



**Abusive supervision, public service motivation, and  
employee deviance:  
The moderating role of employment sector**

Journal:	<i>Evidence-based HRM: a global forum for empirical scholarship</i>
Manuscript ID	EBHRM-08-2015-0034.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Counterproductive work behaviour, Public Service Motivation, Dark side of leadership, Destructive leadership, Person-organisation fit

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

View Only

## **Abusive supervision, public service motivation, and employee deviance:**

### **The moderating role of employment sector**

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to examine abusive supervision and public service motivation (PSM) as antecedents of deviant workplace behaviours.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The study was conducted in a cross-sectional research design with survey data from 150 employees in the public, private and non-profit sector in Germany and the USA.

**Findings** – Abusive supervision is positively associated with employee deviance, whereas PSM is negatively related to deviant behaviours. The employment sector moderates the negative relationship between PSM and employee deviance such that this relationship is stronger in the public and non-profit sector.

**Research limitations/implications** – Limitations arise from the convenience sampling approach and the cross-sectional nature of the dataset.

**Practical implications** – Human resource managers should consider behavioural integrity in the attraction, selection and training of both supervisors and subordinates. Private organisations can address the needs of strongly public service motivated employees by integrating associated goals and values into organisational missions and policies.

**Originality/value** – This is the first study to introduce PSM into research on employee deviance. It shows that a pro-social motivation can drive anti-social behaviours when employees with high levels of PSM are members of profit-seeking organisations.

**Keywords** Counterproductive work behaviour, Dark side of leadership, Destructive leadership, Person-organisation fit

**Paper type** Research paper

## Abusive supervision, public service motivation, and employee deviance: The moderating role of employment sector

### Introduction

Workplace deviance has detrimental effects on organisational performance, which makes it worth studying for scholars of organisational behaviour and human resource management (Aquino *et al.*, 1999; Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Deviant workplace behaviour purposefully violates organisational norms and is intended to harm an organisation, its members, or both (Spector and Fox, 2005). A number of disparate acts fall into this category, such as theft, destruction of property, misuse of information, time and resources, unsafe behaviour, poor attendance and work quality, use of drugs and alcohol, and inappropriate verbal and physical actions (Gruys and Sackett, 2003). It is clear from these examples that human resource managers have a vital interest to hinder employees from displaying such behaviours because they run counter to the goals and interests of the organisation (Sackett and DeVore, 2002).

While the negative consequences of employee deviance for the individual, group and organisation are well-established in the literature, less is known about the antecedents of these behaviours. A better understanding of these determinants permits organisations to prevent or to reduce undesired behaviours at the workplace. In particular, interpersonal factors, such as supervisory relationships, and individual characteristics beyond personality traits, such as motivational dispositions, have hitherto received little attention as determinants of employee deviance. We narrow this gap by studying the impact of two important factors: First, we examine the downward link between deviant behaviours on the part of supervisors and subordinates. Our focus is on abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000) as determinant of employee deviance. With this focus, we contribute to an emerging stream of literature on the implications of supervisory misbehaviour for counterproductive behaviours at the workplace (Martinenko *et al.*, 2013; Schyns and Schilling, 2013). Second, this is the first study to introduce public ser-

1  
2  
3 vice motivation (PSM) (Perry and Wise, 1990) into research on employee deviance. We argue  
4  
5 that PSM, defined as “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives grounded primari-  
6  
7 ly or uniquely in public institutions and organizations” (Perry and Wise, 1990, p. 368), pro-  
8  
9 tects individuals and organisations from deviant behaviours and thus may counterbalance the  
10  
11 negative effects of abusive supervision. This is due to PSM being a specific type of pro-social  
12  
13 motivation which facilitates behaviour that is beneficial for the organisation or society. This  
14  
15 relationship is evidenced by studies showing the positive association of PSM with affective  
16  
17 commitment to change (Wright *et al.*, 2013), volunteering (Perry *et al.*, 2008), collaborative  
18  
19 behaviour (Getha-Taylor and Haddock-Bigwarfe, 2014), and organisational citizenship be-  
20  
21 haviour (Bottomley *et al.*, 2015).  
22  
23  
24

