

The 2nd International Business Management Research Conference (IBMRC)

IBMRC

16th November, 2012

at Faculty of Business Administration, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, THAILAND

Message From Editor-in-Chief

Every year, our Conference brings together academicians and researchers in the areas of business management and other related areas in order to disseminate knowledge and exchanged the knowledge between academicians, researchers, as well as Master's and Doctorate students who are extending their studies on the innovative knowledge.

For year 2012, we are proud to present the publication of The 5th and 2nd volume of BMRC and IBMRC Conference Proceeding which had produced by the Conference Publications Committee of Faculty of Business Administration, Chiang Mai University. All BMRC and IBMRC Conference Proceeding articles are subject to a stringent process of review by at least two members of our Editorial Advisory Board. Manuscripts are carefully accepted for possible inclusion in the Proceedings before being considered for final publication.

For the 5th BMRC and 2nd IBMRC in the year 2012, the Faculty of Business Administration at Chiang Mai University proudly organized the events on November 16, 2012. The events had brought together around 100 delegates consisting of academic experts, businessmen, graduate students and representatives from both government agencies as well as private organizations. The conference encompasses manuscripts including three themes which are: 1) Logistics, Information Technology and Management, 2) Financial and Accounting, and 3) Hospitality and Marketing.

We would like to express our sincere thanks to our stakeholders and the editorial boards as well as especially our delegates.

We would like to thank all the contributing authors for providing such a rich variety of outstanding research articles on a broad range of exciting topics.

Narumon Kimpakorn, Ph.D.

Editor-in-Chief

BMRC & IBMRC Conference Editorial Boards

Principle & Rationale

The vision of the faculty of business administration at Chiang Mai University is to focus on enhancing the academic knowledge of business management. The faculty encourages the creation and development of ongoing research to academic scholars and students. This would lead to the expansion of new knowledge in managing a business which can provide a benefit to the profession itself, the local community, and industries nationwide. The business administration conference is one of the methods in disseminating knowledge by the Board of Administration.

Chiang Mai University has heeded to the importance of endorsing the development and propagation of knowledge. The effort is demonstrated in producing a channel to have participants from the private business sector, government institutions, and academic research centers to come together and exchange their experiences and ideas as well as collaborate on upholding the profession of business management. Under the provision of Chiang Mai University, the business management research conference has continued on from 2008. The conference has received accolades from the participants of the seminar. Therefore, it is the aim of the institution to strengthen the academic administration line in providing leadership and knowledge in business management. Moreover, the purpose of creating this forum is to disseminate knowledge in the business management. This is to stimulate a continuation of ideas being exchanged between academics, researchers, and students who are extending their studies on the master's and doctorate in business management and other related fields. The Faculty of Business Administration at Chiang Mai University is proud to hold the second international annual conference in "International Business Management Research" which will be held on November 16th, 2012.

Objectives

- To promote the academic center's view of business management.
- To promote the development of research which will lead to a result in new knowledge and on the application of knowledge management as a benefit for business management in the community and the nation level.
- To Create opportunity to exchange knowledge, vision and experience in developing research in business management.
- To impart benefit of research and development of business continuity management.
- To provide a forum to publish academic works in business management.

The area of manuscript

- 1) Marketing management research
- 2) Financial management research
- 3) Organizational management research
- 4) Human resource management research
- 5) Accounting research
- 6) Consumer behavior management research
- 7) Entrepreneurship development research
- 8) Information technology and management research
- 9) Organizational communication and marketing communication research
- 10) Corporate social responsibility research
- 11) Other related research topics

Acceptance Manuscript

Individuals who are interested in taking part in the conference can submit a completed article which will be reviewed and selected by 2/3 experts to decide if the work meets with the conference requirements. Upon acceptance authors of the article will be asked to attend the forum to give a presentation. The presentation can be done in two ways.

