carry out the research project. According to Alvi (2016), target population is defined as all the members who meet the specific requirement for a particular research investigation. As this research topic is about the workplace deviance among employees in Malaysia’s manufacturing industry, the target population for this research project would be the employees of manufacturing industry in Malaysia.
Based on the Monthly Manufacturing Statistics Malaysia, it showed that the total employees employed in manufacturing industry in May 2018 was 1,070,000 persons, an increase of 18,077 persons compared to 1,051,923 persons in May 2017 (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2018). Thus, the target population for this research project is 1,070,000 people.

### 3.3.2 Sampling Frame and Sampling Location

Sampling frame is the collection of source materials from which the sample is selected (Turner, 2003). In other word, sampling frame includes a complete list of all possible people who together form a population. Ideally, the sampling frame will perfectly coincide with the target population, but sometimes the sample frame would be larger or smaller than target population. It depends on practical ways of getting in touch with each member of the sample. The sampling frame of manufacturing industry in Malaysia is unattainable because there are limitations on access to personal data and information due to protection of private and confidential materials.

Sampling location is the place where the researchers approach the target population in order to collect the data by distributing the questionnaires. The sampling location for this research project is Selangor. According to Statistics from Department of Statistics Malaysia, the manufacturing industry of Selangor has grown by 7.9% in year 2017 as compared to year 2016 which is 4.3%. In addition, the state government has contributed RM 7 billion as investment into manufacturing industry in year 2018 (The Star Online, 2018). This showed the importance of Selangor’s manufacturing industry in terms of contribution to Malaysia’s economy performance. According to Statistics from Department of Statistics Malaysia, Selangor is the largest contributor that contributes 28.9% of Malaysia’s manufacturing GDP in year 2016. Since
Selangor represents a significant part of manufacturing industry, we would like to conduct our research in Selangor to investigate whether the workplace deviance is a critical issue in Malaysia.

Figure 3.1 Percentage Share of Manufacturing Sector by State, 2016

Source: Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2018

3.3.3 Sampling Elements

Sampling elements are about the respondents who have participated in our survey. The sampling elements of this research project are all the employees who currently working in manufacturing industry in Kuala Lumpur. They will provide the information such as their working conditions, working environments and the relationship between colleagues and supervisors to us.
This information will be able to help us to conduct our research project. The questionnaire will be distributed to various categories of employees in terms of ages, genders, positions, working periods and education levels. The reason that we distributed the questionnaire to different individuals is because we want to get different perceptions of the factors that would influence workplace deviance. Besides that, the respondents from different categories will provide more accurate, reliable, valid and unbiased data.

### 3.3.4 Sampling Technique

Sampling technique is majorly classified into probability sampling and non-probability sampling. All the members in probability sampling have a pre-specified and an equal opportunity to be chosen as a representative sample. This method is based on the randomization principle and the procedure of selecting the sample will be designed. Probability sampling includes four types of methods which are simple random sampling, stratified sampling, cluster sampling and systematic sampling. On the other hand, non-probability sampling means the researcher does not know which member from the population will be chosen as a sample and the members are not given an equal chance to become part of the sample (Surbhi, 2016). Convenience sampling, quota sampling, judgement or purposive sampling and snowball sampling are the sampling methods under non-probability sampling.

Non-probability sampling techniques has been adopted as the sampling method to conduct this research project because the population of manufacturing industry is too large and it is more cost saving compared to probability sampling method (Alvi, 2016). In additions, we are unable to get and access to the personal information of employees of each companies in manufacturing industry. The convenience sampling has been selected as the
sampling method to conduct this research project. We are able to obtain those respondents that are most conveniently available where it enable us to approach them and distribute our questionnaires to them without any restrictions (Paul, 2008).

### 3.3.5 Sampling Size

According to the statistics from Department of Statistics Malaysia, it showed the total employed population in manufacturing industry in 2018 is 1,070,000 persons. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) had developed a table for determining sample size for the research project. According to Hashim (2010), he mentioned that the table of Krejcie and Morgan is used for a known and finite population in order to simplify the procedure of determining sample size. Thus, this table is used to determine our sample size since our sample size is known which is 1,070,000 persons. Therefore, based on the Table 3.1, the sample size for employees in manufacturing industry should be 384 persons because the population of manufacturing industry is 1,070,000 persons. Thus, we need to distribute 384 questionnaires over 1,070,000 target population.
Table 3.1 Table for Determining Sample Size of a Known Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—N is population size. S is sample size.

3.4 Research Instrument

In our research, we are using questionnaire as our research instrument to collect data from our target respondents. The reason we use questionnaire but not other method such as interview is because the use of questionnaire to collect data is less time-consuming and cost-efficient. However, in order to collect relevant results successfully, a well-designed questionnaire is crucial. This is because a well-designed questionnaire is able to provide us accurate information and give a hand to us to achieve our research objectives.

We have used fixed alternative questionnaire and closed-ended question to design our questionnaire, where multi-choice answers are provided in the questionnaires. Our respondents are free to choose the optimal options that most represent their own opinions. The purpose for us to use fixed alternative questionnaires is to ease the respondent for filling up, as well as by using this method the answers gathered from respondents would not deviate too much from our research objectives.
3.4.1 Questionnaire Design

Table 3.2 Questionnaire Section A, B and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Components/Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A</td>
<td>Demographic Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B</td>
<td>Dependent Variable: Workplace Deviance Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C</td>
<td>Independent Variables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 1: Perceived organizational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2: Distributive Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 3: Procedural Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 4: Interactional Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

In our survey questionnaire, we have categorized into 3 sections. Section A contains respondent’s demographic profile such as gender, age, ethnic group, marital status, gross monthly salary, education level, working experience, job title, average working hours per week and employment status. Section A has a total of 9 questions for respondents to fill up.

In Section B, it consists 12 questions of workplace deviance coupled with Five Point Likert scale rating, which the range is from strongly disagree to strongly agree. While in Section C, there are 4 parts which are perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. For the variable perceived organizational support, it consists of 8 questions, distributive justice consists of 4 questions, procedural
justice consists of 6 questions and interactional justice consists of 6 questions. Also, we have used Five Point Likert scale rating in designing this section.

### 3.4.2 Pilot study

A pilot study is a small study to investigate research protocols, data collection instruments and other research procedures in order for researchers to prepare for a larger study. The reason we run the pilot study is because it enables us to become familiar with the procedures in the protocol before we proceed to full study (Hassan, Schattner, & Mazza, 2006). In our study, we had distributed 30 sets of questionnaires to our target respondents who are the employees working in manufacturing industry at Kampar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th Aug 2018</td>
<td>Distribute questionnaire at Kampar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Aug 2018</td>
<td>Collect back the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Aug 2018</td>
<td>Run pilot test in Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Developed for the research

On 8<sup>th</sup> August 2018, we have distributed 30 survey questionnaires to our target respondents at Kampar. After that, we collected back the questionnaire on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2018. Meanwhile, we have used two days times to rearrange the survey questionnaire collected, in order to run the pilot test with Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2018.
Based on the table above, the gap to distribute and collect back the questionnaires is not tight, thus there was enough time for the respondents to fill up the questionnaires. In this case, the respondents were able to fill up the questionnaires at their ease and the quality of the response was assured.

**Table 3.4 Reliability analysis for Pilot Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Number of Item</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable</td>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Developed for research

Refer to Table 3.5, workplace deviance has coefficient alpha value of 0.9192, perceived organizational support has coefficient alpha value of 0.6294, distributive justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.8253, procedural justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.7788 and interactional justice has coefficient alpha value of 0.9280. Since the alpha values of all the variables are more than 0.6, the variables are reliable.
3.5 Construct Measurement (Scale and Operational Definitions)

3.5.1 Origin of Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adopted from</th>
<th>Scale of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.5.2 Scale of measurement

According to Sekaran, and Bougie (2016), measurement includes allocation of numbers or symbols to characteristics of items based on a prefixed set of rules. The reason of assignment of numbers to the item is because the numbers enable the researchers to conduct statistical analysis and to investigate the hypotheses developed. While, a scale is an instrument or method used to distinguish variables from one and another. There are four types of measurement scale which are nominal scale, ordinal scale, interval scale and ratio scale.
3.5.2.1 Nominal scale

Nominal scale is used for non-numeric variables and it is the lowest measurement level (Sekaran & Bougie, 2012). A nominal scale involves only assigning data into categories with no order or ranking. It classifies objects into mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive groups. This scaling provides only some basic, categorical, gross information and personal data such as gender or department (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).

