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ABSTRACT

Workplace deviance is one of the undesirable behaviors which is responded by employees due to abusive supervision in the workplace. Abusive supervision is one of the crucial topics in the knowledge of the body of management literature. The employees display aggression and retaliation behavior against supervisor interpersonal mistreatment, and ultimately employees engage with deviant behavior. Psychological capital reduces the effect of workplace deviance in the presence of abusive supervision. This study presents a motivational model of how to decrease the effect of workplace deviance in the presence of abusive supervision. The total sample size was 300 pharmaceutical representatives, and the study found that psychological capital moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and employee workplace deviance. Practical implications give few reasons for abusive supervision and guidelines on how to reduce the influence of deviant behaviors and offer new directions for future research and report unexplored theoretical predictions.
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Workplace deviance is one of the undesirable behaviors which is responded by employees. The supervisor’s mistreatment and these behaviors are highly harmful to organizations (Aquino, Galperin, & Bennett, 2004). According to Bennet and Robinson (2003), deviance is a kind of
destructive behavior in which employees intentionally violate the organization’s norms and plan to harm an organization, coworkers or both. Many intellectuals have also reported that workplace deviance negatively impacts on organizations financially and psychologically (Roberts, Scherer, & Bowyer, 2011; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). Job stress, perceived interactional injustice, leader-member exchange, job commitment and satisfaction, organization management style, negative believes on organization, psychological distress, work related negative effects are the prototype of the workplace deviance (Li, Wang, Yang, & Liu, 2016; Lian, Ferris, Morrison, & Brown, 2014; Michel, Newness, & Duniewicz, 2016; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Park, Hoobler, Wu, Liden, Hu, & Wilson, 2017; Restubog, Scott, & Zagenczyk 2011; Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2008; Tepper, Henle, Lambert, Giacalone, & Duffy, 2008; Wang, Mao, Wu, & Liu, 2012). Social exchange perspective found support in management literature regarding workplace deviance (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), because interpersonal mistreatment by supervisor impact badly and distract the relationship of supervisor and employees. Intellectuals evidently found that individual reciprocate retaliation behavior against perceived unfairness in the organization (Greenberg & Alge, 1998; Skarlicki, Floger, & Tesluk, 1999), and breach the trust (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Vander Elst, Cuyper, Baillien, Niesen, & Witte, 2016) threat to identity (Aquino & Douglas, 2003). Consequently, some researchers have detached the interpersonal and organizational dimensions of deviant behavior (Diefendorff & Mehta, 2007; Thau et al., 2008; Tepper et al., 2008) and some take these dimensions jointly (Detert, Trevino, Burris, & Andiappan, 2007; Hamid, Juhdi, Ismail, & Abdullah, 2017; Michel et al., 2016). Thus, our focus is on dimensions of deviant behaviors, e.g. organization-directed deviance and supervisory-directed deviance.

Supportive supervision plays an important role in the growth of an organization. Authentic leaders motivate and influence subordinate’s psychological state (Wang et al., 2014). Many researchers have identified the various outcomes of managerial coaching such as job performance (Ali, Lodhi, Raza, & Ali, 2018), organizational citizenship behavior (Raza, Ali, Ahmed, & Ahmad, 2018; Raza, Ali, Ahmed, & Moueed, 2017) trustworthiness (Kim & Kuo, 2015), and thriving at work (Raza, Moueed, & Ali, 2018). Undeniably, a psychological contract exists between supervisors and subordinates, whenever a contract breach from one side, ultimately organization has to bear heavy cost (Vander Elst et al., 2016). Therefore, their relationship is become more complicated and challenging aspect for an organization because to some extent both display abusive and supportive behavior in the workplace. In last decades, researchers have focused to explore logical reasoning behind harmful, destructive behaviors at workplace and investigate antecedence of supervisory mistreatment, subordinate vengeance, workplace deviance that highly influence organization growth (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Park et al., 2017; Tepper, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler & Ensley, 2004; Tepper, Duffy & Shaw, 2001; Tepper et al., 2008; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002).