The awarding of the “Best Paper Award” is in accord with the criteria and discretion of the organizing committee. Papers will only be considered in the proposed meeting room. In addition, the owner of manuscript has a right to request on prohibiting their work to be published in the Journal of Research and Conference Management (ISSN1906-7135), published by the Faculty of Business Administration, Chiang Mai University. However, the request will be fulfilled only if the editor board accept the manuscript

Consultants

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Assoc.Prof. Dr.Siriwut Buranapin | Dean of Faculty of Business Administration,
Chiang Mai University |
| 2. | Professor Dr. Richard Wright | Fullbright senior specialist, USA |
| 3. | Professor Dr. Kim Byong Shrik | Kyunggi University, Korea |
| 4. | Professor Dr.Paul Patterson | University of New South Wales, Australia |
| 5. | Associate Prof. Dr. Nicholas Dimmitt | Asian Institute of Technology |

Peer Reviewers

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Professor.Dr.Patriya Tansuhaj | Washington State University, USA |
| 2. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Supaporn Luekittikul | Chulalongkorn University, Thailand |
| 3. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Weerapon Thongma | Mae Jo University, Thailand |
| 4. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Chirawan Chaisuwan | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 5. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Apichart Sopadang | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 6. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Boonjai Srisatidharakul | Chulalongkorn University, Thailand |
| 7. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Patchara Tantiprabha | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 8. | Assoc.Prof.Dr.Ravi Lonkani | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 9. | Assoc.Prof.Sirikiat Ratchusanti | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 10. | Assoc.Prof.Orapin Santidhirakul | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 11. | Assoc. Prof.Kitti Siripunlop | Thammasart University, Thailand |
| 12. | Assoc. Prof.Orachorn Maneesong | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 13. | Assist. Prof.Dr.Kittinoot Chulikavit | Mae Jo University, Thailand |
| 14. | Assist. Prof.Dr.Amorat Tuamrunroj | Assumption University, Thailand |
| 15. | Assist. Prof.Dr.Pattaragit Netiniyom | Kasetsart University, Thailand |
| 16. | Dr. Pattama Shimpalee | University of South Carolina, USA |
| 17. | Dr. Thomas R. Cary | City University of Seattle, USA |
| 18. | Dr. Chuleeporn Changchit | Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi, USA |
| 19. | Dr. Peter Wyeth | Washing For State University, USA |
| 20. | Dr. Gerard Tocquer | Mahidol University, Thailand |
| 21. | Dr.Sansana Siritam | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 22. | Dr.Narumon Kimpakorn | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 23. | Dr.Tanyanuparb Anantana | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 24. | Dr.Chaiwuth Tangsomchai | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 25. | Dr.Narunard Sarapaivanich | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 26. | Dr.Warat Winit | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |
| 27. | Dr.Pichayalak Pichayakul | Chiang Mai University, Thailand |

The 2nd International Business Management Research Conference
Venue: Faculty of Business Administration, Chiang Mai University,
Chiang Mai, Thailand

Friday 16th, November 2012

Schedule

8.30–9.00 am.	Registration (Convention Hall at 6 th Floor) (Upload powerpoint file for presentation at registration desk)
9.00–9.15 am.	Opening Ceremony by President/Representative of Chiang Mai University (Convention Hall at 6 th Floor)
9.15–10.30 am.	Special seminar on topic “Branding Issues in Asia Context” by Associate Professor Dr.Gerard Tocquer, Vice Dean International Program College of Management Mahidol University and Chair of the General Management Program in the College of Management at Mahidol University (Convention Hall at 6 th Floor)
10.30– 10.45 am.	Coffee–Break (Convention Hall at 6 th Floor)
10.45–12.30 am.	Seminar presentation – Session 1 (presentation 15 min. , Q&A 5 min./paper) – Room No.2502 (5 th Floor) – Room No.2503(5 th Floor)
12.30 –13.30 pm.	Lunch (Convention Hall at 6 th Floor)
13.30 –14.30 pm.	Seminar presentation – Session 2
14.30–14.45 pm.	Coffee–Break (in front of seminar room)
14.45–16.00 pm.	Seminar presentation – Session 3

CONTENT

IBMRC: International Conference, Room No.2502(5th Floor)

