

# Employee deviant behavior: role of culture and organizational relevant support

R. Arzu Kalemci

*Cankaya Universitesi, Ankara, Turkey*

Ipek Kalemci-Tuzun

*Baskent Universitesi, Ankara, Turkey, and*

Ela Ozkan-Canbolat

*Cankiri Karatekin Universitesi, Cankiri, Turkey*

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to increase the knowledge and understanding of organizational and supervisory support in the context of employee deviant workplace behavior (DWB) by examining the potential associations of employees' cultural value orientations. This paper aims to: clarify DWB; review perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisory support (PSS); discuss the meaning of employees' cultural value orientations (individualism–collectivism, power distance and paternalism); use the fuzzy logic model to analyze relationships between DWB and POS, as well as PSS and employees' cultural value orientations.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This research applies a fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis.

**Findings** – The results show the role of employee perceived organizational and supervisory support and cultural dimension (power distance and paternalism) configurations on employee DWB.

**Originality/value** – The main originality of this study is to further increase the understanding of organizational and supervisory support in the context of employee DWB by examining the potential associations of employees' cultural value orientations. This study extends the previous research by providing evidence that organizational and supervisory support influences employees' DWB.

**Keywords** Cultural orientation, Perceived organizational support

**Paper type** Research paper

## 1. Introduction

Deviant workplace behavior (DWB), a voluntary behavior, violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, is perceived as threatening to the well-being of the organization or its members (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). DWB gained attention from organizational behavior researchers with its negative psychological, social and tangible consequences for employees and organizations. Destructive behavior and constructive behavior are two types of DWBs discussed in literature (Bennett and Stamper, 2001). This study emphasizes and highlights destructive deviant behavior.

Upon review of relevant literature, it can be said that the effects of supportive organizational practices on DWB are an interesting area despite the extant evidence on the effect of organizational support on employee attitudes and behavior, including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intention and job performance (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986, 1990; Maertz *et al.*, 2003; Payne and Huffman, 2005; Tuzun and Kalemci, 2012; Tuzun *et al.*, 2016). Influence of a supportive



organizational climate on employee work performance is best explained by the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960).

Based on the social exchange theory, Eisenberger *et al.* (1986) developed the concept of perceived organizational support (POS) to understand employee–employer exchange relationships. POS refers to an individual's perception of how much the organization values employees' contributions and cares about their well-being. Organizational support theory adopts Levinson's (1965) view that employees perceive their supervisors as representatives of the organization. Employees may engage in exchange relationships with supervisors that differ from their experience with the organization (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986; Levinson, 1965). In this manner, perceived supervisory support (PSS) refers to employee views about the extent to which a supervisor values contributions and care about their well-being (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988). Greater social exchange with the effective application of organizational practices can be associated with stronger employee commitment, better work performance, lower turnover intention and violated behavior (Geddes and Baron, 1997; Geddes and Callister, 2007; Shore *et al.*, 2009). The logic behind work performance and deviant behavior is similar when employees feel they have not found support from both the organization and supervisor. In turn, employees develop negative attitudes and demonstrate negative behavior toward the organization. Negative attitudes and behaviors may cause employees to act against the organization (Dailey and Kirk, 1992; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).

Although there is an apparent generalizability of social exchange theory, there are significant differences in the application of the social exchange in cultures with different value orientations. This is especially true in a relationship between two people. One of the most cited perspectives of cultural values comes from Hofstede's (1984) four dimensions, which explain differences between cultures. These are: power distance, individualism–collectivism, masculinity–femininity and uncertainty avoidance. In addition, psychologists have dealt with a range of values varying across and within cultures, including individualism–collectivism, power distance, masculinity–femininity and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1992; Tyler *et al.*, 2000). Accordingly, paternalistic relationship was nourished from the national cultural dimensions identified by Ayman *et al.* (2000).

Although past studies used value scores to identify the characteristics of entire cultures, researchers recognize that value orientations can also be used to reflect an individual's characteristics (e.g. Triandis, 1995). The focus of this prospective research is to moderate the effect of individual-level cultural values on social exchange relationships in organizational settings, as well as cultural values operationalized in the individual and the organizational domain (Dorfman and Howell, 1988).

This paper aims to: clarify DWB; review POS and PSS; discuss the meaning of employees' cultural value orientations (individualism–collectivism, power distance and paternalism); and use the fuzzy logic model to analyze relationships between DWB and POS, as well as PSS and employees' cultural value orientations.

## **2. Perceived organizational and supervisory support relations with employee DWB**

Organizational norms are generally composed of expected behaviors, languages and principles (Coccia, 1998). Organizations express various behaviors, which eventually construct organizational norms (Appelbaum *et al.*, 2007). A group of terms associated with deviance has evolved with normal work behavior breaching the norms of the organization. These are defined as antisocial behaviors (Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly, 1998), organizational misbehaviors (Vardi and Wiener, 1996), non-complaint behaviors (Puffer, 1987), workplace deviance (Robinson and Greenberg, 1998) and dysfunctional work behaviors (Griffin *et al.*, 1998). Each term reflects a different pattern of behavior. Indeed, this lack of agreement requires researchers to use different theoretical frameworks to explain types of behavior.

A typology of behaviors (including the mentioned behaviors) has been developed by Robinson and Bennett (1995). Therefore, this paper focuses on the construct of DWB as defined by Robinson and Bennett (1995). This typology provides comprehensive information for the researchers to discuss their arguments in an organized manner (Everton *et al.*, 2007, p. 119; Yoo *et al.*, 2013). Accordingly, Robinson and Bennett (1995, p. 556) defined organizational deviant behavior as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both.”