Supervisor’s responsibility is to make strategies on how to train employees, development of an organization and planning to improve organizational functions and performance (Jones, Woods, & Guillaume, 2016). Ali, Ahmad and Iqbal (2012) found human resource planning for internal and external fit. They are the representatives and main key to connect their subordinates with the organization. Employees display interpersonal relationship because organizational performance depends on it (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). Thus, in this study our
focus is on the dark side of supervision and employees’ outcomes. Globally, abusive supervision is a growing issue in every type of service setting that affects the organization badly. According to Tepper (2000), abusive supervision is “subordinates’ perception at the extent to which a supervisor displays undesirable verbal and nonverbal behavior (e.g., yelling, discouragement, loud bursts, publicly humiliation, rudeness), excluding physical contact”. Abusive supervision is subjective that means one employee may view supervisor behavior as abusive, another may not (Tepper, 2000). Researchers empirically investigated abusive supervision and its harmful effects. Subordinate outcomes include lessen job commitment and satisfaction (Duffy & Ferrier, 2003; Tepper et al., 2004; Tepper et al., 2008); increase revengeful behaviors toward organization, supervisors and coworkers (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Michel, Newness, & Duniewicz, 2016; Thau et al., 2008); higher turnover, psychological distress (Li, Wang, Yang, & Liu, 2016; Tepper, 2000); counterproductive actions (Detert et al., 2007). In many empirical types of research, links of abusive supervision and employee’s deviance behaviors are well documented in different cultural context (Hamid et al., 2017, Klumer, Mosholder, Ispas, Bing, Iliescu, & Ili, 2018; Martinko, Harvey, Brees & Mackey, 2013; Wang et al., 2014). Thus, no study has investigated how abusive supervision trigger subordinate’s deviant behavior in Pakistani cultural context.

Moreover, psychological capital has been acknowledged as moderator and mediator in many types of research which indicate that employees’ resources are most significant to handle uncertainties in the workplace. According to Job Demand-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), job resources (such as empowerment, task identity, perceived organization support and perceived supervisory support) and psychological capital (self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism) are the motivational elements that predict work engagement and enhance employee’s performance. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) postulate that job demand creates distress which resultant psychological exhaustion, poor health and anxiety by holding a constant job. In such a case, positive psychological resources prevent the felling of stress and anxiety. Researchers have found the origin of counterproductive working behavior. For example, Fox and Spector (1999) posit that workplace constraints are the primary source of workplace deviance. That means individuals who experience stressor at work environment; they may counteract with workplace deviance. Therefore, Avey, Luthans, and Jensen (2009) argue that PsyCap fight against stressor which creates frustration and anxiety and resultant workplace deviance. Fox and Spector’s (1999) process model points that resilience help to prevent the workplace distress, frustration and stressor.

Consequently, a high level of hope helps individuals to find alternative ways to cope with problems which turn as a stressor. Furthermore, optimistic combat against stressor as highly optimistic employee always have positive expectations in the context of future events that will be improved. Prior research indicates that continuous interaction and subsequent exchange relationship and leaders implant positive psychological state into their subordinates (Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005).

Authentic leaders can trigger the follower’s psychological capacities because they are credibly hopeful and trustworthy (Gardner & Schermerhorn, 2004). They are able to increase the followers’ hope by developing their willpower as well as give the positive direction which increase their sense of self-efficacy (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004).
Contrary, Li et al. (2016) found that abusive supervision is positively linked with member’s psychological distress. Roberts et al. (2011) posits that individuals who have a higher level of psychological capital can easily cope with stressful situations as well as more positively respond rather than negatively. Thus, we choose positive psychological capital as a moderator between abusive supervision and subordinate’s deviant behaviors to fill the literature gap. Therefore, the association between abusive supervision, interpersonal deviance, supervisor-directed deviance and organizational-directed deviance will be weak when an individual has high psychological capital rather than low.

**Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses Development**

Multiple theories (e.g., COR theory, social exchange theory, Fairness theory, reactance theory, Affective event theory, etc.) assist to broadly study the negative impact of abusive supervision and workplace deviance, but we mainly support Social exchange theory and COR theory to conduct the research.