	Page
B1 The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Governance and Financial Decision on Corporate Value Present by Agus Purwanto	13
B2 The Effect of Voluntary Disclosure, Asymmetry Information and Earning Management on Cost of Equity Capital Present by Agus Purwanto	26
B3 The Power of Corporate Governance in Financial Reporting Practice: an Indonesian Case Study Present by Anis Chariri	38
B4 Audit Team Dynamics and Audit Quality Present by Yefta Andi Kus Noegroho and Dyah Ekaari Sekar Jatining Sih	53
B5 A study of Corporate Budget Planning, Control and Performance Evaluation in Mauritius Present by Vidisha Gunesh Ramlugun	73
B6 Evaluating the Role of Customer Engagement and Pro-Environmental Identification on Theory of Planned Behavior to Predict Green Consumption Behavior Present by Premruedee Jitkuekul	87
B7 The Relationship between Executive Compensation, Employee Compensation, and Firm Value Present by Duangnapa Sukhahuta	98
B8 Effect of the Collective Thailand Local Tax Efficiency Present by Nichapat Boonyarat	115

CONTENT

IBMRC: International Conference, Room No.2503 (5th Floor)

		Page
C1	Ban Mae Kampong Homestay Community: Are Attributes Aligned with Wellness Tourism? Present by Traci Morachnick	126
C2	Adding Value to a Thai Rural Tourism Product Offering through “Wellness” Attributes: Case of Mae Klang Luang Village Present by Pichayalak Pichayakul	143
C3	Message Framing and Source Credibility in Functional Food Advertisements Present by Euis Soliha	157
C4	The Moderation Effect of Abusive Supervision on the Relationship between Leader–Member Exchange and Workplace Deviance Present by Fenika Wulani	169
C5	Recognition, Training, and Retention of Workers in Japanese Overseas Subsidiaries in Thailand and Vietnam Present by Yuzuru Utsunomiya	176
C6	What’s your Problem ?! Implications of Team Learning in Dealing with a Natural Crisis Present by Ravee Phoewhawmy	192
C7	The Influence of Quality on Consumer Green Product Preferences Present by Chamaiporn Fung–Fuang	205
C8	The Role of Relationship Investment in Relationship Marketing in Nonprofit Organizations Present by Tanti Handriana	215
C9	An Exploration into Thai People’s Perception Towards Onscreen English Fonts with Implication to Electric Commerce ration into Present by Chatpong Tangmanee	228



International Business Management Research Conference

THE MODERATION EFFECT OF ABUSIVE SUPERVISION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE AND WORKPLACE DEVIANCE

Fenika Wulani* Hani Handoko** and BM. Purwanto

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationships between Leader-Member Exchange/LMX and workplace deviance behaviors (supervisor-directed deviance and organizational deviance), and investigated the role of abusive supervision as a moderating variable on those relationships. Respondent of this study is 199 non managerial and full-time employees working on various industries in Indonesia. The results showed that the higher LMX quality, the lower supervisor – directed deviance. In addition, this study found that LMX was more strongly associated with supervisor-directed deviance when abusive supervision was higher, than lower. However, this study suggested that no significant interaction effect on organizational deviance.

Keywords : Leader-Member Exchange, workplace, relationship

* Doctoral student, Faculty of Economics and Business, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia (fwulani@yahoo.com)

** Lecturer, Faculty of Economics and Business, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) has been received many attentions from researchers. According to Bolino and Turnley (2009), most of this study has investigated on its outcomes. Those studies showed that LMX was associated with positive outcomes, such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and Job performance (Gerstner & Day, 1997). On the other side, according to Dalal (2005), there are three broad performance domains: task performance, OCB, and counterproductive behavior. Unfortunately, to our knowledge, there were very little studies that investigated the effect of LMX on counterproductive behavior, whereas this behavior could impact on organizational performance (Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2006). One of counterproductive behavior' form that has more interest in researches is workplace deviance (Lee & Allen, 2002).