The theoretical framework of social exchange explains why employees want to participate in positive behaviors and why employees prefer to avoid negative behaviors when providing support and resources to their employing organization. According to social exchange theory, individuals act with the belief that the receiver will return the received benefit in a similar manner (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Based on the social exchange theory, Eisenberger *et al.* (1986) developed the theory of POS to understand employee–employer exchange relationships. POS refers to an individual’s perception of how much the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Consistent with the POS approach, employees balance their exchange relationships with their organizations. Studies show that a high level of POS leads to increased affective commitment and citizenship behavior (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1990; Hayton *et al.*, 2012; Kurtessis *et al.*, 2015; Rhoades *et al.*, 2001), reduced absenteeism and lower levels of intention to quit (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986; Tuzun and Kalemci, 2012; Wayne *et al.*, 1997) and less deviant behavior (Geddes and Stickney, 2011; Van Emmerik *et al.*, 2007). According to these studies, employees may continue an exchange relationship with both the organization and their immediate supervisor (Settoon *et al.*, 1996; Wayne *et al.*, 1997). It also means that employees who perceive managers as representatives of the organization (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986; Levinson, 1965; Shoss *et al.*, 2013) may engage in exchange relationships with supervisors.

According to Kottke and Sharafinski (1988), PSS refers to employee views about the extent to which supervisor values employees’ contributions and cares about their well-being. Research indicates that supportive practices from supervisors cause favorable outcomes for both employees and the organization, including reduced stress and improved performance (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Shoss *et al.*, 2013). The idea that supportive practices affect work-related attitudes and behavior through employees’ perceptions or experiences is supported by the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986). The link between organizational support and DWB by employees is possible because social exchange theories assert that relationships are built around norms of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). The theory argues that employees’ perception of support, whether from the organization or supervisor, is reciprocated back to the organization (Allen *et al.*, 2003). Given this claim of social exchange theory and reciprocity, it is possible to link organizationally relevant support and DWB by employees (e.g. Tuzun *et al.*, 2016):

*H1a.* POS is related to DWB.

*H1b.* PSS is related to DWB.

### **3. Employee cultural orientations relations with employee DWB**

It has been observed that the application of social exchange theory to cultures with different value orientations has significant differences, particularly in terms of the view of an individual relationship with others. Related literature suggests that cultural differences lead to differences in management practices (Bame-Aldred *et al.*, 2013; Newman and Nollen, 1996; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 2004).

One of the most mentioned perspectives on cultural differences is developed by Hofstede (1984), who highlights a need for international managers to understand cultural systems

---

unique to a country. In fact, related studies show that management's effectiveness is culturally specific; management techniques appropriate for one national culture may not be appropriate for another culture (Hofstede, 1984; Kateb *et al.*, 2014). In fact, previous studies show that differences in national culture provide an important explanation for different compensation (Schuler and Rogocsky, 1998) and recruitment (Milikic, 2009) practices of countries. Accordingly, Ayca (2005) found that Hofstede's (1984) three cultural dimensions (uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and power distance) influence job analysis and outcomes (i.e. job description and job specification).

According to Hofstede (2005, p. 76), "individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family and collectivism as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onward are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people's lifetimes continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty." While Hofstede (1984) saw individualist cultures as prioritizing personal goals and self-actualization, collectivist cultures prioritize family and groups, with the culture seeking satisfaction from a respectable job as defined by the group rather than by oneself. Individualist cultures prioritize individual goals over those of the group. On the contrary, those in collectivist cultures significantly consider their relations (Triandis, 2001). Despite country differences, this dimension may have significant within-country differences (Oyserman *et al.*, 2002). Individualism and collectivism, as important cultural dimensions, help to explain and clarify cultural differences with the assumption that people in the same culture are largely homogeneous. However, according to the literature, under different conditions, people selectively shape their attitudes and preferences from both individual and collectivistic cognitive structures (Triandis, 1995).

Thus, it would be misleading to assume that everyone in a collectivistic culture is a collectivist or everyone in an individualistic culture is an individualist. There is considerable evidence to suggest that distinctions between collectivist and individualist exist in the form of individual differences within cultures, and that the defining characteristics of individualism and collectivism exist at the individual level (Wasti, 2003). When measured at the individual level, individualism and collectivism are referred to as idiosyncrasy and allocentrism (Wasti, 2003), or individualistic and collectivistic values, respectively (Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002, 2004). Consistent with these suggestions, this paper treats individualism and collectivism as a variable to differentiate individuals.

In the organizational context, individualism and collectivism describe the relationships of employees with coworkers, work teams, working groups, supervisors and the organization. Individuals with collectivist values define themselves as members of the group (Earley and Gibson, 1998; Triandis, 1995). Collectivists often see themselves as embedded in the social context as they seek close, long-term relationships. Within the working environment, the interpersonal harmony is important for the collectivist. On the other hand, the individualist sets up relationships with the organization in a calculative manner. Employees with individualistic values need a stronger freedom and establish low-context, unemotional relationships. According to Wagner (1995), employees with individualistic values view the self as separate from others, with an emphasis on personal achievements and goals. Employees with individualistic values cooperate with the working group as a tool to achieve individual goals which cannot be achieved through individual work (Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002).