**Abusive Supervision and Deviant Behaviors**

The workplace is one of the most challenging platforms for an individual where diversity of destructive attitude and behavior is expressed in different ways that negatively influence the individual’s productivity and organization’s growth. These undesirable behaviors ultimately violate the set norms and significantly affect the entire organization. Many researchers give different names to these undesirable behaviors and as a construct used in variety of studies like workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennet, 1995), workplace violence and aggression (Neuman & Barron, 1998), counterproductive behavior (Detert et al., 2007; Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, & Kessler, 2006) and retaliatory behavior (Jones, 2009) which voluntarily disrupt organization’s norms as well as sabotage the well-being of the organization, coworkers or both (Robinson & Bennet, 1995). Based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), individuals reciprocate positive and negative reactions in the organization. For instance, Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) found empirical evidence that interactional justice is positively associated with employee’s organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors. On the other side, negative reciprocate defined by Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) as negative treatment returned with negative treatment. Interpersonal mistreatment (supervisory mistreatment) trigger the employee’s retaliatory and counterproductive behaviors (Jones, 2009; Mitchell & Amobrose, 2007). Robinson and Greenberg (1998) posit that interpersonal mistreatment is the main element of abusive supervision as well as a solitary predictor of workplace deviance (Detert et al., 2007) that is harmful for all levels of the organization.

Abusive supervision includes rudeness, hostility, humiliation, publicly criticism, angry and shouting high increase turnover, psychological distress and decrease perceived organizational justice (Restubog et al., 2011; Tepper, 2000). Restubog et al. (2011) empirically tested the argument which is based on transactional theory of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987) that individuals who experience abusive supervision and become distressed, fearful or anxious will exhibit aggression and violence by engaging in undermining social behavior (e.g., criticizing, demotivate, ignoring), while employees who do not become distressed by supervisory mistreatment they will retaliate against supervisor by engaging in deviant behavior. Thau et
al.’s (2008) study found that when employees perceive the management style of the organization is higher rather than the low level of uncertainty, the association of abusive supervision and workplace deviance will be stronger. Uncertainty Management Theory explains this relationship in these words, when uncertainty is unified with abusive supervision, employees react more negatively against the organization (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002).

Social exchange theory provides a better understanding to investigate the linkage between abusive supervision and deviant behavior. Social exchange theory explains when an individual grieves unsuspected punishment, they ultimately engage in aggressive behaviors. Empirical evidence posits that subordinates negatively react to abusive supervision by engaging in deviant behaviors that sabotage organizations and its members (Aquino, Tripp & Bies, 2006; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Tepper et al., 2008). Workplace deviance typology established by Robinson and Bennett (1995) is categorized into two types; (a) organizational deviance and (b) interpersonal deviance. Organizational deviance is one of the deviant behaviors that directly harm the organization (e.g., delaying work, sabotage, lateness, stubbornly extend overtime).

Interpersonal deviance is another type of deviant behavior that directly harm the coworkers (e.g., verbal abuse, theft, violence, gossips, sexual harassment). Researcher argue that it is also important to distinguish among types of deviance either it is targeted to the organization deviance or interpersonal deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Target of deviance is an important component that help to identify the dimension of deviance either individual target to other individual (interpersonal deviance) or to organization (organization deviance) (Bennet & Robinson, 2000) or to supervisor directed deviance (Wang et al., 2012). Supervisory directed deviant behavior is kind of voluntarily vengeance that employees take from supervisors for their abusive behavior (Skarlicki & Folger, 2004). Correspondingly, different predictors are expected to influence the targets differently (Hershcovis et al., 2007). We assume that individuals who experience supervisor mistreatment may exhibit deviant behavior and target the organization, its members (co-workers) and their supervisor.

**Moderating Role of Psychological Capital**

Undoubtedly, employees rely on organizational resources (e.g., pay, social status, organizational support, information and trust) as well as personal resources (e.g., psychological capital, knowledge, skill and ability) to accomplish their career goals (Foa & Foa, 1980; Hobfoll, 2001). We use Conservation of Resource theory to analyze positive psychological capital as a moderator among abusive supervision and subordinate’s deviant behaviors in our theoretical framework. Wang et al.’s (2012) study indicates that abusive supervision disrupts the employee’s psychological state which leads to deviant behaviors. Ashforth’s (1997) study suggest that abusive supervision generates employee’s feelings of disaffection, frustration, and helplessness. Restubog, et al. (2011) viewed abusive supervision as an external stressor that generates subordinate’s negative feelings and thoughts.