Example of nominal scale:

1. Gender

☐ Male ☐ Female

Source: Developed for the research

3.5.2.2 Ordinary scale

According to Sekaran and Bougie (2016), the purpose of ordinary scale is not only showing the differences among the variables but to rank the variables in order. For any variables that can be ranked according to preferences, ordinary scale would be applied. The preference would be ranked from first to last or from best to worst and will be assigned number 1, 2 and so on. Besides, ordinary scale possesses some features of nominal scale. The difference between them is that ordinary scale can be used for rank-orders, thus it is also known as ranking scale. Nevertheless, it does not show the interval value among the rankings (Sekaran & Bougie, 2012).
Example of ordinary scale:

- SPM
- SPM
- Diploma
- Bachelor’s Degree
- Master’s Degree
- Doctorate Degree
- Others, please specify:

Source: Developed for the research

3.5.2.3 Interval Scale

An interval scale is numeric scale that does not only capture the order but also the exact differences between the values. Unlike ordinary scale that does not show the interval value among the rankings, interval scale enables researchers to capture the differences between objects. In short, interval scale captures the differences, the ranking and the equality of the magnitude of the differences in the variable (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).
Example of interval scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My supervisor makes job decisions in a biased manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor collects accurate and complete information before making job decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor applies all job-related decisions consistently to all employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My supervisor allows me to challenge or appeal job decisions made by him or her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Strongly Disagree (SD)
2. Disagree (D)
3. Neutral (N)
4. Agree (A)
5. Strongly Agree (SA)

**Source:** Developed for the research

### 3.6 Data Processing

Researchers need to collect the data from the respondents in order to produce a meaningful and useful information (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). After collecting the data, those data need to be processed in order to obtain a meaningful result. Data processing can be defined as the process of integrating and manipulating the data and altering it into meaningful information. There are 4 processes which are data checking, data editing, data coding, and data transcribing.
3.6.1 Data Checking

Data checking is a process of checking the questionnaires collected back from the respondents. Some of the answer of questionnaires may be incomplete or missing due to the inadequate understanding of the questions of the respondents. Thus, this step is important to ensure that the questionnaires that we have distributed to the respondents are filled properly.

3.6.2 Data Editing

Data editing is the second step after the process of data checking. Data editing is the process of detecting errors and making the error correction on the questionnaires which have an omission, unclear, inconsistencies and illogical answer. The reason that the errors will happen is because the respondents may not understand the question or they just unwilling to answer the question. Hence, this step is to ensure that the information or answers that are provided by the respondents are complete and precise.

3.6.3 Data Coding

Data coding is the third step where the researchers assign number to every alternative in all questions. The allocated number is to let the researchers easily and systematically key in the data into the database by using SAS Enterprise Guide.
In section A, the answer of each question is coded as:

<p>| Q1 | Gender          | Male=1         |
|    |                 | Female=2       |
| Q2 | Age             | Below 20 years old=1 |
|    |                 | 20-29 years old=2 |
|    |                 | 30-39 years old=3 |
|    |                 | 40-49 years old=4 |
|    |                 | 50-59 years old=5 |
|    |                 | Above 60 years old=6 |
| Q3 | Ethnic group    | Malay=1        |
|    |                 | Chinese=2      |
|    |                 | India=3        |
|    |                 | Other=4        |
| Q4 | Marital Status  | Single=1       |
|    |                 | Married=2      |
|    |                 | Divorced=3     |
|    |                 | Widowhood=4    |
|    |                 | Others=5       |
| Q5 | Gross Monthly Salary | Below RM1,000=1 |
|    |                 | RM1,000 to RM1,999=2 |
|    |                 | RM2,000 to RM2,999=3 |
|    |                 | RM3,000 to RM3,999=4 |
|    |                 | RM4,000 to RM4,999=5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (Q)</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Options and Corresponding Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q6          | Educational level   | Above RM5,000=6  
SPM=1         
STPM=2        
Diploma=3     
Bachelor’s Degree=4  
Master’s Degree=5  
Doctorate Degree=6  
Others=7       |
| Q7          | Working experience  | Less than 5 years=1  
5-10 years=2  
11-15 years=3  
16-20 years=4  
21-25 years=5  
More than 26 years=6 |
| Q8          | Average working hours per week | Less than 30 hours=1  
35 hours=2  
40 hours=3  
45 hours=4  
More than 50 hours=5 |
| Q9          | Employment status   | Part-time=1  
Full-time=2  |

Source: Developed for the research
In section B and C, the answer of each question is coded as:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

### 3.6.4 Data Transcribing

For the data transcribing, it is a process that the researchers have to transcribe all the data coded into the SAS Enterprise Guide for data analysis. The researchers will run this process after all the answers for each question have been coded.

### 3.7 Data Analysis

Data analysis is a process of converting data into information (Galetto, 2018). After the data has been collected from respondents, we have used Statistical Analysis System Enterprise Guide (SAS) software Version 7.1 to analyze and interpret the data. We have checked and key in all the data from the questionnaire into the software.
3.7.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis is also known as data simplification (Loeb, Morris, & Dynarski, 2017). It is able to convert raw data into a statement formed which makes it convenient for researchers to read and interpret, restructuring, ordering and manipulating data in order to generate descriptive information. We have prepared several questions regarding demographic information which consists of gender, age, ethic group, marital status, gross monthly salary, education level, working experience, job title, average working hours per week and employment status. The data will be shown in a pie chart after the analysis is conducted. The reason of using pie chart is because it is more presentable and easier for the reader to understand the information as it displays the data as a fractional part of a whole.

3.7.2 Scale Measurement

Reliability can be defined as an evaluation tool which is used to measure and produce the consistent and stable result. Reliability analysis has been used in scale measurement to evaluate the reliable result. According to Tavakol and Dennick (2011), the range of the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is from 0 to 1 which means from not consistent to completely consistent.

According to Sekaran and Bougie (2016), showed that the coefficient alpha value that less than 0.60 is considered as poor reliability. For the fair reliability, the value of coefficient alpha is between 0.60 and 0.70. In addition, the value of coefficient alpha with good reliability is between 0.70 and 0.80. Lastly, the value of coefficient alpha with 0.80 and above is considered as very good reliability. The table below shows the range of the value of coefficient alpha:
Table 3.6 Coefficient Alpha Ranges (α)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient Alpha(α)</th>
<th>Level of Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 0.60</td>
<td>Poor Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60 to 0.70</td>
<td>Fair Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70 to 0.80</td>
<td>Good Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80 to 0.95</td>
<td>Very Good Reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.7.3 Inferential Analysis

3.7.3.1 Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient

Pearson Correlation Matrix is a measure used to show the strength, direction and significance of the relationship among all variables which are the dependent and independent variables at interval scale ratio (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The correlation range is between -1.00 and +1.00. Specifically, when the correlation coefficient is +1.00, it indicates that the variables are perfectly positive correlated. In contrast, when the correlation coefficient is -1.00, it indicates that the variables are perfectly negative correlated. In addition, when the coefficient value is less than 0.5, it signifies there is a weak correlation. However, when the coefficient value is more than 0.8, it signifies there is a strong correlation.
We have used Pearson Correlation Coefficient for questions in Section B and C in order to test the relationship between the variables. Besides, we have used Likert Scale to show the level of agreement on each question regarding perceived organizational support and organizational justice toward workplace deviance in manufacturing industry. Table 3.8 shows the rules of thumb of Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient Range</th>
<th>Strength of Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>± 0.91 to ±1.00</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.71 to ± 0.90</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.41 to ± 0.70</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.21 to ± 0.40</td>
<td>Small but define relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± 0.00 to ± 0.20</td>
<td>Slight, almost negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.3.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis is used to analyze the variance between single dependent variable with multiple independent variables which have a cause-effect relation (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). Multiple regression analysis is a multivariate technique that often is used in a business research. This analysis objectively assesses the degree and the character of the relationship between independent variable and multiple dependent variables. By looking at the coefficient regression, it can relatively explain the importance of each of the independent variables in the prediction of dependent variable.

The formula equation for multiple regression analysis:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \ldots + \beta_k x_k + \epsilon \]

3.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, we will discuss research methodology of this study. It discusses about the research design, data collection method, sampling design, research instrument, constructs measurement, data processing and data analysis. In addition, we also use SAS Enterprise Guide Software to test the reliability of the questionnaire.
4.0 Introduction

Throughout this chapter, there were 384 set of questionnaires distributed to the respondents who are working in manufacturing industry. The result of questionnaires were collected and analyzed by using SAS Enterprise Guide software. The analysis carried out are descriptive analysis, reliability analysis, pearson correlation coefficient analysis and multiple regression analysis.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

There are total 9 questions of respondents’ demographic profile in this part. The questions that included in this part are gender, age, ethnic group, marital status, gross monthly salary, education level, working experience, average working hours per week and employment status.
4.1.1 Respondent Demographic Profile

4.1.1.1 Gender

Table 4.1 Statistics of Respondents’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>35.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>64.32</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.1: Statistics of Respondents’ Gender
Based on the Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1, there are two gender groups which are male and female. There are 137 male respondents with the percentage of 35.68% and 247 female respondents with the percentage of 64.32%. This shows that the majority of the respondents are female employees.