Employees with high values of collectivism expect beneficial behaviors with the organization, such as organizational citizenship behavior (e.g. Van Dyne *et al.*, 2000). It is important to emphasize the effect of groups in the workplace when evaluating DWB within the organization (Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). Individuals with collectivist values aim to establish harmonious interpersonal relationships within the group (Kim *et al.*, 1994). Collectivists want to achieve group success vs individual success. On the other hand,

employees with high individual values focus on personal interests and self-satisfaction. Nevertheless, highly individualistic employees perceive heterogeneity within the group as a positive factor to increase group effectiveness (Sosik and Jung, 2002). According to Kim and Markus (1999), uniqueness can be perceived as a form of DWB in collectivist cultures because these cultures emphasize harmony and individual responsibility within a group (Fiske *et al.*, 1998; Markus *et al.*, 1997; Triandis, 1995). Collectivist orientation with organizational support in terms of POS and PSS has an interrelatedness relationship with DWB:

*H1c.* Employees' individualist/collectivist orientation is related to DWB.

Although individualism and collectivism variables influence employee response to organizational support, this paper argues that power distance is also critical due to its focus on understanding how employees reciprocate in situations with more (or less) powerful exchange partners. According to Hofstede (2005, p. 46), "power distance can be defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally." Although Hofstede (1980) introduces cultural values on the societal level, researchers find that a majority of studies investigate Hofstede's cultural values at the individual level rather than the societal level (Farh *et al.*, 2007; Kirkman *et al.*, 2006). In accordance with these studies, this paper defines and operationalizes power distance at the individual level. At an individual level, power distance refers to the extent to which an individual accepts the unequal distribution of power in organizations and its influence on how individuals perceive and react to authority (Clugston *et al.*, 2000). Social exchange theory, with its main argument of reciprocity, suggests that employees react to an abusive supervisor by engaging in deviant behaviors. In other words, employees are more likely to engage in behaviors that harm the organization and its members when they are abused by authority (Thau *et al.*, 2009):

*H1d.* Employees' power distance orientation is related to DWB.

The role of high power distance in relationship to POS, PSS and between DWB leads to the idea of paternalism. Webster (1975, p. 21) defines paternalism as "the principle or system of governing or controlling a country, group of employees, etc., in a manner of suggesting a father's relationship with his children." When paternalism is addressed in the organizational context, it refers to the supervisor's role of caring, protecting and guiding subordinates in both work and nonwork environments (Aycan *et al.*, 2000). Consistent with the social exchange theory's main argument of reciprocity, it is expected that subordinates will be loyal and virtuous against their supervisor. Paternalism is accepted in hierarchical societies. The paternalistic relationship is based on power inequality between the leader and the followers. Inequalities in power distribution are legitimized, especially in cultures with high power distances (Aycan, 2005). Western cultures criticize paternalism for creating inequality. One of the most important assumptions of paternalistic leadership is that the leader is superior to subordinates in knowledge, skills, experience and morals. Although this assumption may be untrue, it leads to unquestioned obedience and loyalty by subordinates (Aycan *et al.*, 2000). In addition, as part of the paternalistic role, the leader has social roles, such as joining employees' weddings or celebrations. Thus, leaders reduce the social distance between followers and act as a father (Aycan, 2001). Paternalism moderates the relationships between POS, PSS and DWB. Individuals with high paternalism values are more loyal due to the support they receive from the organization and their supervisors. These individuals are less likely to engage in DWB:

*H1e.* Paternalism is related to DWB.

*H1f.* POS, PSS, collectivism, power distance and paternalism have a bidirectional relationship with DWB.

#### 4. Methodology

This paper aims to reveal the effects of POS, PSS and impacts of cultural values on the deviant behavior of employees in a comparative way. The analysis unit of the research is the actors-employees. The research uses a structured interview as its data collection method. To assess POS and PSS, this study uses Eisenberger *et al.* (1986) and Tate *et al.* (1997) items to assess employees' perception that their organization and supervisors take care of their workers. This paper assesses Bennett and Robinson's (2000) deviant behaviors of the employees' scale. Dorfman and Howell's (1988) scale is used to assess the impact of individualism/collectivism (high scores evaluated as collectivism and addressed as collectivism). Power distance cultural values and paternalism are assessed with Aycans *et al.* (2000). The interviews are carried out in 8 companies with 241 interviews, including the general manager, production manager, marketing manager and human resource manager (or their assistants).

The findings are the result of a descriptive analysis. Then, the process rates the findings on the basis of the hundred system intended for analysis through the fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) program utilized in the assessment of the relationship between the deviant behavior and POS, PSS and the impact of cultural values. The industry selection process focuses on the service industry due to its dynamic market structure, which responds to employees' deviant behaviors. Thus, there is a need to examine reasons for deviant behaviors.

This portion of the research uses fsQCA. As a theoretical approach tool, the qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) technique studies cases including groups with different qualitative properties suitable for testing the configuration theories. As opposed to the regression and correlation methods matching the Boolean Algebra (Fiss, 2007) linearity theory, QCA may focus on equifinality and togetherness of the variables to obtain simplified statements creating specific results. QCA refers to scenarios that "enable a system to reach at the same final situation from different start points and through different (or multiple ways)" (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p. 2).

QCA offers a framework for the comparison of organizational configurations. This paper follows the recommendations of Fiss (2007) to avoid several analytic methods, including cluster analysis, interaction effects and deviation scores. When demanding complex causality and non-linear relationships, the paper follows the theories of the QCA method. A qualitative focus enables the analysis of a few cases as it is both intense and complementary (Ragin, 2008). For this reason, this paper uses a specific type of QCA (the fsQCA) to determine the relationships between product innovation and strategic flexibility configurations.