According to Conservation of Resources (COR theory), abusive supervision as a kind of undesirable behavior comes from leaders which causes stressful sources for employees that deplete their resources, and has reflective consequences for their health and well-being (Hobfoll, 2001; Restubog, Scott, & Zagenczyk, 2011). This theory also suggests that depletion in employee’s resources is more silent than gain them. Depletion in resources leads to negative
consequences like work-family conflicts (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012) increase turnover (Halbesleben, 2011), job dissatisfaction (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999), and low performance (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

Empirical studies suggest that abusive supervision generally demonstrate subordinate’s Somatic anxiety (Rafferty, Restubog, & Jimmieson, 2010), depression (Haggard, Robert, & Rose, 2011), psychological distress (Li, Wang, Yang, & Liu, 2016; Tepper et al., 2007), and anxiety (Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2009). Raza et al. (2018) found that the moderating role of work family conflicts between the relationship of trait mindfulness and job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Psychological distress is a kind of mental strain categorized by undesirable thoughts like depression or anxiety (Selye, 1974). These undesirable thoughts and mental strain characteristically cause employee’s resource depletion (Byrne et al., 2014). According to COR theory, employees always strive to gain, retain and protect their resources (Hobfoll, 2001). Research shows that individual attributes influence the association of interpersonal mistreatment and negative outcomes (Li et al., 2016; Rafferty et al., 2010). Kluemper et al. (2018) found employees with a low level of core-self-evaluation (CSE) sense more abusive supervision and involve in deviant behaviors. CSE contains four core traits like self-esteem, the locus of control, emotional stability and generalized self-efficacy support individuals to function in the workplace (Judge & Bono, 2001). People vary in their ability to tolerate the negative events in the organization. Individuals who have higher cognitive ability less like to respond to supervisory abuse and engage in workplace deviant behaviors (Kluemper et al., 2018).

We support COR theory (Hobfoll, 2001) and our major focus is on positive PsyCap because it is one of the employee’s resources which helps to cope with work environment uncertainties. Psychological capital is considered a multidimensional construct and it is defined as an employee’s positive psychosomatic state of development (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). Basically, it contains four psychological resources: Self-efficacy (having confidence to face any challenging situation), optimism (positive expectations of success), hope (determined toward goals), and resilience (ability to quickly cope with difficulties) (Luthans et al., 2007) that help individuals to accomplish goals and generate positive work-related outcomes, performance and reduce turnover (Avey et al., 2009, Avey Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). Luthans et al. (2008) found that an employee’s PsyCap and supportive climate is positively associated with performance, satisfaction and commitment. Avey et al.’s (2011) meta-analysis indicates that PsyCap is negatively associated with employee’s undesirable attitude (stress, anxiety, turnover intention) and undesirable behavior (e.g., deviance), whereas it is positively related to desirable attitude (satisfaction, commitment and wellbeing), employee performance and desirable behavior (organizational citizenship). Newman, Nielsen, Smyth, and Hirst (2018) argue that social support from work domain enhances employee psychological wellbeing through the psychological capital. Li et al. (2016) define psychological capital as an individual’s significant specific resource that helps them to effectively cope with interpersonal mistreatment which lessens the negative influence of mental strain. This helps to prevent subordinate to engage with deviant behavior.
Theoretical Framework
The theoretical framework is presented in Figure 1:

![Theoretical framework of the study](image_url)

**Research Questions and Research Hypotheses**
The research questions of the study are:
- What is the relationship of abusive supervision and supervisor directed deviance?
- What is the relationship of abusive supervision and organization directed deviance?
- Does positive psychological capital moderate the relationship of abusive supervision and supervisor directed deviance?
- Does positive psychological capital moderate the relationship of abusive supervision and organizational directed deviance?

Based on literature review, we hypothesize that:

\( \textbf{H}_1 \): Abusive supervision has a positive association with supervisor directed deviance.

\( \textbf{H}_2 \): Abusive supervision has a positive association with organizational directed deviance.

\( \textbf{H}_3 \): Positive psychological capital moderates the association of abusive supervision and supervisor directed deviance as the relationship of abusive supervision and supervisor directed deviance weakens in the presence of positive psychological capital.

\( \textbf{H}_4 \): Positive Psychological capital moderates the association of abusive supervision and organizational directed deviance as the relationship of abusive supervision and organizational directed deviance weakens in the presence of positive psychological capital.

**Method**
**Sample and Procedure**
We directly contacted four pharmaceutical organization’s human resource managers, they agreed to contribute and influentially respond in our study. Concerning the time horizon, the nature of the study is cross-sectional and quantitative. Our targeted population is from the pharmaceutical industry which is best suitable for this model in term of job requirements and
culture of the industry. To conduct this study firstly, we arrange a meeting with human resource managers and explain them the study purpose and research methods. With the help of HR departments, a list of 363 subordinates (full-time employees) finalized by using the simple random technique. We distributed questionnaires to participants individually and directly collected via researchers to confirm the confidentiality. Furthermore, we attached a letter with each questionnaire to ensure confidentiality of their responses, the aim of the study, and their participation. Some employees declined to participate so that our sample size shortened to 301 employees. The respondents were 64% male, 54% were in the age of 25-30, 65% respondents had master education, and 58% respondents had job experience of 1-5 years.