Nevertheless, on the working relationship of supervisor–employee could not free from the dark–side leadership phenomena like abusive supervision. Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, and Barick (2004) suggest that employees who perceive their job situation as an unfavorable will more violates the organization norms. The interesting issue that, would employees in high quality exchange engage in deviant behavior when they experience abusive supervision? Would abusive supervision drive employees who hold low quality exchange to more engage in deviant behavior?

In this study we investigated the relationship between LMX and workplace deviance behaviors (supervisor–directed deviance and organizational deviance). Further, we considered the moderating effect of abusive supervision. We suggested that abusive supervision experience would impact on the relationship between LMX and workplace deviance behaviors.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK/ AND HYPOTHESIS

LMX theory suggests that leader usually develops different exchange relationship with his/her subordinates – some employees have high quality relationship, but other group of employees have low quality relationship (Yukl, 1989); Bolino & Turnley, 2009). Employees in low quality relationship, than high, less liked, receive less supervisory support and fewer advancement opportunities from their supervisor (Bolino & Turnley, 2009). As a result, in low quality group, employees could perceive unfairness and worse relationship with their supervisor (Kim, O'Neill, & Hyun, 2009).

Unfortunately, employees' feeling about unfairness could have important effect on their behavior (Bolino & Turnley, 2009). Bolino and Turnley (2009) suggested that employees in lower quality LMX tend to related on negative behaviors. While Colbert et al.(2004) suggest that employees who have unfavorable perception of their work situation will more likely to engaged in deviant behavior. Workplace deviance is defined as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well–being of an organization, its members, or both” (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556). This behavior is often as a result of specific event such as social pressure, unfair treatment, and poor working condition (Colbert et al., 2004).

According to negative reciprocity principles, employees may attempt to resolve exchange imbalance by harming the other parties who harm them (Thau & Mitchell, 2010) and withholding their behavior (Colbert et al., 2004). Therefore, employees in the lower quality exchange relationship will more engaged in deviance behavior – with the targets are their supervisor and their organization. These are because they perceive that their supervisor is unfairness agent and they will decrease their input and violate organization norms to restore justice. While according to social exchange theory, employees who receive benefit from other party (for example, their supervisor), will repay with favorable behavior to their supervisor. Therefore, employees who experience high quality exchange with their supervisor will less violate organization norms.

Hypothesis 1a: LMX quality is negatively related to supervisor-directed deviance

Hypothesis 1b: LMX quality is negatively related to organizational deviance

According to Glaso and Einarsen (2006), supervisor-employees relationship could involve emotion. As consequently, it is possible that employees, whether in low or high quality relationship, could experience negative behavior from their supervisor (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012). Previous studies found that group of high quality relationship also has negative interpersonal treatment (Braiker & Kelly, 1979; Fincham & Linfield, 1997; on Lian et al., 2012a). One of supervisor's negative treatment which has a powerful impact on employee counterproductive behavior is abusive supervision (Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004).

Tepper (2000, p. 178) defined abusive supervision as "the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviors, excluding physical contact." The forms of abusive supervision such as supervisor gives the silent treatment, invades employees' privacy, and blames employees to save supervisor' embarrassment (Tepper, 2000). Abusive supervision is a source of stress and has impact on organization effectiveness (Tepper et al., 2004). In that case, we could say that abusive supervision is unfavorable experience for employees.

Therefore, we argued that employees who hold lower quality exchange, when experience high negative behavior such as abusive supervision, will more engaged in deviance behavior. It is because for employees who have lower quality exchange, experience high abusive supervision will strengthen the perception of worse condition of their job. However, for employees who have higher quality exchange, their relationship with their supervisor is important. It is also possible that they don't want to lose their good position. As a result, employees who hold higher quality exchange, while experience high abusive supervision, will less likely to engaged in deviance behavior.

Hypothesis 2a: Abusive supervision moderates the negative relationship between LMX quality and supervisor-directed deviance. The negative relationship between LMX and supervisor-directed deviance will be stronger when abusive supervision is high, than low.