This research determines the impact of cultural values configurations, including individualism/collectivism, power distance and paternalism and perceived supports in organizational life configurations (i.e. POS and PSS as causes/conditions). The survey includes six questions to determine the collectivism dimension, six questions for power distance and five questions for paternalism. This survey uses eight questions to examine POS; three questions examine PSS. This paper assesses the cumulative of the questions for defining configurations. Deviant behavior scales are used as outcomes related to the hypotheses. The outcomes show the cumulative of deviant behavior questions in the survey.

While collecting the measures for conditions, researchers took the cumulative valuation of POS, PSS and impacts of cultural values. The following sub-effect summations were found: seven POS; two PSS; six individualism/collectivism cultural impact; six power distance cultural impact; five paternalism cultural affect. The researchers examined the deviant behavior of employees as an outcome and calculated outcomes with respect to 19 sub-effects. While determining the measures for outcome, researchers used the same conditions and took the cumulative valuation of these sub-effects.

After collecting measures for the conditions and the outcome, the researchers calibrated the conditions such that they were computable in an fsQCA (Schneider and Wagemann, 2012). For the outcome, the researchers set a maximum value of 54 for the outcome, the threshold for the crossover value for outcome at 29 and a minimum value at 19.

This paper presents quantitative analysis with data provided by 235 employees through a survey. The authors set the threshold for the crossover value at 29, meaning employees perceive deviant behavior occasionally on average. The minimum value indicates that employees perceive deviant behavior in no way. The maximum value for the outcome indicates employee's highest perceived deviant behavior in the organization.

For causes and conditions, the researchers set the maximum value for collectivism and power distance at 30, the threshold for the crossover value at 10 and minimum value at 6. The researchers set the maximum value for paternalism at 25, the threshold for the crossover value at 8 and minimum value at 5. The researchers determine the maximum value for POS and PSS at 35 and 10, the threshold for the crossover value at 11 and 4 and minimum value at 7 and 2, respectively. In doing so, the researchers calibrate the entire effects of cultural aspects, POS configurations and PSS configurations with respect to all cases. This research processes deviant behaviors of employees as the outcome testing for certain combinations of cultural impacts with respect to individualism/collectivism, power distance, paternalism effects and POS and PSS effects. The study uses these negations separately.

### 5. Solutions

The core of fsQCA is a truth table analysis, which seeks to identify casual combinations that are sufficient for the outcome. Truth tables give an indication of identical cases and limited diversity phenomenon. Table I presents a truth table for the interrelatedness of deviant behaviors and the effects of cultural factors and POS and PSS configurations.

The truth table lists every combination of conditions, in this case  $2^5$  with 5 being the number of conditions (Schneider and Wagemann, 2012). The researchers set the consistency threshold to 0.8, which is a value expected to create robust results (Fiss, 2011; Rihoux and Ragin, 2009; Schneider and Wagemann, 2012). Only solutions that belong to more than zero cases are reported. The truth table for the interrelatedness of deviant behaviors and the effects of cultural aspects and POS and PSS configurations satisfies the required assumptions.

Collectivism	Power distance	Paternalism	PSS	PSS	Row cons.	Pri cons.	Sym cons.
0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0.996	0.991	0.998
0	1	1	0	1	0.996	0.987	0.998
1	0	0	0	1	0.994	0.987	0.990
0	0	1	0	1	0.993	0.990	0.992
0	0	0	1	1	0.993	0.985	0.993
1	0	1	1	1	0.992	0.983	0.982
0	1	1	0	0	0.991	0.957	0.957
1	0	1	0	1	0.989	0.983	0.995
0	0	0	0	1	0.988	0.981	0.988
1	1	1	1	1	0.986	0.965	0.975
1	1	0	0	0	0.896	0.935	0.935

**Table I.**  
Truth table for the outcome "deviant behavior"

The concept of asymmetric causality (Lieberson, 1985) is important when evaluating the potential of QCA for social science research. Different to most statistical procedures, QCA links conditions and the outcome through set asymmetric theoretical relations. Therefore, QCA provides both presence and absence of phenomenon in two different analyses (Schneider and Wagemann, 2010). The analysis of the negation of outcome determines understanding of casual logic driving the positive cases with respect to negative ones (Ragin and Rihoux, 2004). The researchers also contribute a truth table for the negation of deviant behaviors and the effects of cultural factors and POS and PSS configurations for checking the results (see Table II).

According to the first procedure, the researchers determine the following intermediate solutions (see Table III).

Table III shows six alternative solutions to explain the interrelatedness of cultural effects, POS and PSS configurations, and deviant behavior. Ragin (2006) suggests using raw and unique coverages to evaluate empirical importance. The findings of Schneider and Wagemann (2010) determine that raw coverage refers to the size of overlap between the causal condition sets and the outcome sets. Additionally, unique coverage that partitions the raw coverage controls the overlapping explanations.

The total coverage with respect to the importance of all causal paths is 0.894, which explains that a causal path covers most of the outcome. The raw coverage for the single causal paths ranges from 0.804 to 0.158. While all the unique coverage of the causal paths is above 0, three have unique coverage of 0.001, 0.002 and 0.003, which are close to 0. Therefore, the first three combinations are important in explaining deviant behaviors of employees' results.