### 4.1.1.2 Age

**Table 4.2 Statistics of Respondents’ Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20 years old</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>59.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>98.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>99.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Developed for the research
Based on the Table 4.2 and Figure 4.2, there are six age groups which include below 20 years old, 20 to 29 years old, 30 to 39 years old, 40 to 49 years old, 50 to 59 years old and above 60 years old. There are 205 respondents have an age of 20 to 29 years old which represents the largest age group with a percentage of 53.39%. In addition, there are 108 respondents have an age range of 30 to 39 years old with a percentage of 28.13%. On the other hand, the age range of 40 to 49 years old consists of 41 respondents with a percentage of 10.68%. The age category of below 20 years old consists of 23 respondents with a percentage of 5.99%. There are 5 respondents have an age of 50 to 59 years old which represents 1.30% in this research project. Last but not least, there are only 2 respondents with the age above 60 years old which represents a percentage of 0.52%.

Source: Developed for the research


4.1.1.3 Ethnic Group

Table 4.3 Statistics of Respondents’ Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>59.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.3: Statistics of Respondents’ Ethnic Group

Source: Developed for the research
Based on the Table 4.3 and Figure 4.3, there are three ethnic groups who contribute in this research which are Malay, Chinese and Indian. The largest contributor in this research is India which represents a total of 154 respondents (40.10%). Chinese respondents are the second largest contributors in this research which represents 126 respondents (32.81%). The lowest contributors of respondents is Malay which represents only 104 respondents (27.08%).

4.1.1.4 Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>64.32</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>64.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>99.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Figure 4.4: Statistics of Respondents’ Marital Status

Marital Status

Source: Developed for the research

Based on the Table 4.4 and Figure 4.4, there are four groups of marital status contribute in this research which are single, married, divorced and widowhood. There are 247 respondents (64.32%) are single. There are 136 respondents (35.42%) who have already married. There are 1 respondent (0.26%) has divorced.
### 4.1.1.5 Gross Monthly Salary

**Table 4.5 Statistics of Respondents’ Gross Monthly Salary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Monthly Salary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below RM1000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM1000 – RM1999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2000 – RM2999</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>49.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM3000 – RM3999</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>95.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM4000 – RM4999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>98.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above RM5000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Developed for the research*
Figure 4.5: Statistics of Respondents’ Gross Monthly Salary

Based on Table 4.5 and Figure 4.5, there are six categories of gross monthly salary which are below RM1000, RM1000 to RM1999, RM2000 to RM2999, RM3000 to RM3999, RM4000 to RM4999 and above RM5000. Most of the respondents are receiving RM3000 to RM3999 as their gross monthly salaries in which it represents a total of 176 respondents (45.83%). There are 160 respondents (41.67%) who receive RM2000 to RM2999 as their gross monthly salaries; 26 respondents (6.77%) are receiving RM1000 to RM1999; 13 respondents (3.39%) are receiving RM4000 to RM4999 and 5 respondents (1.30%) are receiving above RM5000 as their gross monthly salaries. Last but not least, 4 respondents (1.04%) are receiving below RM1000 as their gross monthly salary.

Source: Developed for the research
4.1.1.6 Education Level

Table 4.6 Statistics of Respondent’s Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>99.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.6 Statistics of Respondent’s Education Level

Source: Developed for the research
There are seven categories of educational level which are SPM, STPM, Diploma, Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, Doctorate Degree and others. Based on the Table 4.6 and Figure 4.6, most of the respondents are from the Bachelor Degree in which it consists of 256 respondents (66.67%). There are 78 respondents (20.31%) who have a Diploma education level; 32 respondents (8.33%) are from SPM level; 15 respondents (3.91%) are from STPM level. Lastly, there are 3 respondents (0.78%) holding the Master’s Degree.

4.1.1.7 Working Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>41.41</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>41.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>50.52</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>91.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>96.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>99.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>99.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Based on the Table 4.7 and Figure 4.7, there are 6 classifications of working experience which are less than 5 years, 5 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, 21 to 25 years and more than 25 years. Most of the respondents work for 5 to 10 years which is 194 respondents (50.52%). The second highest working experience is less than 5 years which represents 159 respondents (41.41%). The third higher number recorded is the respondents who work for 11 to 15 years which is 19 respondents (4.95%). The number of respondents who work for 16 to 20 years, 21 to 25 years and more than 25 years are 9 (2.34%), 1(0.26%) and 2(0.52%) respectively.

Source: Developed for the research
4.1.1.8 Average working hours per week

Table 4.8 Statistics of Respondent’s Average Working Hours per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average working hours per week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 hours</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 hours</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 hours</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Figure 4.8 Statistics of Respondent’s Average Working Hours per Week

Number of Respondents According to Average Working Hours per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average working hours per week</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 hours</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 hours</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 hours</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 hours</td>
<td>70.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Based on table 4.8 and figure 4.8, there are five classification of average working hours per week which are less than 30 hours, 35 hours, 40 hours, 45 hours and more than 50 hours. There are 272 respondents work with an average working hours of more than 50 hours per week which represents a percentage of 70.83%. In addition, the second higher average working hours per week recorded is 45 hours which represents 80 respondents (20.83%). The number of respondents who work for 40 hours, less than 30 hours and 35 hours are 14 (3.65%), 13 (3.39%) and 5 (1.3%) respectively.
4.1.1.9 Employment Status

Table 4.9 Statistics of Respondent’s Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Figure 4.9 Statistics of Respondent’s Employment Status

Number of Respondents According to Employment Status

Source: Developed for the research

Based on table 4.9 and figure 4.9, there are two categories of employment status which are full time and part time. All of our respondents are full-time employees.
4.1.2 Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs

This part will discuss the mean and standard deviation measurement of the independent variable and dependent variable. Section B and C consist of 36 questions which will be tested using SAS Enterprise Guide software.

4.1.2.1 Workplace Deviance

Table 4.10 Central Tendencies Measurement of Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>SD Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I used to take property from work without permission.</td>
<td>1.01563</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.12418</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I used to discuss confidential company information with an unauthorized person.</td>
<td>1.32031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.46721</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I always neglect to follow boss’s instructions.</td>
<td>1.34115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47471</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I used to litter work environment.</td>
<td>1.30469</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.46088</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I used to use an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.</td>
<td>1.58854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90110</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>P-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I always take an additional or longer break than is acceptable at workplace.</td>
<td>1.31510</td>
<td>0.46516</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I always drag out work in order to get overtime.</td>
<td>1.02603</td>
<td>0.15947</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I always spend too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.</td>
<td>1.58854</td>
<td>0.90110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I used to intentionally work slower than others could have worked.</td>
<td>1.01302</td>
<td>0.11351</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I always come in late to work without permission.</td>
<td>1.01563</td>
<td>0.12418</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I always put little effort into work.</td>
<td>1.02083</td>
<td>0.14301</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I used to falsify a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses.</td>
<td>1.04167</td>
<td>0.20009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=384

**Source:** Developed for the research
Based on the Table 4.10, there are two statements “I used to use an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.” and “I always spend too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.” have the highest mean of 1.58854 and highest standard deviation of 0.90110. In short, these two statements are having the same mean and standard deviation. Next, the statement of “I always neglect to follow boss’s instructions.” has the third highest mean of 1.34115 and third highest standard deviation of 0.47471. Besides, the statement “I used to discuss confidential company information with an unauthorized person.” has a mean of 1.32031 and standard deviation of 0.46721. The statement of “I always take an additional or longer break than is acceptable at workplace.” has a mean of 1.31510 and a standard deviation of 0.46516. The statement of “I used to litter work environment.” has a mean of 1.30469 and a standard deviation of 0.46088. The statement of “I used to falsify a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses.” has a mean of 1.04167 and a standard deviation of 0.20009. The statement of “I always drag out work in order to get overtime.” has a mean of 1.02603 and standard deviation of 0.15947. The statement of “I always put little effort into work.” has a mean of 1.02083 and standard deviation of 0.14301. The statement of “I always come in late to work without permission.” and “I used to take property from work without permission.” have mean of 1.01563 and a standard deviation of 0.12418. Last but not least, the statement of “I used to intentionally work slower than others could have worked.” has a mean of 1.01302 and a standard deviation of 0.11351.
### 4.1.2.2 Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Table 4.11 Central Tendencies Measurement of Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My organization cares about my opinions.</td>
<td>4.63281</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.52912</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My organization really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>4.89844</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39262</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My organization strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>4.62760</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.54497</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.</td>
<td>4.63802</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.54242</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.</td>
<td>4.63802</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.54242</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me.</td>
<td>4.62760</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.54497</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My organization shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td>4.62500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.53102</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the Table 4.11, the highest value of the mean (4.89844) belongs to the statement “My organization really cares about my well-being” but it has the lowest standard deviation value of 0.39262. On the other hand, the highest value of the standard deviation (0.54497) belongs to the statement “My organization strongly considers my goals and values” which has a mean value of 4.62760 which is ranked at 5th and the statement “If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me.” which has a mean of 4.62760. Besides, the lowest value of mean (4.62500) belongs to the statement “My organization shows very little concern for me.” which has a standard deviation of 0.53102. From the table, there are two statements “Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.” and “My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.” have the same value of mean which is 4.63802 and same value of standard deviation which is 0.54242. Last but not least, the statement “My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.” has a mean of 4.65104 and a standard deviation of 0.52419.
4.1.2.3 Distributive Justice