25 While PSM originates in the public administration literature, it was never a sector spe-  
26  
27 cific concept and always emphasized the individual predisposition to act in the public interest  
28  
29 (Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry, 1996). Thus, it is a universal concept related to individuals in all  
30  
31 sectors of employment (i.e. public, private, and non-profit). For example, Andersen, Pallesen  
32  
33 and Pedersen (2011) found no differences between general PSM levels among public and pri-  
34  
35 vate physiotherapists in Denmark. PSM’s universal nature is further particularly evident in job  
36  
37 choice and sector attraction studies using student samples (see e.g. Pedersen 2013) as these  
38  
39 subjects are not yet affiliated with any sector of employment and the hypotheses that PSM  
40  
41 leads to public sector preference is not always supported.  
42  
43  
44

45 Nonetheless, Perry *et al.* (2010) argue that PSM is still more dominant in the public  
46  
47 sphere due to the particular missions, institutions, and values governing the public sector work  
48  
49 environment. As a consequence, the sector of employment may affect how PSM is related to  
50  
51 employee deviance. Our study provides evidence for this moderating effect. As predicted, we  
52  
53 find that PSM is negatively related to employee deviance both in the public and non-profit  
54  
55 sector, whereas this association is positive in the private sector. Theories of person-  
56  
57 organisation (P-O) fit suggest that membership in a public or non-profit organisation is in-  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 instrumental in addressing the needs and values of employees with high levels of PSM, which  
4  
5 reduces behaviour directed against the organisation and its members. On the contrary, mem-  
6  
7 bers of private organisations show more engagement in deviant behaviours the stronger they  
8  
9 are public service motivated because they experience lower levels of need satisfaction and  
10  
11 value congruence. This finding has important implications for the attraction and selection of  
12  
13 personnel in different sectors of employment.  
14  
15

16 The paper proceeds as follows: The second section reviews the literature on abusive  
17  
18 supervision and PSM in order to derive hypotheses with regard to employee deviance. This is  
19  
20 followed by the third section explaining the variables, measures, and analyses of our empirical  
21  
22 study. We conducted a survey among employees with 150 respondents from the public, pri-  
23  
24 vate, and non-profit sector in Germany and the USA. The fourth section presents the results,  
25  
26 which are discussed in section five. The final section concludes the paper.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **Literature review and hypotheses**

### 33 *Abusive supervision and employee deviance*

34  
35  
36 While much of leadership research has long focused on constructive aspects of leadership,  
37  
38 often associated with an overly heroic image of successful leaders, recent scholarship has paid  
39  
40 growing attention to misbehaviours of bad leaders and their harmful effects on subordinates  
41  
42 and organisations (Schyns and Schilling, 2013). Among the several concepts that shed light  
43  
44 on “the dark side of leadership” (Conger, 1990) is “abusive supervision” (Tepper, 2000).  
45  
46 Abusive supervision is defined as “subordinates’ perception of the extent to which supervisors  
47  
48 engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical  
49  
50 contact” (Tepper, 2000, p. 178). For example, these forms of abuse can be angry outbursts,  
51  
52 use of derogatory names, intimidation and humiliation of subordinates, invading privacy or  
53  
54 withholding important information. Abusive supervision differs from similar concepts such as  
55  
56 “petty tyranny” (Ashforth, 1997), “supervisor aggression” (Schat *et al.*, 2006) and “workplace  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 bullying” (Hoel and Cooper, 2001) in that it only includes nonphysical hostility. Furthermore,  
4  
5 it is worth noting that abusive supervision in the above sense is a perception by subordinates.  
6  
7 The extent to which subordinates attribute abusive behaviours to leaders is contingent on sub-  
8  
9 jective factors, such as personal characteristics and demographic background, as well as on  
10  
11 situational factors (Martinenko *et al.*, 2013; Tepper, 2007). However, in spite of the perceptu-  
12  
13 al nature of abusive supervision, it is not an ephemeral impression but rather has an enduring  
14  
15 quality and continues until the leadership relationship is terminated or the supervisor modifies  
16  
17 his or her behaviour (Tepper, 2000).  
18  
19