The most notable expression with a unique coverage of 0.098 is PSS\*~power distance. This solution (first solution) shows that configurations of PSS and negation power distance (absence of power distance) cultural effect are consistently indicators of deviant behaviors of employees. The second notable expression with a unique coverage of 0.027 is PSS\*paternalism solution, which shows that PSS and paternalistic cultural effect interrelate with employees' deviant behaviors. The third empirically important causal path with unique coverage of 0.030 indicates that employees' deviant behaviors depend on the absence of paternalistic and power distance cultural effects, as well as the absence of POS (~POS\*~Paternalism\*~Power distance).

As the analysis of negation cases provides the causal logic driving the positive cases and/or help to understand substantively interesting insights in their own right (Ragin and

Collectivism	Power distance	Paternalism	POS	PSS	Row cons.	Pri cons.	Sym cons.
1	1	0	0	0	0.805	0.065	0.065
0	1	1	0	0	0.795	0.043	0.043

**Table II.**  
Truth table for outcome negation of deviant behavior

Solution term	Coverage (raw)	Coverage (unique)	Consistency
PSS*~power distance	0.804	0.098	0.960
PSS*paternalism	0.642	0.027	0.965
~POS*~ paternalism*~power distance	0.434	0.030	0.981
~PSS*~POS*~ paternalism*collectivism	0.156	0.002	0.988
~POS*paternalism*power distance*~collectivism	0.158	0.001	0.986
POS*paternalism*power distance*collectivism	0.173	0.003	0.987
Overall solution	0.894		0.948

**Table III.**  
Solution terms for deviant behavior



Rihoux, 2004), researchers use negation of DWB as control variable for checking reliability of DWB variable interrelatedness with POS and PSS and cultural dimensions of employees' configurations. The researchers determine the following complex solutions for negation of deviant behavior (see Table IV).

Table IV determines that one solution may explain the interrelatedness of cultural effects, POS and PSS configurations, and the absence of employees' deviant behaviors. The most notable expression with a unique coverage of 0.526 is collectivism\*power distance\*~paternalism\* ~POS\*~PSS, which shows that cultural effects of collectivism, power distance and negotiation of paternalism, and negotiation of POS and PSS configurations affect are consistent indicators of negation of employees' deviant behaviors. The solution of the negation of employees' deviant behaviors is a different solution from employees' deviant behaviors. The researchers accept the three causal paths when they determine employees' deviant behavior and cultural effects, and POS and PSS configurations relatedness.

### 6. Discussion

The main purpose of this study is to further increase the knowledge and understanding of organizational and supervisory support in the context of employee DWB by examining the potential associations of employees' cultural value orientations. The results indicate that PSS with employees' cultural orientation interrelates with employee DWB in two ways. The first path explains a high level of employees' PSS with low or absent level of power distance (PSS\*~power distance) related to employee DWB. Employees have a positive attitude toward their organization, which increases their motivation and performance, when they perceive that they are receiving support, courage and feedback to successfully improve their skills (Colbert *et al.*, 2004). The opposite case may lead to frustration (Colbert *et al.*, 2004), which also leads to deviant behavior, including hostility or aggression (Spector, 1997).

On the other hand, Bennett and Robinson (2000) suggest that perceived fairness and justice to the employees are negatively associated with interpersonal and organizational deviance. Employees with low power distance are more sensitive to unequal treatment by their supervisors. They react negatively compared to employees who have high power distance orientation (Thau *et al.*, 2009; Wang *et al.*, 2012). Individuals who are high in power distance orientation perceive their managers as superior, legitimizing power disparity and avoiding acts against their superiors as they obey leadership's decisions (Bochner and Hesketh, 1994). This also means that they are less likely to react adversely to distributive and procedural injustice from supervisors (Lian *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, high levels of power distance with organizational support in terms of PSS interrelate with DWB. Employees with high levels of power distance do not negatively react to distributive and procedural injustice from supervisors. They receive support from their supervisor; the organization makes more sense to the individual who is high in power distance orientation.

The second path shows that a high level of employees' PSS with paternalistic behavior of supervisor interrelates with DWB (PSS\*paternalism). A main assumption of paternalistic leadership is that the leader is superior in knowledge, skill and experience. This assumption may lead to unquestioned obedience and loyalty by subordinates (Aycaan *et al.*, 2000). Accordingly, as a part of the paternalistic role, the leader has social roles, including joining employees' celebrations and acting in a father role (Aycaan, 2001). Based on this information,

**Table IV.**  
Solutions terms  
for negation of  
deviant behavior

Solution term	Coverage (raw)	Coverage (unique)	Consistency
collectivism*power distance*~paternalism* ~POS*~PSS	0.526	0.526	0.805
Overall Solution	0.526		0.805

this paper concludes that paternalism moderates the relationship between PSS and DWB as individuals with high paternalism values will be more loyal to support from their supervisors and less likely to engage in DWB.

The third path shows different types of DWB relationships with employees' PSS, POS and cultural orientation.  $\sim\text{POS}^*\sim\text{Paternalism}^*\sim\text{Power distance}$  indicates that absence or low level of POS with paternalism and power distance relates to DWB. Although related empirical research basically investigated the relationship between POS and positive work outcomes (e.g. Hayton *et al.*, 2012; Rhoades *et al.*, 2001; Wayne *et al.*, 1997), supportive practices in terms of POS and PSS are also negatively related to DWB (Colbert *et al.*, 2004; Ferris *et al.*, 2009; Liao *et al.*, 2004; Tuzun *et al.*, 2016). When employees feel desirable support, they will reciprocate the obligation through positive behaviors. On the other hand, when support is seen to be undesirable, employees will return such favor by engaging in unfavorable behavior.