**Measures**

**Abusive Supervision**
Subordinates responded the frequency at which their supervisor abusively behaves. To evaluate this frequency, we used a 15-item scale of Tepper (2000). Sample Items are “My supervisor ridicules me” and “My supervisor does not allow me to interact with my coworkers.”

**Psychological Capital**
The psychological capital questionnaire contains 12 items related to the academic context (Avey et al., 2011). This questionnaire has four dimensions of the psychological capital construct with a Likert-type scale (from 1 agree to 5 disagree). We used three items linked with self-efficacy dimension (e.g. “I feel sure when sharing information about my studies with other people”). Two items linked with optimism dimension (e.g. “Concerning my studies, I’m optimistic about what the future offers me”). Four items linked with hope dimension (e.g. “Right now I see myself as being pretty successful in my studies”). And three items linked with resilience dimension (e.g. “I usually take the stressful aspects of my studies in stride”).

**Supervisor Directed Deviance**
The frequency at which their subordinates display supervisor directed deviance was measured by 12-items scale of Bennett and Robinson (2000). Sample items contain “Made an obscene comment or gesture toward a supervisor.” And “Publicly embarrassed my supervisor.”

**Organization Directed Deviance:**
The frequency at which their subordinates display organizational directed deviance was measure by 10-items scale of Bennett and Robinson (2000). Sample items are “Put little effort into your work.” And “Come in late to work without permission”.

**Analysis Strategy**
For data analysis, we used SPSS (version 22) and Amos (version 22) with SEM technique. We applied basic statistical tools to generate descriptive statistics results. Measurement mode and structural model are two steps in SEM. We used Measurement model to found convergent validity by average variance extracted (AVE) and discriminant validity that measured by Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion. Furthermore, we tested hypotheses and mediating effects by using the structural model.
Results

Measurement Model

Measurement model frequently used to evaluate confirmatory factor analysis (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). To ensure the validity, confirmatory factor analysis was used. Therefore, we evaluated measurement model by using CFA. Furthermore, the fit indices measurement model was estimated. The results indicated value ($\chi^2 = 3118.449$, df = 1298, $\chi^2$/df = 2.403, RMSEA = 0.065, CFI = 0.90, NNFI = 0.90) of a good fit, as these values better recognized cut-off ($\chi^2$/df < 3, RMSEA < 0.08, CFI > 0.95, NNFI > 0.95) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Cheung and Rensvild (2002) postulated that the value of CFI and NNFI equivalent to 0.90 are acceptable.

We tested data reliability through composite reliability (CR). Table 2 indicates CR values of all variables which are greater than 0.70. Thus, for further analysis our data is reliable (Kline, 2005). Additionally, the value of AVE must be greater than 0.5 for convergent validity and CR ≥ 0.70. Table 2 also shows the value of AVE which indicates that our both results are acceptable and we achieved convergent validity (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Composite Reliability CR &gt; 0.7</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE) ≥ 0.5</th>
<th>Square root AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor directed Deviance</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization directed Deviance</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discriminant validity was examined through Fornell-Larcker criterion. The values of discriminant validity were obtained by comparing the value of AVE square root (oblique in parenthesis) and inter construct values. Table 3 indicates values of AVE square root which is greater than the correlation values of each variable (Kim & Kim, 2010). Thus, these results confirm the discriminant validity of the study. Our results support the hypotheses of this study. Furthermore, the multicollinearity issue does not exist because the values of correlation coefficients are less than 0.70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larker Criterion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Abusive Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychological Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor directed Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organization directed Deviance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

Hypothesis Testing

For hypotheses evaluation, structural model technique was used as presented in Table 4. Our results indicate the fit indices values as a good fit ($\chi^2 = 1072.31$, df = 366, $\chi^2$/df = 2.93, RMSEA = .07, CFI = .90, NNFI = .90), these values are good recommended cut-off ($\chi^2$/df < 3, RMSEA < .08, CFI > .95, NNFI > .95) (Browne & Cudeck 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999). To
ensure the mediating role of positive PsyCap, the direct path (abusive supervision to interpersonal deviance) and indirect path (through positive psychological capital) are tested through two structural model (Iacobucci, Saldanha, & Deng, 2007).