20  
21 Previous research has established various harmful effects of destructive leadership in  
22  
23 general (Schyns and Schilling, 2013) and of abusive supervision more specifically (Martinen-  
24  
25 ko *et al.*, 2013). Negative outcomes of abusive supervision on the part of subordinates include  
26  
27 perceptions of injustice, aggression at the workplace, psychological distress, citizenship with-  
28  
29 drawal, decline in performance, dissatisfaction with the job and higher levels of turnover, to  
30  
31 name but a few (Martinenko *et al.*, 2013). Previous studies have also provided some evidence  
32  
33 that subordinates respond to perceptions of abusive supervision with deviant behaviours (e.g.  
34  
35 Avey *et al.*, 2015; Detert *et al.*, 2007; Mackey *et al.*, 2015; Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007; Tep-  
36  
37 per *et al.*, 2009). This association is obvious for deviant behaviours that are directed against  
38  
39 the source of harm (i.e. the supervisor) since reciprocity is a fundamental principle and driv-  
40  
41 ing factor of social exchange (Göbel *et al.*, 2013). From this perspective, supervisor-directed  
42  
43 counterproductivity in response to abusive supervision is an instance of negative reciprocity,  
44  
45 i.e. retaliatory behaviours in return for negative treatment (Burton and Hoobler, 2011; Liu *et*  
46  
47 *al.*, 2010; Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007; Wei and Si, 2013).  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Deviant workplace behaviours by employees, however, vary in terms of their target  
53  
54 and are not only directed towards individuals but also against the organisation. This may also  
55  
56 be a reaction to abusive supervision. According to reactance theory (Brehm and Brehm,  
57  
58 1981), individuals strive to regain personal control when they face external limitations to their  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 autonomy. Previous research suggests that employees who are under abusive supervision ex-  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

autonomy. Previous research suggests that employees who are under abusive supervision experience a loss of control and thus engage in behaviours that are intended to restore control and foster autonomy (Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007; Zellars *et al.*, 2002). Since victims of abusive supervision are in a power-dependence relationship with their supervisor, they often do not feel empowered to take revenge on the supervisor directly, although norms of negative reciprocity provide a strong motivation to do so (Tepper *et al.*, 2009).

In order to protect themselves from even further retaliation by the supervisor, abused subordinates turn towards the organisation as a more readily available and safer target because such deviant behaviours are less likely to be detected. Deviant behaviours are also less likely to be punished compared to open interpersonal aggression towards the supervisor (Lian *et al.*, 2014; Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007). This may also rebalance perceptions of injustice (Burton and Hoobler, 2011; Tepper, 2000; 2007), serve as a valve for frustration (Avey *et al.*, 2015; Martinenko *et al.*, 2013) and maintain self-esteem (Wang and Jiang, 2014). We therefore arrive at our first hypothesis:

H1: Perceptions of leaders' abusive supervision will be positively related to subordinates' deviant workplace behaviours.

#### *Public service motivation and employee deviance*

Public service motivation (PSM), understood as individuals' desire to altruistically contribute to society through service delivery (Braender and Andersen, 2013), consists of four dimensions reflecting different forms of norm-based, rational, and affective motivations. These dimensions are attraction to policy making (ATP), compassion (COM), self-sacrifice (SS), and commitment to the public interest (CPI). Both aggregate PSM and its dimensions have been linked to a number of work outcomes and workplace behaviours. These outcomes and behav-

1  
2  
3 iours are characterised by generating benefits for the organisation because the concern for the  
4  
5 public good overrides individual preferences for opportunistic personal gains.  
6