Due to the above explanations, this paper finds that employees' PSS, POS, cultural dimensions, power distance and paternalism relate with DWB. Cultural dimension individualism/collectivism with employees PSS and POS only relates with the absence of employee deviant behavior (see Table IV) ( $\text{collectivism}^*\text{power distance}^*\sim\text{paternalism}^*\sim\text{POS}^*\sim\text{PSS}$ ). This path explains that low level or absence of DWB may emerge with a high level of collectivism and power distance with the absence of paternalism where employees do not feel POS and PSS. Employees with high collectivist values think – and even internalize – that it is their duty to adopt organizational policies and norms. For this reason, it is less likely that these individuals show behaviors contrary to organizational goals. This research shows that employees' individualist/collectivist behavior does not relate with DWB in contrast to employees' individualist/collectivist behavior related to the absence of DWB.

## 7. Conclusion

Through different methodological perspectives, this study extends the previous research by providing evidence that organizational and supervisory support influences employees' DWB. With an fsQCA, results show the role of employee PSS, POS and cultural dimension configurations to foster employee DWB. This study also examines equifinality in POS, PSS, power distance and paternalism configurations with respect to DWB. Conclusive supportive PSS with lack of power distance orientation may cause employees to engage in deviant behavior. Supportive PSS with paternalistic orientation may also cause employees to engage in deviant behavior. On the other side, lack of supportive POS with lack of paternalistic and power distance orientation may cause deviant behavior. This study indicates that a lack of POS, power distance and paternalistic cultural orientation interrelates with DWB. Within this aspect, this research differs from other studies.

## References

- Allen, D.G., Shore, L.M. and Griffeth, R.W. (2003), "The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 99-118.
- Appelbaum, S.H., Laconi, G.D. and Matousek, A. (2007), "Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts and solutions", *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 7 No. 5, pp. 586-598.
- Aycan, Z. (2001), "Paternalism: Yönetim ve Liderlik Anlayışına İlişkin Üç Görgül Çalışma", *Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 11-32.
- Aycan, Z. (2005), "The interface between cultural and institutional / structural contingencies in human resource management", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 1083-1120.

- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R.N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G. and Khursid, A. (2000), "Impact of culture on human resource management practices: Aten country comparison", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 192-220.
- Bame-Aldred, C.W., Culen, J.B., Martin, K.D. and Parboteeah, K.P. (2013), "National culture and firm-level tax evasion", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 3, pp. 390-396.
- Bennett, R.J. and Robinson, S.L. (2000), "Development of a measure of workplace deviance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 3, pp. 349-360.
- Bennett, R.J. and Stamper, C.L. (2001), "Corporate citizenship and deviancy: a study of work behavior", in Galbraith, C. and Ryan, M. (Eds), *International Research in the Business Disciplines: Strategies and Organizations in Transition*, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp. 265-284.
- Blau, P.M. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Bochner, S. and Hesketh, B. (1994), "Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 233-257.
- Clugston, M., Howell, J.P. and Dorfman, P.W. (2000), "Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment?", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 5-30.
- Coccia, C. (1998), "Avoiding a toxic organization", *Nursing Management*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 32-34.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L.A. and Barrick, M.R. (2004), "Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 4, pp. 599-609.
- Cropanzano, R. and Mitchell, M.S. (2005), "Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 874-900.
- Dailey, R.C. and Kirk, D.J. (1992), "Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover", *Human Relations*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 305-317.
- Dorfman, P.W. and Howell, J.P. (1988), "Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited", in Farmer, R.N. and Goun, E.G. (Eds), *Advances in International Comparative Management: a research annual*, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp. 127-150.
- Earley, P.C. and Gibson, C.B. (1998), "Taking stock in our progress on individualism –collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 265-304.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. and Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990), "Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 75 No. 1, pp. 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. and Sowa, D. (1986), "Perceived organizational support", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71 No. 3, pp. 500-507.
- Everton, W.J., Jolton, J.A. and Mastrangelo, P.M. (2007), "Be nice and fair or else: understanding reasons for employees' deviant behaviors", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 117-131.
- Farh, J.L., Hackett, R.D. and Liang, J. (2007), "Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China: comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality", *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 715-729.
- Ferris, D.L., Brown, D.J. and Heller, D. (2009), "Organizational support and organizational deviance: the mediating role of organization-based self-esteem", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 108, pp. 279-286.
- Fiske, A., Kitayama, S., Markus, H.R. and Nisbett, R.E. (1998), "The cultural matrix of social psychology", in Gilbert, D.T., Fiske, S.T. and Lindzey, G. (Eds), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, pp. 915-981.
- Fiss, P.C. (2007), "A set-theoretic approach to organizational configurations", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 1180-1198.