Hypothesis 2b: Abusive supervision moderates the negative relationship between LMX quality and organizational deviance. The negative relationship between LMX and organizational deviance will be stronger when abusive supervision is high, than low.

RESEARCH METHOD

1. Scope of the study

The limits of this study were in the area of LMX, workplace deviance, and abusive supervision. This research was done in Indonesia.

2. Sample

Respondents of this study were 199 non managerial and full-time employees working on various industries in Surabaya, east java, Indonesia. Surabaya is the second biggest city (after Jakarta) in Indonesia, and has been known as a centre of business city in the eastern Indonesia.

3. Methods of data collection

Twenty six people in researcher' friendship networking agree to assistance for distributing questionnaires. Each of them were distributed around 5-10 questionnaires to 251 individuals. The response rate was 86.1% (n = 216), and the final sample for hypothesis tests was 199.

4. Measures

LMX was assessed with 7 items ($\alpha = .793$) from Scandura and Graen (1984) LMX7 scale. We used a five-

point scale that ranged from 'never' (1) to 'always' (5). Sample items are: 'My manager recognizes my potential,' and 'My manager understands my problems and needs.'

Abusive supervision was assessed with 15 items ($\alpha = .926$) from Tepper (2000). Respondents used a five-point scale that range from 'I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me' (1) to 'He/she uses this behavior with me very often' (5). Sample items are: 'Puts me down in front of others,' and 'Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid.'

We assessed organizational deviance with 12 items ($\alpha = .843$) from Bennett and Robinson (2000). Respondents used a seven-point scale that range from 'never' (1) to 'everyday' (7). Sample items are: 'Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working,' and 'Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked.'

Supervisor-directed deviance was assessed with 10 items ($\alpha = .838$) from Mitchell and Ambrose (2007). Respondents used a seven-point scale that range from 'never' (1) to 'everyday' (7). 'Swore at my supervisor,' and 'Made an obscene comment or gesture toward my supervisor.'

We also controlled for variables that could correlate with deviant behavior: gender and age. According to Aquino and Douglas (2003), employees demographic such as gender and age could be a predictor for counterproductive behavior

RESULTS

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to test our hypothesis. We controlled for gender and age. Table 1 shows the results of the effect LMX quality on workplace deviance behaviors and the moderating effect of abusive supervision on those relationships. Prior the analysis, we entered all control variables at the first step. The result was supported to hypothesis 1a that LMX quality had negative relationship with supervisor-directed deviance ($b = -.142, p < .05$). Contrary to hypothesis 1b, there was no significant relationship between LMX quality and organizational deviance ($b = .009, ns.$). Moderating analysis also supported to hypothesis 2a that abusive supervision had significant effect on the relationship between LMX quality and supervisor-directed deviance ($b = -.146, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .020, p < .01$). However, there was no significant effect of abusive supervision on the relationship between LMX quality and organizational deviance.

Table 1. also shown that in all step, employees' age and gender had significant effect on organizational deviance, but not on supervisor-directed deviance. These analyses revealed that man, than woman, was more engaged in organizational deviance. Besides that, the younger employees, than older, were more engaged in organizational deviance.

To provide full support for hypothesis 2a, we also analyzed the interaction by testing the relationship between LMX quality and workplace deviance at high (one SD above the mean) and low (one SD below the mean) values of abusive supervision. This analysis shown that the negative relationship between LMX quality and supervisor-directed deviance was stronger when abusive supervision was high ($b = -.276, p < .01$). But when abusive supervision was low, there was no significant relationship between LMX quality and supervisor-directed deviance ($b = -.003, ns.$).

Table 1 : Hierarchical regression results

Variable	Supervisor-directed deviance			Organizational deviance		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Age	-.134	-.088	-.068	-.195**	-.168*	-.151*
Gender	-.061	-.031	-.028	-.191**	-.175*	-.172*
LMX		-.142*	-.14*		-.099	.096
Abusive supervision		.226**	.2**		.113	.09
LMX x Abusive supervision			-.146			-.125
ΔR^2	-.021	.083**	.020*	.073**	.026	.015

CONCLUSIONS/ AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Consistent with negative reciprocity and social exchange theory, employees who receive negative treatment from other party (for example: their supervisor), will repay with unfavorable behavior to their supervisor. Our analysis shown that employees in lower quality exchange were more reciprocate with deviant behavior to their supervisor, but employees in higher quality exchange were less reciprocate with deviant behavior to their supervisor.