### Table 4

**Structural Model Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypothesized Paths</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Weights (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁</td>
<td>Abusive Supervision → Supervisor directed deviance</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>Abusive Supervision → Organization directed deviance</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significance at p<0.001 ** significance at p<0.01 * significance at p<0.05

As shown in Table 4, H₁ hypothesis (β = .44, p < .001) supports that the abusive supervision positively relates to supervisor directed deviance. H₂ hypothesis (β = .44, p < .001) shows that the abusive supervision has a positive effect on organizational directed deviance.

### Moderation Analysis 1

In this study, Baron and Kenny (1986) method has been used to check the moderating impact of positive psychological capital. The measurement model has been evaluated through fit indices. The results showed good fit values ($\chi^2 = 3.002, df = 2, \chi^2/df = 1.50, RMSEA = .03, NNFI = .92, CFI = .97$).

Hypothesis 3 posits that positive psychological capital moderates the association between abusive supervision and supervisor directed deviance. If the positive psychological capital is high, it will weaken the relationship between abusive supervision and supervisor directed deviance, and it is supported. Table 5 shows that the standardized regression coefficients from interaction term are -.15 which is significant ($t = -5.44, p < .001$). Figure 2 also displays moderating effect of positive psychological capital.

### Table 5

**Results of Moderation Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypothesized Paths</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Weights (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Supervisor directed Deviance ← Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Supervisor directed Deviance ← Positive Psychological Capital</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Supervisor directed Deviance ← Interaction</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-5.44</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significance at p<0.001 ** significance at p<0.01 * significance at p<0.05
Moderation Analysis 2
The measurement model has been evaluated through fit indices. The results showed good fit values ($\chi^2 = 3.002$, df = 2, $\chi^2$/df = 1.50, RMSEA = .03, NNFI = .91, CFI = .97). Hypothesis 4 posits that positive psychological capital moderates the association between abusive supervision and organization directed deviance. If the positive psychological capital is high, it will weaken the relationship between abusive supervision and organization directed deviance and vice versa, and it is supported. Table 6 shows that the standardized regression coefficients from interaction term are -.17 which is significant ($t = -1.55$, $p < .001$). Figure 3 also presents moderating effect of positive psychological capital.

Table 6
Results of Moderation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypothesized Paths</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Weights ($\beta$)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$</td>
<td>Organization directed Deviance $\leftarrow$ Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$</td>
<td>Organization directed Deviance $\leftarrow$ Positive Psychological Capital</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-4.89</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$</td>
<td>Organization directed Deviance $\leftarrow$ Interaction</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significance at p<0.001 ** significance at p<0.01 * significance at p<0.05
Discussion and Conclusion

The main purpose of our study was not just to explore the negative impact of abusive supervision on subordinate’s deviant behavior but also to investigate the moderating role of positive PsyCap in the proposed model. Indeed, Prior studies have focused on the linkage of abusive supervision and employee’s negative behaviors in the western organizational context like Chinese, US (where high-power distance exhibit). However, we attained our study results in Pakistan organizational context where low power distance culture exhibit. In Chinese organizational context, Wang et al.’s (2012) study suggests that employees react more negatively when they experience abusive supervision under low power distance rather than high power distance culture.

Interestingly, our study outcomes show that abusive supervision directly influences subordinate’s deviant behavior. There are multiple theories which help to recognize that how abusive supervision negatively impacts on employee’s outcomes and how employees cope with these unwanted situations but primarily we support Social exchange theory and COR theory. At some extent, both theories suggest that at workplace employees not just reciprocate behavior either it is positive or negative but also exchange resources which influence entire organization. Depletion in employee resources is one of the costly problems of the organizations.