Table 4.12 Central Tendencies Measurement of Distributive Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>SD Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My outcome reflects the effort that I have put into my work.</td>
<td>4.39063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48853</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My outcome is appropriate for the work that I have completed.</td>
<td>4.36719</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48267</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My outcome reflects what I have contributed to my work.</td>
<td>4.35156</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48351</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My outcome is justified for my given performance.</td>
<td>4.35677</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.48508</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=384

Source: Developed for the research

Based on Table 4.12, the statement “My outcome reflects the effort that I have put into my work” has the highest mean which is 4.39063 and also has the highest standard deviation which is 0.48853. The statement “My outcome is appropriate for the work that I have completed” has the second highest mean which is 4.36719 and the lowest standard deviation which is 0.48267. While the statement “My outcome reflects what I have contributed to my work” has the lowest mean (4.35156) and third highest standard deviation (0.48351). Last but not least, the statement “My outcome is justified for my given performance” has the third highest mean (4.35677) and second highest standard deviation (0.48508).
4.1.2.4 Procedural Justice

Table 4.13 Central Tendencies Measurement of Procedural Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>SD Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor makes job decisions in a biased manner.</td>
<td>4.58594</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.60710</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
<td>4.66667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47202</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor collects accurate and complete information before making job decisions.</td>
<td>4.64844</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47808</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by me.</td>
<td>4.64583</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.47888</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor applies all job-related decisions consistently to all employees.</td>
<td>4.92708</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26034</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor allows me to challenge or appeal job decisions made by him or her.</td>
<td>4.94271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23270</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=384

Source: Developed for the research
Based on the Table 4.13, the statement of “My supervisor allows me to challenge or appeal job decisions made by him or her.” has the highest mean which is 4.94271 however it has the lowest value of standard deviation which is 0.23270. Besides, the statement of “My supervisor makes job decisions in a biased manner.” has the lowest figure of mean which is 4.58594 however it has the highest figure of standard deviation which is 0.60710. Moreover, the statement of “My supervisor applies all job-related decisions consistently to all employees.” has the second highest mean value which is 4.92708 but it has a standard deviation 0.26034 which is ranked at 5th. For the statement of “My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.”, it has a mean of 4.66667 and standard deviation of 0.47202. While for the statement “My supervisor collects accurate and complete information before making job decisions.”, it has a mean of 4.64844 and standard deviation of 0.47808. Last but not least, the statement of “My supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by me.” has a mean of 4.64583 and a standard deviation of 0.47888.
4.1.2.5 Interactional Justice

Table 4.14 Central Tendencies Measurement of Interactional Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>SD Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor considers my viewpoint.</td>
<td>4.36979</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.89602</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor was able to suppress personal biases.</td>
<td>4.62760</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.48407</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about the decision and its implications.</td>
<td>4.90365</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29546</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.</td>
<td>4.92969</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25601</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.</td>
<td>4.92445</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26457</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor took steps to deal with me in a truthful manner.</td>
<td>4.63802</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48120</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=384

Source: Developed for the research

Based on the Table 4.14, the statement with the highest mean (4.92969) is “My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.”, but it has the lowest standard deviation of 0.25601. On the other hand, the statement that has the highest standard deviation (0.89602) is “My supervisor considers my viewpoint.”, but it has the lowest mean of 4.36979. In addition, the
statement of “My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.” has the second largest mean of 4.92448 and its standard deviation of 0.26457 is ranked at 5th. However, the statement of “My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about the decision and its implications.” has the third largest mean of 4.90365 and standard deviation of 0.29546 which is ranked at 4th. Furthermore, the statement “My supervisor took steps to deal with me in a truthful manner.” has the mean value of 4.63802 which is ranked at 4th and the standard deviation of 0.48120 which is ranked at 3rd.

4.2 Scale Measurement

In this research project, the SAS Enterprise Guide software has been used for reliability analysis in order to evaluate the dependent variable which is workplace deviance and independent variables which are perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. There are total 384 respondents included in the reliability analysis of this research project.
4.2.1 Reliability Analysis

Cronbach’s alpha has been used to test the reliability of this research project. The purpose of reliability test is to determine the internal consistency for all the variables. Moreover, it also can be used to identify the random error that occurs in the questionnaire.

Table 4.15: Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Full Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Items</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>Reliability Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Based on the Table 4.15, all the variables are reliable. All the variables have a good reliability with the Cronbach’s alpha value of more than 0.70, therefore, all the variables show the level of the internal consistency respectively.

Firstly, the dependent variable, workplace deviance which is measured by 12 items in the pilot test, showed a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.9192. In the full study, the Cronbach’s alpha value is 0.8643 and measured by 12 items. The Cronbach’s alpha indicates a very good reliability.

Secondly, the first independent variable is perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support is measured by 8 items in the pilot study and the result of the Cronbach’s alpha is 0.6294. However, in the full study, the Cronbach’s alpha value was increasing to 0.9449. This Cronbach’s alpha value is ranked the second highest among all the independent variables. The Cronbach’s alpha indicates a very good reliability.

Thirdly, in the pilot test, the Cronbach’s alpha value of distributive justice which is measured by 4 items is 0.8253. However, in the full study, the Cronbach’s alpha value was slightly increasing to 0.9567. This Cronbach’s alpha value is ranked the highest among all the independent variables. The Cronbach’s alpha indicates a very good reliability.

Moreover, the Cronbach’s alpha value of procedural justice which is measured by 6 items in pilot test is 0.7788. The Cronbach’s alpha value has increased to 0.8351 in full study. The Cronbach’s alpha indicates a very good reliability.
Lastly, the Cronbach’s alpha value of interactional justice which is measured by 6 items in the pilot test is ranked the highest among the independent variables which is 0.9280. But, the Cronbach’s alpha value has slightly decreased to 0.7342 in the full study. The Cronbach’s alpha indicates a good reliability.

In conclusion, since the Cronbach’s alpha value of all the variables is between 0.70 to 0.95, thus, the questionnaire is considered reliable and consistent. All the variables are reliable.

4.3 Inferential Analyses

4.3.1 Pearson Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis is a method to measure the strength, significance and direction of a linear relationship between two variables. The outcome of pearson correlation analysis is pearson correlation coefficient which has a value range from -1 to +1. A correlation coefficient with a value of -1 means that the there is a perfect negative relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. A correlation coefficient with a value of +1 means that the there is a perfect positive relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. A correlation coefficient with a value of 0 means that the there is no linear relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable.
4.3.1.1 Correlation between Perceived Organizational Support and Workplace Deviance

Table 4.16 Correlations between Perceived Organizational Support and Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Developed for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Organizational Support</th>
<th>Workplace Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Workplace Deviance              | Pearson Correlation              | -0.77267           | 1                  |
|                                 | Significant (p-value)             | <.0001             |                    |
| N                               | 384                              | 384                |

Based on Table 4.16, there is a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance with a correlation coefficient of -0.77267. Thus, when perceived organizational support increases, the workplace deviance will decrease. Besides, the correlation coefficient of -0.77267 falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90. This specifies that the strength of the relationship between perceived
organizational support and workplace deviance is high. Since the p-value (<.0001) is less than alpha value (0.05), the relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance is significant.

4.3.1.2 Correlation between Distributive Justice and Workplace Deviance

Table 4.17 Correlations between Distributive Justice and Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Workplace Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.52872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for Research
Based on Table 4.17, there is a negative relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance with a correlation coefficient of -0.52872. Thus, when distributive justice increases, the workplace deviance will decrease. Besides, the correlation coefficient of -0.52872 falls within the correlation range of ±0.41 to ±0.70. This shows that the relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance is moderate. Since the p-value (<.0001) is less than alpha value (0.05), the relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance is significant.

4.3.1.3 Correlation between Procedural Justice and Workplace Deviance

Table 4.18 Correlations between Procedural Justice and Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Workplace Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.74860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for Research
Based on Table 4.18, there is a negative relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance with a correlation coefficient of -0.74860. Thus, when procedural justice increases, the workplace deviance will decrease. Besides, the correlation coefficient of -0.74860 falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90. This shows that strength of the relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance is high. Since the p-value (<.0001) is less than alpha value (0.05), the relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance is significant.

### 4.3.1.4 Correlation between Interactional Justice and Workplace Deviance

Table 4.19 Correlations between Interactional Justice and Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Developed for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
<th>Workplace Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.78277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (p-value)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on Table 4.19, there is a negative relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance with a correlation coefficient of -0.78277. Thus, when interactional justice increases, the workplace deviance will decrease. Besides, the correlation coefficient of -0.78277 falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90. This shows that the strength of relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance is high. Since the p-value (<.0001) is less than alpha value (0.05), the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance is significant.