The moderating analysis also was support the hypothesis that abusive supervision had effect on the relationship between LMX quality and supervisor-directed deviance. When abusive supervision was high, the relationship would be stronger. However, when abusive supervision was low, there was no relationship between LMX quality and supervisor-directed deviance. The possible explanation was, not all employees in lower exchange quality would engage in deviant behavior to their supervisor. It was because they still wish to hold high exchange quality with their supervisor (Bolino & Turnley, 2009). Consequently, they will less reciprocate with negative behavior to their supervisor.

Contrary with hypothesis 1b and 2b, there was no significant relationship between LMX quality and organizational deviance, and abusive supervision had no effect on that relationship. Organizational deviance includes action such as withholding effort. According to Engle and Lord (1997), supervisor liking, than subordinates performance, will be more determine the relationship quality between superior and their subordinates. Hence, it is possible that not all employees on higher quality exchange will less engage in organizational deviance. It is because they aware that high performance not important enough to be a high quality exchange group. On the other hand, we argued that not all employees on lower quality exchange will withhold their input. It is because, although some employees may perceive that similarity on personality with their supervisor is more important than performance, other employees perceive that to be a member of high quality exchange, do a high performance is still important. It was consistent with Xu, Wright, Chiu, and Chao (2008) that leader could develop high exchange quality with

employees who have performance level as supervisor expected.

This study suggested that when experience high abusive behavior, individuals in low quality LMX will response with deviance behavior to their supervisor (as a harmdoer), but not to their organization. This result consistent with Bies and Tripp (1996; on Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007)'s study. Their study found that individuals will retaliate who those harm them. It was also possible that some individuals do not reduce their input because they aware it is too costly if they do not fulfill the standard of performance. Especially if they realize the limited availability of employment opportunities in elsewhere.

According to those results, it is still important to investigate the effect on LMX quality on workplace deviance, especially to uncover some moderator variables that possible have effects to weaken or strengthen this relationship. For example, investigate on employees' perception about the criteria which is used by supervisor to selection employees in high or low quality exchange relationship.

REFERENCES

- Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H. (2009). Relative deprivation among employees in lower-quality leader-member exchange relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 276–286.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L.A., & Barrick, M.R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (4), 599–609.
- Engle, E.M., & Lord, R.G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (4) 988–1010.
- Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827–844.
- Glaser, L., & Einarsen, S. (2006). Experienced affects in leader-subordinate relationships. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 22, 49–73
- Kim, S., O'Neill, J.W., & Cho, H.M. (2009). When does an employee not help coworkers? The effect of leader-member exchange on employee envy and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, article in press.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, (1), 131–142.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D.J. (2012). Does taking the good with the bad make things worse? How abusive supervision and leader-member exchange interact to impact need satisfaction and organizational deviance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117, 41–52.
- Mulki, J.P., Jaramillo, F., & Locander, W.B. (2006). Emotional exhaustion and organizational deviance: can the right job and a leader's style make a difference? *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 1222–1230.
- Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (2), 555–572.
- Tepper, J.P. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 178–190.
- Tepper, B.J., Duffy, Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M.D. 2004. Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (3): 455–465.
- Thau, S., & Mitchell, M.S. (2010). Self-gain or self-regulation impairment? Tests of competing explanations of the supervisor abuse and employee deviance relationship through perceptions of distributive justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95 (6), 1009–1031.
- Xu, H., Wright, R.P., Chiu, W.C.K., & Chao, W. (2008). Relational schemas as sources of evaluation and misevaluation of leader-member exchange: some initial evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 266–282.
- Yukl, G.A. (1989). *Leadership in organization*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.