Empirical study’s findings reported that demeaning language like abuse, publicly insult, and shout come from supervisor who depletes the employee’s self-regulatory strength (Thau & Mitchell, 2010; Wang et al., 2012). Self-regulation is one of the most important employee’s resources that helps individuals to avoid violation of social norms and allows them to take self-control of their emotions and thoughts (Bandura, 1991). If individuals are better in their self-regulatory state, they can develop good relationships and achieve job success (Vohs, Finkenauer, & Baumeister, 2011). Likewise, positive psychological capital is another employee’s personal resource which help to manage workplace uncertainties. Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017) defined PsyCap as it is related to individuals’ positive emotions and personal resources like self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience and hope that help them to attain success. We also investigated mitigating effects of interpersonal mistreatment and employee’s deviant behavior through the positive psychological capital, especially in Pakistan organizational context. The abusive supervision and deviant behavior relationship moderated by psychological capital. The relationship will be stronger if an individual has low positive psychological capital than high. This means that whenever employees experience mistreatment from their supervisor, they directly engage with deviant behavior like organizational deviance and supervisory deviance.

Consequently, an individual who has higher positive psychological capital would be less likely to engage with deviant behavior and cope with abusive supervision. This is supported by Hu’s (2012) study that individuals who have high emotional intelligence they have the ability to handle their emotions well even with the perception of abusive supervision. Raza, Moueed and Ali (2015) found the impact of management support for human resource development on employee job satisfaction. Lodhi and Ali (2017) found consumer reaction in cultural values. Raza, Ahmad and Ali (2016) studied strategic shift toward knowledge based educational management. Literature also indicate that there is no exclusive study examining mediating
effects of positive psychological capital. However, previous study found a direct relationship of psychological capital with desirable behavior and attitude which reveals that employees who have psychological capital are satisfied and committed as a result they increase their performance and engage in citizenship behavior. The negative relationship with undesirable behavior and attitude shows that individuals who have low psychological capital are in stress and have anxiety and as a result turnover intention increases as well as they display workplace deviance (Avey et al., 2011). However, our results clearly support the suggested hypothesis that indicates PsyCap moderates between abusive supervision and individual’s deviant behavior.

Finding negative consequences of abusive supervision is not only important but also challenging for developed and developing countries organizations. However, our research findings contribute to management literature by investigating the role of psychological capital among abusive supervision and workplace deviance. It provides deep understanding about employee’s resources which help to cope with abusive supervision and their deviant behavior. This study indicates that every individual has a different level of PsyCap and handles the impact of abusive supervision and accordingly displays his/her deviant behavior. This means that an individual with high positive psychological capital easily copes with supervisory mistreatment and might not display aggressive behavior. This study also indicates that abusive supervision provides roots to deviant behavior. Therefore, organizations should adopt such ways that help them to eliminate undesirable behavior and stop abusive supervision from occurring. Our study findings also practically suggest that organizations should investigate the reasons behind supervisory mistreatment and work on their organizations HR policies. For example, organizations should design such kind of polices that support employee’s psychological capital and reduce interpersonal mistreatments. Thau and Mitchell (2010) offer the solution of abusive supervision destructive effects as those who display abusive behavior should not appoint as a supervisor. Thau and Mitchell (2010) also suggest that supervisor training helps them to opt authentic leadership style. Organizations should create such a friendly atmosphere, build trust, and care about their employee’s wellbeing. At some extent, these increase employee’s psychological capital and eliminate the impact of interpersonal mistreatment like abusive supervision.

This study also acknowledged some limitations and future directions. Firstly, targeted participants only were taken from the pharmaceutical industry, Lahore, Pakistan. This means that results are not generalizable to other organizations. Participants were taken from Lahore region so that results are not generalizable to other regions. Further data can be collected from multiple industries to evaluate the industrial effects by the suggested model. Secondly, we used the cross-sectional method to conduct this study so that future research can be conducted by using the longitudinal method to find a relationship. Third, many other situational factors can be used as a moderator and mediator to study the relationship of abusive supervision and deviant behavior. Fourth, we used a positive PsyCap as a moderator to study the relationship. In future, the researcher can study other factors (reason) with abusive supervision like strict organizational polices, supervisory empowerment, etc. Finally, we used a single source to collect data. Therefore, employee’s social desirability and
self-serving may affect their rating. Future research should use multiple sources to collect data for deviance. Self-reporting technique may help to avoid the effects of social desirability.

Employees perceive that supervisors act as organization agent, and they follow the top management instructions. In that case, they directly subrogate the organization's norms and involve in retaliation process. Therefore, this study clearly shows that subordinates display undesirable behavior to abusive supervisory behavior by involving in deviant behavior and take revenge from organization, supervisor and co-workers. Our research findings also revealed that PsyCap moderates the association of abusive supervision and deviant behavior. However, results also suggest that supervisor mistreatment hit the psychological state of subordinates.
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