4.3.2 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

A multiple linear regression analysis is used to determine the relationship between a dependent variable and a set of independent variable. A multiple linear regression analysis can be considered as an extension of simple linear regression which is used to determine the relationship between a dependent variable and an independent variable (Mark & Mark, n.d.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.79426</td>
<td>5.69856</td>
<td>199.56</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>10.82248</td>
<td>0.02856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>33.61674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Based on Table 4.20, the p-value (<.0001) is less than the alpha value (0.05). This means that the F-statistic of this research is significant. In other word, it specifies that this research model is a good model in terms of describing the correlations between dependent variable (workplace deviance) and independent variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice). In addition, the dependent variable is significantly explained by independent variables and the hypothesis is supported.

**Interpretation on R square**

Table 4.21: Summary of R Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Developed for the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root MSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient Variables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation on Parameter Estimates

Table 4.2: Parameter Estimates

| Variable                        | DF | Parameter Estimate | Standard Error | t Value | Pr >|t| |
|---------------------------------|----|--------------------|----------------|---------|------|
| Intercept                       | 1  | 4.37739            | 0.13743        | 31.85   | <.0001|
| Perceived Organizational Support| 1  | -0.30715           | 0.04277        | -7.18   | <.0001|
| Distributive Justice            | 1  | -0.08234           | 0.02261        | -3.64   | 0.0003|
| Procedural Justice              | 1  | 0.17988            | 0.08007        | 2.25    | 0.0252|
| Interactional Justice           | 1  | -0.46918           | 0.06568        | -7.14   | <.0001|

Source: Developed for the research

Based on the results, all the independent variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) were significant in explaining the workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. This is because the p-value of all the independent variables are less than alpha value of 0.05 where the p-values of perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are <.0001, <.0001, 0.0003, 0.0252 and <.0001 respectively.
Determinants of Workplace Deviance among Manufacturing Employees in Malaysia

Multiple Linear Regression Equation: \( Y = a + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 \)

- \( Y \) = Workplace Deviance
- \( a \) = constant
- \( X_1 \) = Perceived Organizational Support (POS)
- \( X_2 \) = Distributive Justice
- \( X_3 \) = Procedural Justice
- \( X_4 \) = Interactional Justice
- \( B_i \) = value of parameter estimate, where \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \ldots \)

\[ \text{Workplace Deviance} = 4.37739 - 0.30715(\text{POS}) - 0.08234(\text{DJ}) + 0.17988(\text{PJ}) - 0.46918(\text{IJ}) \]

Interactional justice is the biggest contributor in term of explaining the variance in the workplace deviance variable. This is because interactional justice has the highest parameter estimate of 0.46918. The second biggest contributor is perceived organizational support since it has the second highest parameter estimate which is 0.30715. In other word, it has second strongest contribution in term of explaining the variance in workplace deviance variable. The third biggest contributor is procedural justice (0.17988) followed by distributive justice (0.08234). The negative value of parameter estimates shows that the relationship between dependent variable (workplace deviance) and independent variable (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, interactional justice). However, the result of multiple regression analysis shows that there is a positive relationship between workplace deviance and procedural justice.

When the procedural justice is tested individually using pearson correlation coefficient, there is a negative relationship between workplace deviance and procedural justice. When the procedural justice is tested in combination with
other variables using multiple regression analysis, there is a positive relationship between dependent variable and independent variables. Since the parameter estimate value of procedural justice is the third biggest (0.17988) among four independent variables, this indicates that procedural justice does not contribute much to the relationship between dependent variable and independent variables. The reason of positive relationship is supported by the longer tenure of the employees in this study. In this study, 50.52% of the respondents have worked in manufacturing industry for 5 to 10 years which is considered long tenure. In addition, 70.83% of the respondents work for more than 50 hours a week. Workplace deviance behaviours can be caused by longer tenure because when employees have been working in the same industry for a long period, they feel like “a fixture” of the organization and perceive more authority and liberty to not obey the rules and regulations of the organization (Ng & Feldman, 2010). Moreover, long tenured employees are more likely to engage in workplace deviance because they are valuable to the organization due to their experiences (Lovett & Cole, 2003).
4.4 Conclusion

In a nutshell, we have summarized the collected data and analyzed it by using SAS Enterprise Guide. The demographic profile of the respondents have been analyzed and summarized by using the table and pie chart. Furthermore, the reliability of the independent variables and dependent variable have also been analyzed. Besides, Pearson Correlation Coefficient Analysis is used to determine the strength of all the variables relationship. In addition, Multiple Regression Analysis has been used to estimate the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The end of the result will be brought to the next chapter to further discuss and conclude the entire research.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter consists of the discussions and conclusion of this research project. First, a summary of statistical analysis on demographic profile statistic, central tendencies, scale measurement and inferential analysis result will be discussed under this chapter. Second, this chapter will include the major findings of this research project in order to show the impacts of perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on workplace deviance. Last but not least, this chapter was continued by the discussion on the implication of the study, several limitations that found during the progress of the research and some recommendations for future research.

5.1 Summary of Statistical Analyses

5.1.1 Descriptive Analysis

5.1.1.1 Respondent Demographic Profile

From the demographic profile analysis, there are 384 respondents contributed in this research. The majority of gender is female (64.32%) which represents 247 respondents whereas the male (35.68%) represents 137 respondents.
Besides, 205 respondents (53.39%) contributed in this research are between the age of 20 to 29 years old. The second highest is the age between 30 to 39 years old which consists of 108 respondents (28.13%) and followed by the age between 40 to 49 years old which consists of 41 respondents (10.68%). The age below 20 years old consists of 23 respondents (5.99%) whereas the age between 50 to 59 years old only consists of 5 respondents (1.30%). The least number of respondents contributed in this questionnaire is the age above 60 years old which consists of 2 respondents (0.52%).

The largest ethnic group participated in this questionnaire is India which represents 154 respondents (40.10%). The second largest ethnic group is Chinese with a number of 126 respondents (32.81%) while the least ethnic group is Malay which represents 104 respondents (27.08%).

From the questionnaire, most of the respondents who participated in our questionnaire is classified as single marital status which consists of 247 respondents (64.32%). There are 136 respondents (35.42%) classified as married marital status whereas only 1 respondent (0.26%) is classified as divorced marital status.

The result showed that the most common gross monthly salary received by respondent is RM 3,000 to RM 3,999 which represents 176 respondents (45.83%). The gross monthly salary between RM 2,000 to RM 2,999 consists of 160 respondents (41.67%). The other amount of gross monthly salary are RM 1,000 to RM 1,999 consists of 26 respondents (6.77%), RM 4,000 to RM 4,999 consists of 13 respondents (3.39%), above RM 6,000 consists of 5 respondents (1.30%) and below RM 1,000 consists of 4 respondents (1.04%).
There are 256 out of 384 respondents (66.67%) who hold the Bachelor’s Degree certificate. The respondent who hold Diploma certificate consists of 78 respondents with 20.31% and followed by the SPM certificate which consist of 32 respondents (8.33%). There are only 15 respondents (3.91%) and 3 respondents (0.78%) hold STPM level and Master’s Degree respectively.

There are 194 respondents (50.52%) who have 5 to 10 years of working experience. There are 159 respondents (41.41%) who have served their company for less than 5 years while 19 respondents (4.96%) have 11 to 15 years of working experience. In addition, 9 respondents (2.34%) have worked for 16 to 20 years; 2 respondents (0.52%) have more than 25 years of working experience and only 1 respondent (0.26%) has 21 to 25 years of working experience.

The average working hours per week for most of the respondents is more than 50 hours (70.83%) and 80 respondents (20.83%) work 45 hours per week. Only 14 respondents (3.65%), 13 respondents (3.39%) and 5 respondents (1.30%) who work an average working hours per week of 40 hours, less than 30 hours, and 30 hours respectively.

Lastly, the analysis has clearly showed that all of the respondents are full time employees (100%).
5.1.2 Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs

Table 5.1 Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>1.58854</td>
<td>1.01302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>4.89844</td>
<td>4.62500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4.39063</td>
<td>4.35156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>4.94271</td>
<td>4.58594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>4.92448</td>
<td>4.36979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

5.1.3 Reliability Test

There are total five variables tested in the reliability test. The five variables are workplace deviance, perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. According the reliability test conducted in full study, all variables have reliability above 0.73. Therefore, the questionnaire that used in this study is considered reliable. Among all the independent variables, the variable that has the highest Cronbach’s alpha value is distributive justice with the alpha value of 0.9567 followed by perceived organizational support with the alpha value of 0.9449. The variable with third highest Cronbach’s alpha value is procedural justice with the alpha value of 0.8351. Interactional justice has the lowest Cronbach’s alpha value which is 0.7342. For the dependent variable, which is workplace deviance, it has a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.8643.
Workplace deviance, perceived organizational support, distributive justice and procedural justice are considered as having a very good reliability while interactional justice is considered as having a good reliability.