- 
- Fiss, P.C. (2011), "Building better causal theories: a fuzzy set approach to typologies in organization research", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 393-420.
- Geddes, D. and Baron, R.A. (1997), "Workplace aggression as a consequence of negative performance feedback", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 433-454.
- Geddes, D. and Callister, R.R. (2007), "Crossing the line(s): a dual threshold model of anger in organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 721-746.
- Geddes, D. and Stickney, L.S. (2011), "The trouble with sanctions: organizational responses to deviant anger displays at work", *Human Relations*, Vol. 64 No. 2, pp. 201-230.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1960), "The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 161-178.
- Griffin, R.W., O'Leary-Kelly, A. and Collins, J.M. (1998), "Dysfunctional work behaviors in organizations", in Cooper, C.L. and Rousseau, D.M. (Eds), *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, pp. 65-82.
- Hayton, J.C., Carnabuci, G. and Eisenberger, R. (2012), "With a little help from colleagues: a social embeddedness approach to perceived organizational support", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 235-249.
- Hofstede, G. (1984), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Hofstede, G.H. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Hofstede, G.J. (2005), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Kateb, G.A., Swies, R., Obeidat, B. and Maqableh, M. (2014), "An investigation on the critical factors of information system implementation in Jordanian information technology companies", *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 7 No. 36, pp. 11-28.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978), *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York, NY.
- Kim, H. and Markus, H.R. (1999), "Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 77 No. 4, pp. 785-800.
- Kim, U., Triandis, C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S. and Yoon, G. (1994), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Kirkman, B.L., Lowe, K.B. and Gibson, C.B. (2006), "A quarter century of culture's consequences: a review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 285-320.
- Kottke, J.L. and Sharafinski, C.E. (1988), "Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 1075-1079.
- Kurtessis, J., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M.T., Buffardi, L.C., Stewart, K.A. and Adis, C.S. (2015), "Perceived organizational support: a meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 1854-1884, doi: 10.1177/0149206315575554.
- Levinson, H. (1965), "Reciprocation: the relationship between man and organization", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 370-390.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D.L. and Brown, D.J. (2012), "Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 97 No. 1, pp. 107-123.
- Liao, H., Joshi, A. and Chuang, A. (2004), "Sticking out like a sore thumb: employee dissimilarity and deviance at work", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 57, pp. 969-1000.
- Liebertson, S. (1985), *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.
- Maertz, C.P., Stevens, M.J. and Campion, M.A. (2003), "A turnover model for the Mexican Maquiladoras", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 111-115.

- Markus, H.R., Mullally, P. and Kitayama, S. (1997), "Selfways: diversity in modes of cultural participation", in Neisser, U. and Jopling, D.A. (Ed.), *The Conceptual Self in Context: Culture, Experience, Self-understanding*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 13-61.
- Milikic, B. (2009), "The influence of culture on human resources management processes and practices: the propositions for Serbia", *Economic Annuals*, Vol. 181 No. 1, pp. 93-118.
- Newman, K. and Nollen, S. (1996), "Culture and congruence: the fit between management practices and national culture", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 753-779.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H.M. and Kemmelmeier, M. (2002), "Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumption and meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 128 No. 1, pp. 3-72.
- Payne, S.C. and Huffman, A.H. (2005), "A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover", *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 158-168.
- Puffer, S.M. (1987), "Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission sales people", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 72 No. 4, pp. 615-621.
- Ragin, C.C. (2006), "Set relations in social research: evaluating their consistency and coverage", *Political Analysis*, Vol. 14 No 3, pp. 291-310, doi: 10.1093/pan/mpj019.
- Ragin, C.C. (2008), *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*, University Of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- Ragin, C.C. and Rihoux, B. (2004), "Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA): state of the art and prospects", *Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 3-13.
- Ramamoorthy, N. and Carroll, S.J. (1998), "Individualism/collectivism orientations and reactions toward alternative human resource management practices", *Human Relations*, Vol. 51 No. 5, pp. 571-588.
- Ramamoorthy, N. and Flood, P.C. (2002), "Employee attitudes and behavioral intentions: a test of the main and moderating effects of individualism and collectivism orientations", *Human Relations*, Vol. 55 No. 9, pp. 1071-1096.
- Ramamoorthy, N. and Flood, P.C. (2004), "Individualism/collectivism, perceived task interdependence and teamwork attitudes among Irish blue collar employees: a test of main and moderating effects", *Human Relations*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 347-366.
- Rhoades, L. and Eisenberger, R. (2002), "Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 4, pp. 698-714.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. and Armeli, S. (2001), "Affective commitment of the organization: the contribution to perceived organizational support", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 5, pp. 825-836.
- Rihoux, B. and Ragin, C.C. (2009), *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA and London.
- Robinson, S.L. and Bennett, R.J. (1995), "A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 555-572.
- Robinson, S.L. and Greenberg, J. (1998), "Employees behaving badly: dimensions, determinants, and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance", in Cooper, C.L. and Rousseau, D.M. (Eds), *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, Wiley, New York, NY, pp. 1-30.
- Robinson, S.L. and O'Leary-Kelly, A.M. (1998), "Monkey see, monkey do: the influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. 658-672.
- Schneider, C.Q. and Wagemann, C. (2010), "Standards of good practice in qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) and fuzzy-sets", *Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 397-418.
- Schneider, C.Q. and Wagemann, C. (2012), *Set-theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences: A Guide to Qualitative Comparative Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Schuler, R.S. and Rogocsky, N. (1998), "Understanding compensation practice variations across firms: the impact of national culture", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1992), "Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries", in Zanna, M.P. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 1-65.
- Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N. and Liden, R.C. (1996), "Social exchange in organizations: perceived organizational support, leader member exchange and employee reciprocity", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 3, pp. 219-227.
- Shore, L.M., Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., Chen, X.P. and Tetrick, L.E. (2009), "Social exchange in work settings: content, process, and mixed models", *Management and Organization Review*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 289-302.
- Shoss, M.K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S.L. and Zagenczyk, T.J. (2013), "Blaming the organization for abusive supervision: the roles of perceived organizational support and supervisor's organizational embodiment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 98 No. 1, pp. 158-168.
- Skarlicki, D.P. and Folger, R. (1997), "Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 3, pp. 434-443.
- Sosik, J.J. and Jung, D.I. (2002), "Work group characteristics and performance in collectivistic and individualistic cultures", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 142 No. 1, pp. 5-23.
- Spector, P.E. (1997), *Job Satisfaction*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Tate, U., Whatley, A. and Clugston, M. (1997), "Sources and outcomes of job tension: a three-nation study", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 350-358.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R.J., Mitchell, M.S. and Marrs, M.B. (2009), "How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: an uncertainty management theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 108 No. 1, pp. 79-92.
- Triandis, H.C. (1995), *Individualism and Collectivism*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Triandis, H.C. (2001), "Individualism-collectivism and personality", *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 69 No. 6, pp. 907-924.
- Trompenaars, F. and Hampden-Turner, C. (2004), *Managing People Across Cultures*, Capstone Publishing, West Sussex.
- Tuzun, I.K. and Kalemci, A. (2012), "Organizational and supervisory support in relation to turnover intentions", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 518-534.
- Tuzun, I.K., Cetin, F. and Basim, N. (2016), "Deviant employee behavior in the eyes of colleagues: the role of organizational support and self-efficacy", *Eurasian Business Review*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 389-405, doi: 10.1007/s40821-016-0061-5.
- Tyler, T.R., Lind, E.A. and Huo, Y.J. (2000), "Cultural values and authority relations: the psychology of conflict resolution across cultures", *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 1138-1163.
- Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E. and Cummings, L.L. (2000), "Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 3-23.
- Van Emmerik, I.J.H., Euwema, M.C. and Bakker, A.B. (2007), "Threats of workplace violence and the buffering effect of social support", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 152-175.
- Vardi, Y. and Wiener, Y. (1996), "Misbehavior in organizations: a motivational framework", *Organization Science*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 151-165.
- Wagner, J.A. (1995), "Studies of individualism-collectivism: effects on cooperation in groups", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 152-172.
- Wang, W., Mao, J., Wu, W. and Liu, J. (2012), "Abusive supervision and workplace deviance: the mediating role of interactional justice and the moderating role of power distance", *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 43-60.