7  
8 Brewer and Selden (1998), for example, have shown that PSM is associated with  
9  
10 whistle-blowing, highlighting that personal interests become less dominant when individuals  
11  
12 display high levels of PSM. With regard to work outcomes, Warren and Chen (2013) meta-  
13  
14 analytically show that there is a small but significant positive link between PSM and perfor-  
15  
16 mance independent of whether the performance measure is objective or self-reported (for a  
17  
18 critical discussion of the PSM-performance link, see Petrovski and Ritz, 2014). The link be-  
19  
20 tween PSM and behaviours has been explored through PSM's association with volunteering  
21  
22 (Perry *et al.*, 2008; Lee and Wilkins, 2011), patient selection (Andersen and Serritzlew 2012),  
23  
24 persistence, output, productivity and vigilance (Bellé, 2013). In addition, Bellé (2014) shows  
25  
26 that PSM strengthens the positive effect of transformational leadership on work effort. Con-  
27  
28 sidering the strong linkages that prior studies established with regard to positive workplace  
29  
30 behaviours, we assume that PSM has the potential to protect organisations from destructive  
31  
32 work behaviours.  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Nonetheless, according to O'Leary's (2010) work on guerrilla government excessively  
38  
39 strong commitment to the public interest as reflected in extreme PSM levels may also trigger  
40  
41 undesired work behaviours. For example, as mentioned above Brewer and Selden (1998) pro-  
42  
43 vided evidence that PSM is associated with whistleblowing and O'Leary (2010) identifies  
44  
45 whistleblowing as one manifestation of the 'guerrilla employee's' behaviour. However,  
46  
47 O'Leary simultaneously acknowledges that "Over the years, I have learned that the motiva-  
48  
49 tions driving guerrillas are diverse. Their reasons for acting range from the altruistic (doing  
50  
51 the right thing) to the seemingly petty (I was passed over for that promotion)" (2010, p.8).  
52  
53 Hence we posit that extreme levels of PSM are likely to be associated with guerrilla behav-  
54  
55 iours driven by altruism which still serve to protect the organisation. In that sense we argue  
56  
57 that PSM helps to sort out the "ethical" from the "unethical" guerrilla public servant which  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 supports our earlier argument about PSM protecting organisations from (self-) destructive  
4  
5 behaviours.

6  
7 Additionally, the literature on extra-role behaviours such as OCBs and workplace de-  
8  
9 viance needs to be considered. For example, consistent with earlier work Lee and Allen  
10  
11 (2002) argue that expressive workplace deviance, i.e. a form of deviance triggered by the need  
12  
13 to express emotions linked to frustration, may result in abusive behaviour oriented towards  
14  
15 co-workers. Extending these ideas further, Dineen, Lewicki and Tomlinson (2006) show that  
16  
17 behavioural integrity of the supervisor is negatively related to workplace deviance. Since  
18  
19 PSM goes along with a strong consideration for the needs of others such as co-workers and  
20  
21 subordinates we argue that employees characterized by higher PSM levels are unlikely to dis-  
22  
23 play deviant workplace behaviours because these would harm the organization including co-  
24  
25 workers and subordinates. Thus we hypothesise:

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 H2: Public service motivation will be negatively related to deviant workplace behaviours.

33  
34  
35  
36 *Public service motivation, deviant work behaviour, and employment sector*

37  
38 PSM may also have different behavioural implications depending on the sector of employ-  
39  
40 ment, and we expect this to be particularly true with regard to employee deviance. Research  
41  
42 and theory on person-organisation (P-O) fit suggest that “the compatibility between people  
43  
44 and the organizations in which they work” (Kristof, 1996, p.1) is an important driver of be-  
45  
46 haviour in organisations (Kristof-Brown *et al.*, 2005). Arguably, P-O fit is higher when em-  
47  
48 ployees with high levels of PSM work in the public or non-profit sector, as opposed to em-  
49  
50 ployment in the private sector. Thus, highly public service motivated individuals may self-  
51  
52 select into public and non-profit sector employment because these organisations “are more  
53  
54 likely to provide the opportunity to satisfy public service motivational needs and thus will  
55  
56 attract individuals who are so inclined” (Houston, 2011, p.764). In other words, public and  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 non-profit organisations meet the needs of public service motivated employees better than  
4  
5 private organisations because organisational goals and values are to a larger extent congruent  
6  
7 with those of the individual. Clearly, the goal to serve the public interest and to contribute to  
8  
9 the common good is both a component of PSM and the core mission of public organisations.  
10  
11 Furthermore, employees with high levels of PSM are likely to hold public values that are also  
12  
13 embedded in policies and cultures of public organisations, such as altruism, social cohesion,  
14  
15 accountability, and neutrality (Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007). Although non-profit organiza-  
16  
17 tions pursue the public interest in a more narrow sense and often serve very specific purposes,  
18  
19 their mission is also aligned with public values and address attitudes beyond self-interest and  
20  
21 organizational interest.  
22  
23