### 5.1.4 Inferential Analyses

#### 5.1.4.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

According to the results, the independent variable that has the highest value of Pearson Correlation Coefficient is interactional justice (-0.78277), followed by perceived organizational support (-0.77267), procedural justice (-0.74860) and distributive justice (-0.52872). The correlation coefficient values of interactional justice, perceived organizational support and procedural justice falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90. This specifies that the strength of the relationship between independent variables (interactional justice, perceived organizational support and procedural justice) and dependent variable (workplace deviance) is high. While for distributive justice, it has a correlation coefficient value falls within the correlation range of ±0.41 to ±0.70. This means that the relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance is moderate. Since the p-value of all the variables are <.0001, the relationships between independent variables and dependent variable are significant.
5.1.4.2 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Based on the result, the R-square value of the study is 0.6781. This means that 67.81% of the dependent variable (workplace deviance) can be explained by independent variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice). On the other hand, 32.19% of the dependent variable is explained by other factors. In addition, the p-value of the study is <.0001 is less than alpha value of 0.05. This specifies the relationship between independent variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) and dependent variable (workplace deviance) are significant.

Multiple Linear Regression Equation: \( Y = a + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 \)

Workplace Deviance = 4.37739 - 0.30715 (POS) - 0.08234 (DJ) + 0.17988 (PJ) - 0.46918 (IJ)

From the equation, interactional justice provides highest contribution in terms of explaining the variation of workplace deviance since it has a highest parameter estimate of (-0.46918). This is followed by perceived organizational support (-0.30715), procedural justice (0.17988) and distributive justice (-0.08234).
### 5.2 Discussions of Major Findings

**Table 5.2: Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient / R-square</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁: There is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.</td>
<td>p=&lt;.0001</td>
<td>r=-0.77267</td>
<td>H₁ is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂: There is a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.</td>
<td>p=&lt;.0001</td>
<td>r=-0.52872</td>
<td>H₂ is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃: There is a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.</td>
<td>p=&lt;.0001</td>
<td>r=-0.74860</td>
<td>H₃ is supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄: There is a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.</td>
<td>p=&lt;.0001</td>
<td>r=-0.78277</td>
<td>H₄ is supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H₅: The four variables (perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) are significant in explaining the variances of workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia?  

\[ p = <.0001 \quad R^2 = 0.6781 \quad \text{H₅ is supported.} \]

Source: Developed for the research

### 5.2.1 Relationship between Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and Workplace Deviance

Based on the result, H₁ is supported since the p-value (< .0001) is less than alpha value of 0.05 which specifies that there is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. In addition, the correlation coefficient value of -0.77267 which falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90 specifies that there is a high negative relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance.

The result is supported by study done by Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004) which proves that there is a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. The evidence is that when organization supports the effort of their employees, the employees are less likely to withhold their efforts and engage in workplace deviant behaviors. Furthermore, Khan, Kanwal, and Shoaib (2015) mentioned that there is a negative relationship between workplace deviance and perceived
organizational support. This is because when the employees sense the support from the management is low, they may involve in the antisocial behaviors such as harassment, discrimination, interpersonal violence as well as whistle-blowing (Appiah, 2015). The reason of perceived organizational support is low may because of the organization policy that does not give freedom to the employees to make decisions. This makes the employees think that their involvement are not important to the organizations which in turn engage in workplace deviance.

5.2.2 Relationship between Distributive Justice (DJ) and Workplace Deviance

Based on the result, $H_2$ is supported since the p-value ($< .0001$) is less than alpha value of 0.05 which specifies that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. In addition, the correlation coefficient value of -0.52872 which falls within the correlation range of ±0.41 to ±0.70 specifies that there is a moderate negative relationship between distributive and workplace deviance.

The result is supported by the study done by Faheem and Mahmud (2015) which shows that there is a negative relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance. The evidence is that the employees’ perception of biased outcomes will increase the incidence of workplace deviance at workplace (Adams, 1963). In addition, the study done by Maria and Maureen (2007) states that perception of pay inequity will cause workplace deviant behaviours such as property theft. The reason why the employees engage in workplace deviance is because the employees want to restore equity. However, this negative behaviour is harmful to the organization even it is reasonable for the employees to restore equity.
One of the theories which support the relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance is equity theory. According to Adams (1963), equity theory focuses on exchange relationship where individuals contribute something and expect something in return. Three important variables of this theory are input, output and reference person or group. Inputs can be referred to education, intelligence, experience, training, efforts and others. While output can be referred to pay, benefit, job status, rewards and others. The reference group can be referred to coworker, relative, neighbour, or group of coworkers. An employee compares his or her job’s input with output. Perception of equity occurs when employee perceive his or her input balanced with the output received and when he or she also perceives others inputs are balanced with others output. When the employees perceive inequality, they will do something to correct the inequity and engage in restoring equity.

5.2.3 Relationship between Procedural Justice (PJ) and Workplace Deviance

Based on the result, H3 is supported since the p-value (< .0001) is less than alpha value of 0.05 which specifies that there is a significant relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. In addition, the correlation coefficient value of -0.74860 which falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90 specifies that there is a high negative relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance.
Based on the study done by Faheem and Mahmud (2015), when employees perceive unfairness of the process, they may commit the workplace deviant behaviours such as violating workplace norms or committing actions that are harmful to others. Workplace deviance often occurs when procedural injustice happens. This because employees who are unable to correct the unjust procedures may retaliate against those individuals who benefit from unjust procedures or against those who adopt those procedures (Hendi & Nasrudin, 2006). There is also another research done by Bennet and Robinson (2000) that proves a negative relationship between workplace deviance and procedural justice. Often the employees who experience procedural injustice may engage in workplace deviance due to their intentions to get even with the organization or to retaliate those who cause the injustice to happen.

One of the theories which support the relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance is voice-up theory. According to Thibaut and Walker (1975), the elements of procedure focus on the concepts of process control and voice. Perception of procedural justice is more likely to occur if employees are given more chances to voice up their opinions and participate in the discussion during the decision-making process. Employees who are given the chances to voice up their opinions are likely to have a positive mind set which they may be able to increase the possibility to generate a favourable outcome. On the other hand, when employees are not given the chances to express their opinions and perceive procedural injustice, they may not want to comply with organizational policies since they perceive these policies as unfair.
5.2.4 Relationship between Interactional Justice (IJ) and Workplace Deviance

Based on the result, H4 is supported since the p-value (< .0001) is less than alpha value of 0.05 which specifies that there is a significant relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance among employees in manufacturing industry in Malaysia. In addition, the correlation coefficient value of -0.78277 which falls within the correlation range of ±0.71 to ±0.90 specifies that there is a high negative relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance.

Based on the study done by Bies (2005), when the perceived interactional justice is low, the workplace deviance of the employees is high. This is supported by the evidence that employees who perceive mistreatment and abusive supervision have a high tendency of disturbing colleagues, being late to work and being less productive (Bowles & Gelfand, 2009). On the other hand, when the supervisors treat their employees with respect and patiently explain the intention of their decisions, interpersonal justice is adopted and workplace deviance is less likely to occur (Na-Ting & Cherng, 2012).

One of the theories which support the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance is leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. Leader-member exchange theory is the interaction between supervisor and employee. In this theory, reciprocal relationship plays an important role. For example, if employees receive fair treatment from their supervisors, they will tend to reciprocate something good to their supervisors. When the employees receive fair treatments, they will perceive interactional justice. Leader-member exchange will affect employee’s perception of interactional justice that can lead to workplace deviance (Son, Kim, & Kim, 2014). The
extent of employee’s perception of interpersonal justice would elicit deviant behaviours such as moral outrage, anger and resentment. For instance, employees who receive unfair treatment may engage in retaliation against their employers (Greeberg, 1993).

In this study, the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance is the strongest compared to other independent variables. In other words, interactional justice plays the most significant role when comes to workplace deviance of the employees. This is because interactional justice are more significant in the daily working environment than distributive and procedural justices (Nadisic, 2008). For example, employees evaluate the organizational exchanges on the basis of interactional justice rather than on the basis of distributive and procedural justice.

### 5.3 Implication of the study

#### 5.3.1 Managerial implication

##### 5.3.1.1 Perceived Organizational Support

The result of this research shows there is a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and workplace deviance. This finding is supported by Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barrick (2004), who state that low perceived organizational support may increase the possibility of the employees involve in workplace deviance especially when employees perceived their contributions and welfare are not being recognized and concerned by the company. Consequently, the organizational effectiveness and performance will be affected.
On the other hand, according to Ferris, Brown, and Heller (2009), high perceived organizational support may reduce employee involvement in workplace deviance. High perceived organizational support exists when the company values the employee contribution and care about their well-being which might led the workers to believe that organization is favorably inclined to them. Thus, the organizational effectiveness and performance will be increased.