- Wasti, S.A. (2003), "Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 76 No. 3, pp. 303-321.
- Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M. and Liden, R.C. (1997), "Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 82-111.
- Webster (1975), *Webster's Dictionary*, Merriam-Webster, Springfield, MA.
- Yoo, L., Flaherty, K. and Frankwick, G.L. (2013), "The effect of communication practice on deviance among Korean salespeople: the mediating role of intrinsic motivation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 9, pp. 1991-1999.

### Further reading

- Bandura, A. (1982), "Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 122-147.
- Chen, M. (2001), *Asian Management Systems*, Thomson, London.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I.L. and Rhoades, L. (2002), "Perceived supervisory support: contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 3, pp. 565-573.
- Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R.T. and Wayne, S.J. (1997), "Leader member exchange theory: the past and potential for the future", in Ferris, G.R. (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, JAI, Greenwich, CT, pp. 47-119.
- Loi, R., Hang-Yue, N. and Foley, S. (2006), "Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: the mediating role of perceived organizational support", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 79 No. 1, pp. 101-120.
- Maertz, C.P., Griffeth, R.W., Campell, N.S. and Allen, D.G. (2007), "The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisory support on employee turnover", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 28 No. 8, pp. 1059-1075.
- Masterson, S.S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B.M. and Taylor, M.S. (2000), "Integrating justice and social exchange: the differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 738-748.
- Pellegrini, E.K. and Scandura, T.A. (2006), "Leader-member exchange (LMX), paternalism and delegation in the Turkish business culture: an empirical investigation", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 264-279.
- Scarlicki, D.P. and Folger, P. (1997), "Retaliation in the workplace: the roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 3, pp. 434-443.
- Somers, M. (1995), "Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: an examination of direct and indirect effects", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 49-58.
- Sommer, S., Bae, S. and Luthans, F. (1996), "Organizational commitment across cultures: the impact of antecedents on Korean employees", *Human Relations*, Vol. 49 No. 7, pp. 977-993.

### About the authors

R. Arzu Kalemci is Associate Professor in Management Department, Cankaya University, Turkey. She received the BA Degree in Economics in 1998 from Bilkent University, and the PhD Degree in Management and Organization in 2009 from Baskent University. Her research interest includes organizational behavior, organizational theory, social exchange and business ethic. R. Arzu Kalemci is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: arzukalemci@cankaya.edu.tr

Ipek Kalemci-Tuzun received the PhD Degree in Management from Gazi University. She is Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Commercial Sciences, Baskent University. She is currently lecturing Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management courses. Her areas of research include human resource management applications and employee behavior, social exchanges in organization and social identity theory.

Ela Ozkan-Canbolat is Associate Professor in the Management Department, Cankiri Karatekin University in Turkey. She received the BA Degree in Economics in 2001 from İhsan Dogramaci Bilkent University, and the PhD Degree in Management and Organization in 2008 from Baskent University. She joined the Cankiri Karatekin University in 2009. She is interested in the influence of organizational network, evolutionary game theory, coopetition and innovation. She has focused a major portion of his teaching and research program on the use of evolutionary game theory and methods for understanding organizations and behavior strategies. She has received an award from the Global Innovation and Knowledge Academy Conference in 2015 with Aydin Beraha. Ela has had teaching experience in economics, management, sociology and statistics.

---

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)