24  
25 Although PSM is rooted in public institutions and organisations (Perry and Wise,  
26  
27 1990), employees in any sector of employment may have this universal disposition, though to  
28  
29 varying degrees. For example, Andersen and Serritzlew (2012), in a study on patient selection  
30  
31 with a sample of Danish physiotherapist, show that the CPI dimension of PSM is relevant to  
32  
33 employees not only in the public but also in the private sector. Despite this finding, the sector  
34  
35 of employment is likely to have influence both on the relative strength of PSM and on its be-  
36  
37 havioural implications. Regarding the strength of PSM in different sectors of employment,  
38  
39 selection and socialisation effects may occur. Of interest in this context is work by Kjeldsen  
40  
41 and Jacobsen (2013). In a longitudinal study, they monitor students moving to private and  
42  
43 public sector employment, starting off with identical PSM levels. While they find a “reality  
44  
45 shock” effect on PSM in both groups, public sector employment limits the decline due to its  
46  
47 capacity to nurture public service related needs.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 However, the evidence with respect to sector attraction is inconclusive. On the one  
53  
54 hand, a number of studies fail to find an association between PSM and job preferences for the  
55  
56 public sector (Christensen and Wright, 2011; Lewis and Frank, 2002; Tschirhart *et al.*, 2008;  
57  
58 Wright and Christensen, 2010) although the institutional setting of the public and non-profit  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sector tends to have more features that stimulate and socialise individuals into PSM (Perry,  
4 1997; 2014; Vandenabeele, 2011). For example, in his study of public sector employees in a  
5 New York State Agency, Wright (2007, p.60) concludes that “managers can inspire their em-  
6 ployees to work harder by clearly communicating how their work benefits society”. On the  
7 other hand, previous research provides vast evidence that P-O fit through congruence of goals  
8 and values facilitates organisational commitment on the part of employees (Hoffman and  
9 Woehr 2006; Kristof-Brown *et al.* 2005; Verquer *et al.* 2003). In turn, the more employees are  
10 committed to their organisation, the less likely they engage in behaviour that runs counter to  
11 organisational goals and values. We conclude from these pieces of evidence that sector differ-  
12 ences affect the way PSM relates to deviant workplace behaviours. Thus, we suggest that the  
13 employment sector acts as a moderator in this relationship:  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 H3a-b: The employment sector will moderate the relationship between public service moti-  
31 vation and deviant workplace behaviours, such that the relationship will be stronger  
32 (a) in the public and (b) in the non-profit sector.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **Data and method**

### 42 *Data collection and study sample*

43 To test our hypotheses, we conducted an online survey over a three-month period from Febru-  
44 ary to April 2014. The questionnaire was provided in both German and English. In order to  
45 arrive at a German equivalent, bilingual speakers translated and back-translated the original  
46 English items (Brislin, 1970). A link to the survey was distributed among the subscribers of a  
47 university newsletter and posted on the institutional facebook account of the same university  
48 as well as on the private account of an involved researcher. As compared to mere student  
49 samples, our sampling approach has the advantage of covering respondents who have consid-  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

erably more working experience and thus provide a more comprehensive and realistic picture. Nevertheless, as with all convenient sampling approaches, our sample cannot claim representativeness. We will come back to this issue in the limitations section.

The sample characteristics are displayed in Table 1. In total, 150 participants completed the questionnaire, out of which 64 (43%) respondents reported to be female, while 86 (57%) respondents reported to be male. As for the age distribution, 120 (80%) respondents were 40 years of age or less, while only 30 (20%) were older. This age distribution is most likely explained by the method of distribution since users of social media tend to be young. 96 respondents (64%) completed the German version of the survey, while 54 respondents (36%) completed the survey in English. For all multi-item constructs in our questionnaire, we conducted t-tests for mean differences between the German and English subsample and found no such differences at a significance level of 5%. This should dispel concerns for issues of translation. Out of all respondents, 93 (62%) participants indicated to work under a male supervisor, while 57 (38%) indicated working under female supervision. In addition, we asked respondents for how long they had been working under their current supervisor. 66 (44%) reported that they had been working under their current supervisor for one year or less, and 84 (56%) reported that they had been working under their current supervisor for a longer period of time. As for organisational affiliation, 66 (44%) participants indicated to be member of a public organisation, 65 (43%) reported to work in a non-profit organisation, and 19 (13%) asserted membership in a private organisation. The size of these organisations in terms of employees varied considerably: 26 (17%) participants reported working in a small organisation with less than 10 employees, 30 (20%) were members of an organisation with 10 to 49 employees, 34 (23%) indicated membership in an organisation with 50 to 249 employees, and 60 (40%) worked in an even larger organisation.