Hence, the management of the company in manufacturing industry should provide good care to improve their employees’ well-being. For instance, the company can provide flexible working arrangement for their workers, especially working mother to work at home, thus boost their engagement. In addition, the company can offer mindfulness training to their workers to relieve stress and feel a sense of balance between work and life which will increase their productivity and focus on their day to day work. Thus, by implementing a mindfulness program, it is a win-win situation for both the company and the employees.

5.3.1.2 Distributive Justice

The result of this research shows there is a negative relationship between distributive justice and workplace deviance. According to Faheem and Mahmud (2015), low distributive justice will increase the chances of the workers involve in workplace deviance. This is because of the employee perceived inequalities arising from an imbalance between inputs and outputs. In a social exchange process, employees contribute certain inputs like education, experience and effort to organization, and in return they expect outcomes such as pay promotion and intrinsic satisfaction. If the employees
perceive procedural injustice, they will engage in sabotage behaviour in order to correct situation of being exploited by the organization.

Hence, the management should continuously assess the employee contributions together with rewards. For instance, the top management should develop an effective rewards system which the contribution of the employees and rewards received by the employees should be aligned. In other word, the management should compensate their employees accordingly. For instance, the supervisor can closely monitor their subordinates and compensate those who have attained the organizational goal and do not compensate those who did not achieve the promised target. An effective reward system is useful in terms of avoiding employees’ performance and efforts are not well compensated.

On the other hand, the researchers agree that the fair outcomes to employees will increase job satisfaction, improve relationships between supervisors and their subordinates and encourage organizational citizenship behavior, therefore benefiting the organization (Satisfaction and Organ, 2015); (Deluga & Morrison, 1994). Thus, organizations should monitor and review their reward or compensation system periodically.
5.3.1.3 Procedural Justice

The result of this research shows there is a negative relationship between procedural justice and workplace deviance. According to research done by Hemdi and Nasrudin (2006), low procedural justice is one of the determinants causing high occurrence of workplace deviance especially when the employees do not perceived fairness in the process of disputes resolve and resources allocation.

For sake of attaining procedural justice, the management of the company can create policies and procedures that take all perspectives and concerns into considerations. With the aim of the response will be fair and consistent regardless of whoever is involved in the situation, the policy apply to every person at every level should be equally affected by the policy of the company.

In addition, when there is a situation cannot be resolved between parties, the manager or supervisor is required to make a ruling. This is because procedural justice suggests that decisions must be neutral, appropriate for the actions and based on fact. For example, the company can develop a strict tardiness policy with specific punishment if employees repeatedly late to the organization. Thus, the employees believe problems will be resolved honestly and fairly and more confidence in the decision made by the management. In this case, the employees will comply with the rules and regulations set by the organization with sincerely convinced and thus reduces the chances of involvement in workplace deviance.
5.3.1.4 Interactional Justice

The result of this research shows there is a negative relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. According to Van Yperen, Hagedoom, Zweers, and Postma (2000), low interactional justice will cause increase the deviance behaviour in the workplace. For instance, the verbal violence between employees and supervisors.

In real life, interactional justice is the dominant factor that induce employee to display deviance behaviour in the workplace. To avoid the occurrence of workplace deviance, the supervisor can treat their employees with respect which will lead the employees feel honoured and helps to obtain mutual respect between each other in the organization. In addition, the supervisor should explain the reason for every decision they have made for the employees to avoid misunderstandings.

For instance, when a leader is appointed to form a team for a specific project, with the intention to exhibit interactional justice, that person will select co-workers who is qualified and bring the right talents to the project instead of selecting his or her friends who are not qualified. In this case, the company practices interactional justice and the employees will understand the importance of treating each other with the same level of integrity and honestly.
5.3.2 Theoretical Implication

There are researchers who had proven three different theories which are related to the organizational justice. Since the organizational justice is formed by the distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. First, the theory that is related to the distributive justice is the equity theory. This theory is focusing on exchange relationship where individuals contribute something and expect something in return (Adams, 1963). Second, the theory that is related to the procedural justice is the voice-up theory. This theory is explaining the concept of process control and voice in the procedure that involve decision making. (Thibaut and Walker, 1975). When people are allowed to voice up their opinion during the process of decision making or allow participation in the decision making, they will perceived procedural justice is existing. Third, the theory that is related to interactional justice is the leader-member exchange theory. This theory is focusing on the interactional relationship between the supervisor and the employee. It is explaining that when the employee is receiving the unfair treatment from their supervisor, they will treat back their supervisor in the similar way. This is also called a reciprocal relationship (Son, Kim, & Kim, 2014). These theories are helping the researcher to understand better the organizational justice.
5.4 Limitations of Study

There are some limitations and constraints when we were conducting this research project. These limitations give a significant impact towards the accuracy and reliability of the results.

5.4.1 Inability to control the environment

The first problem is that we are not able to control the environment where the respondents fill in the questionnaire. The way the respondents answer the questionnaire is affected by the situations that happen during the particular time frame. For instance, before the respondent answered the questionnaire, the respondent might have been scolded by his or her supervisor, thus, the respondent might provide the inaccurate information. In addition, although the respondent gets scold or injustice treatment for the first time of his or her employment, the respondent provides the answers based on the current conditions.

Moreover, some questions in the questionnaires are considered as sensitive topics because those questions raise issues about disapproval or consequences of answering truthfully or the question itself is deemed as an invasion of privacy. Therefore, the respondents might not answer the questions in accordance with their daily behaviors and this make our result unreliable. For example, some respondents felt the questions under workplace deviance are sensitive, therefore, even though the respondents had exercised the workplace deviance behaviors such as misuse of company asset in the workplace, the respondents might not answer truthfully.
5.4.2 Limited access to literature

We have faced the problem of limited access to academic journal due to the high subscription cost. Although Universities Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR) has subscribed a lot of academic journals, it does not provide the adequate journals for us to conduct this research project. Some of the journals and articles that subscribed by UTAR are partial access, thus, we can only view the abstract of the particular journal. Other than that, the journals and articles about workplace deviance are rare in the database of UTAR because this research topic is quite novelty. Therefore, we need to search the academic journal from other sources but the free access journals are limited which poses us a problem of insufficient information.

5.4.3 Limited outcomes in a quantitative research

The questionnaires for quantitative research method are structured with close-ended questions. This kind of questionnaire leads to limited outcomes in our research project. Thus, the outcomes and results of our research project are not able to represent the actual conditions in a generalized form. Besides that, the respondents had limited alternatives to select when they answer the questionnaires which they are not allowed to provide their own opinions and suggestions. For instance, the respondent can answer this statement “My organization really cares about my well-being.” by providing the example of well-being that provided by the organization rather than select the alternatives between strongly agree and strongly disagree.
In additions, the quantitative research method usually requires a large sample size in order to represent the whole population. For instance, the target population for this research project is 1,070,000 people, this is impossible for us to distribute our questionnaire to this huge amount of people. Thus, we collect our data from only 384 respondents.

5.4.4 Financial and time constraints

This research project had incurred high expenses to us such as printing costs, transportation costs, telephone charges, accommodation cost and others indirect costs. Since the sample location is targeted at Selangor, we traveled to Selangor to distribute the questionnaires and collect the data.

Furthermore, we were required to complete this research project in a short time frame. It is quite challenging for us to finish this research project within approximately seven months as there are many procedures to go through at every stage. For example, some of the processes are considered time consuming, such as distributing questionnaire, gathering information and data, running the analysis test by using SAS Enterprise Guide and others. At the same time, we are accountable to complete the assignment of other subjects and also prepare ourselves for final exam.
5.5 Recommendation of study

There are some limitations that we have faced during this research. We are here to provide our recommendations for the future researchers. These recommendations may avoid or minimize the limitations of the study for the future researchers.

5.5.1 Inability to control environment

The respondents may get affected by their environments such as supervisor or their current emotions when they are filling up the survey. The answer would not be reliable if their emotions are not stable and fail to answer in a calm condition. Therefore, the researchers should include the questions that are able to detect the emotion status of the respondent to find out the reliability of the result. The question can be asking the respondent’s current mood or the recent time they get scolded by their supervisor.

The researcher can arrange those questions in a sequence of general to sensitive. Those general questions can help the respondents to remove the feeling of sensitive question in the survey. The researchers can put the sensitive question at the end of the survey to keep the respondents feel comfortable or general about the survey. The researchers can also include the purpose of the questions in the survey such as the explanation for the questions. The researchers should keep the respondents’ information safely and confidentially.
5.5.2 Limited access to literature

One of the problems that we faced is the limited access to literature. Even though the Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman has provided us an e-database, however some of the journals are not accessible. The future researchers can try to get the resources from websites which provide free access to the journals or literature. The future researchers can also try to get the printed journal in other libraries since there are many libraries available in Malaysia.

5.5.3 Limited outcomes in a quantitative research

To solve this problem, the researchers can provide a blank slot for the respondents to write down their opinions or answers after they have answered the survey. This solution enables the researchers to get the accurate answers from the respondents and the researchers can also analyse the written answers or opinions other than the limited alternatives that the researchers provide. Based on the written answers or opinions, the future researchers can get a more accurate answer and gain a better understanding of the respondents’ real opinion regarding the question. This provides a different perspective for the future researchers to understand their research projects.

The future researchers can group their ideal respondents into different groups according to the different status before the researchers distribute the survey to the respondents. The future researchers should not randomly pick respondents to answer the questionnaire. The future researchers can select different groups of people as their respondents. This can help the future researchers to complete the research with nice respondent groups which they are able to get more reliable result.
5.5.4 Financial and time constraints

The future researchers can distribute the survey questionnaire through online method such as Google form to reduce the time of collecting data. Travelling time and expenses can be saved through online method. It is also convenient for the researchers to check the result of the survey questionnaire online. The future researchers can get the data immediately after respondents fill in the survey.
5.6 Conclusion

In the chapter 5, we had summarized both descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. The discussion on the hypothesis test in this research project had been provided as well. Throughout this chapter, the outcomes show that workplace deviance has a significant relationship with perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. The outcomes from this research project presents a negative relationship and this result is supported by previous researchers.

This research project provides a better view for the company management team to realize that the workplace deviance behavior of employees can be affected by the perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice perceived by employees. It is proven that the high perceived organizational support and organizational justice in the workplace may lower the employees’ intention to perform workplace deviance behavior.

Moreover, this chapter also includes the limitations and few recommendations for future researchers in order to avoid the constraints that cause low reliable result. We hope that the recommendations given are able to help future researchers to better conduct the research in the areas of workplace deviance behavior.

In a nutshell, this research project had contributed to the manufacturing industry by providing a better understanding of the relationship between workplace deviance and four independent variables which are perceived organizational support, distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.
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Appendix A

Letter of Permission to Conduct Survey

7th August 2018

To Whom It May Concern

Dear Sir/Madam,

Permission to Conduct Survey

This is to confirm that the following students are currently pursuing their Bachelor of Business Administration (Hons) program at the Faculty of Business and Finance, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR) Perak Campus.

I would be most grateful if you could assist them by allowing them to conduct their research at your institution. All information collected will be kept confidential and used only for academic purposes.

The students are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>Student ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang Yen Wen</td>
<td>16ABB01621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Siao Phooi</td>
<td>15ABB03391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Wong Fu Keong</td>
<td>15ABB05773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khor Chang Pin</td>
<td>15ABB03388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Su Ying</td>
<td>15ABB03514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need further verification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Choong Yuen Omn
Head of Department,
Faculty of Business and Finance
Email: choongyo@utar.edu.my

Puah Azyan Binti Awee
Supervisor,
Faculty of Business and Finance
Email: azyan@utar.edu.my
Appendix B

Questionnaire

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Workplace deviance among employee in Manufacturing Industry Malaysia

Dear Respondent,

We are researchers of Bachelor of Business Administration (Hons) from University Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR). We are conducting a survey on manufacturing industry in Malaysia. The objective of this research is to study the impacts of perceived organizational support and organizational justice on workplace deviance among employee in manufacturing industry Malaysia.

Your co-operation to answer those questions is very important in helping our research. We appreciate if you could complete the following questionnaire. Any information obtained regarding with this study will remain confidential. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified and only group data will be presented.

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Best Regard,

Chang Yen Wen
Chin Siao Phooi
Danny Wong Fu Keong
Instruction for Completing the Questionnaire

1. There are THREE (3) sections in this questionnaire. Kindly answer ALL the questions in Section A, Section B and Section C.

2. Completion of this questionnaire will take you approximately 10-15 minutes.

3. This questionnaire will be kept strictly CONFIDENTIAL.

PERSONAL DATA PROTECTIONS STATEMENT

Please be informed that accordance with Personal Data Protection Act 2010 ("PDPA") which came into force on 15 November 2013, University Tunku Abdul Rahman ("UTAR") is hereby bound to make notice and require consent in relation to collection, recording, storage, usage and retention of personal information.

Acknowledgement of Notice

[ ] I have been notified by you and I hereby understood, consented and agreed per UTAR notice.

[ ] I disagree, my personal data will not be processed.

____________________

Date:

Last but not least, please read the instruction carefully before answering the question. Thank you for your cooperation and willingness to answer the questionnaire. Your response will be kept confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

Section A: Respondent’s Demographic Information
Please tick (✓) for the most appropriate answer in the following items.

1. Gender
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. Age
   - [ ] Below 20 years old
   - [ ] 20-29 years old
   - [ ] 30-39 years old
   - [ ] 40-49 years old
   - [ ] 50-59 years old
   - [ ] Above 60 years old

3. Ethnic group
   - [ ] Malay
   - [ ] Chinese
   - [ ] India
   - [ ] Others, please specify: ____________________

4. Marital Status
   - [ ] Single
   - [ ] Married
   - [ ] Divorced
   - [ ] Widowhood
   - [ ] Others, please specify: _____________

5. Gross Monthly Salary
   - [ ] Below RM1,000
   - [ ] RM1,000 to RM1,999
   - [ ] RM2,000 to RM2,999
   - [ ] RM3,000 to RM3,999
   - [ ] RM4,000 to RM4,999
   - [ ] Above RM5,000
6. Education Level

☐ SPM  ☐ SPTM  ☐ Diploma

☐ Bachelor’s Degree  ☐ Master’s Degree  ☐ Doctorate Degree

☐ Others, please specify: _____________________

7. Working Experience

☐ Less than 5 years  ☐ 5-10 years  ☐ 11-15 years

☐ 16-20 years  ☐ 21-25 years  ☐ More than 26 years

8. Average working hours per week

☐ Less than 30 hours  ☐ 35 hours  ☐ 40 hours

☐ 45 hours  ☐ More than 50 hours

9. Employment Status

☐ Part-time  ☐ Full-time
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Section B: Dependent Variable
Please describe your personal views of the following statements as objectively as you can. Please circle only ONE appropriate number that BEST reflects your agreement with the statement using the Likert scale 1 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Neutral (N)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workplace deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: Independent Variables
Please describe your personal views of the following statements related to your current working environment as objectively as you can. Please circle only ONE appropriate number that BEST reflects your agreement with the statement using the Likert scale 1 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Neutral (N)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 1: Perceived Organizational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: Distributive Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: Procedural Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor makes job decisions in a biased manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor collects accurate and complete information before making job decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor applies all job-related decisions consistently to all employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor allows me to challenge or appeal job decisions made by him or her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 4: Interactional Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My supervisor considers my viewpoint.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor was able to suppress personal biases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about the decision and its implications.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor took steps to deal with me in a truthful manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking time out to participate in our survey. We truly value the information you have provided.
Appendix C

Pilot Test
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MC 1</th>
<th>1.0000</th>
<th>0.4837</th>
<th>0.3346</th>
<th>0.2905</th>
<th>0.2657</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
<th>0.2567</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC 2</td>
<td>0.4837</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 3</td>
<td>0.3346</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 4</td>
<td>0.2905</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 5</td>
<td>0.2657</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 6</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 7</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 8</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 9</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 10</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 11</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC 12</td>
<td>0.2567</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generated by the SAS System (Local: SWD\Mعارض) on February 16, 2010 at 11:00 PM
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Perceived Organizational Support
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**Distributive Justice**
Procedural Justice
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**Interactional Justice**
Appendix D

Full Study Reliability Test
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Perceived Organizational Support

![Image of Perceived Organizational Support Reliability Result]

![Image of Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 384]
**Determinants of Workplace Deviance among Manufacturing Employees in Malaysia**

**Distributive Justice**

![Image of SPSS output showing reliability analysis and correlation coefficients]
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Procedural Justice
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Interactional Justice
Appendix E

Pearson Correlation Coefficient
Appendix F

Descriptive Analysis

Number of Respondents according to Average Working Hours per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average working hours per week</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or less than 35 hours</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64 hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 79 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 or more than 80 hours</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.53%</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents according to Working Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 5 years</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>41.41%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>41.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5-10 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.65%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>90.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10-15 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 15-20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More than 20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Number of Respondents according to Age

**The PROC FREQ Procedure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>55.30</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>55.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>65.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>70.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>90.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generated by the SAS System (Version 9.4) on January 24, 2019 at 11:16:52 PM.
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### Number of Respondents according to Gross Monthly Salary

**The PROC FREQ Procedure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross monthly salary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generated by the SAS System (Version 9.4) on January 24, 2019 at 11:17:42 PM.
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Number of Respondents according to Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84.32%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>39.42%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generated by the SAS System (Local): SSI_BRIEVE from January 24, 2019 at 11:21:24 PM

Number of Respondents according to Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84.32%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>39.42%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generated by the SAS System (Local): SSI_BRIEVE from January 24, 2019 at 11:16:47 PM
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Appendix G

Multiple Regression Analysis