\*\*\* Please insert Table 1 about here. \*\*\*

### Study measures

*Dependent variable.* In order to measure deviant behaviours at work, we used 14 items from the employee deviance scale suggested by Aquino *et al.* (1999). Six items covered interpersonal deviance (e.g. *I have gossiped about my supervisor.*), while eight items reflected organizational deviance (e.g. *I made unauthorized use of organizational property.*). The reliability of the global measure was high (Cronbach's  $\alpha=0.91$ ).

*Independent variables.* Abusive supervision was measured using the 10 items from a scale suggested by Mitchell and Ambrose (2007). The items included active-aggressive (e.g. *My supervisor ridicules me.*) and passive-aggressive forms of abusive leadership (e.g. *My supervisor breaks promises he/she makes.*). The total measure of abusive supervision showed a high internal consistency ( $\alpha=0.93$ ). For the measurement of public service motivation, we used a global PSM measure consisting of seven items adapted from Wright *et al.* (2012) and Giauque *et al.* (2011) (e.g. *Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.*). Two items measured attraction to policy making, self-sacrifice and compassion, and one item measured the public interest dimension of PSM. The PSM measure displayed acceptable reliability ( $\alpha= 0.73$ ).

*Control variables.* We included age, gender, and employment volume (i.e. full-time vs. part-time) of the respondents into the analysis, as well as a single-item measure for their job satisfaction (i.e. *Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?*). Regarding respondents' organisational affiliation, we considered both the sector of employment (i.e. public, private or non-profit) and the size of the organisation in terms of employees. Controls with regard to leadership were the gender of the supervisor and the duration of the leadership relation.

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations of all study measures are provided in Table 2. The survey instrument for the multiple-item measures is presented in the Appendix.

\*\*\* Please insert Table 2 about here. \*\*\*

## Results

Our analytic strategy involved estimating three different regression models. The first model includes the direct effects of abusive supervision and PSM. The second model focuses on the subdimensions of PSM (ATP, COM, SS, CPI), and the third model adds the moderating effect of the employment sector. All models include our full set of control variables, and all models were estimated using robust standard errors to avoid heteroscedasticity. We further have no reason to believe multicollinearity is a problem as variance inflation factors were checked (mean VIF: 1.55 and single highest VIF of 3.04). Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of the data and Table 3 displays the regression results. All coefficients in Table 3 are standardised.

Hypothesis 1 proposed a positive association of abusive supervision with employee deviance. The results show this effect in all three models (Model I:  $b=0.231, p<.05, **$ ; Model II:  $b=0.217, p<.1, *$ ; Model III:  $b=0.248, p<.05, **$ ). Since the effect remains stable in all specifications, hypothesis 1 is strongly supported by our results.

Hypothesis 2 stipulates a negative association between PSM and deviant behaviours. We find this effect for the global PSM measure in Model I ( $b=-0.371, p<.01, ***$ ). The effect reverses and is significant only at a lower level when we add the moderating effect in Model III ( $b=0.560, p<.1, *$ ). Regarding the subdimensions of PSM, we find the predicted effects for self-sacrifice ( $b=-0.164, p<.1, *$ ) and attraction to policy making ( $b=-0.199, p<.05, **$ ). This provides partial support for hypothesis 2.

To assess hypothesis 3, Model III adds the interaction between PSM and employment sector to the estimation using the private sector as reference category. Results show that the negative association of PSM and employee deviance is stronger in the public sector ( $b=-0.738, p<.01, ***$ ) and also holds in the non-profit sector ( $b=-0.595, p<.05, **$ ) but is less pronounced there. Figure 1 displays the simple slopes of the variables included in the moderation analysis. Thus, considered jointly, these results provide strong support for hypothesis 3.

1  
2  
3 As for the control variables, we find a consistent effect of employees' gender on devi-  
4 ant behaviours. Men tend to deviate more from organisational norms and rules than women.  
5  
6 Furthermore, employees who are in a shorter leadership relationship with their supervisors  
7  
8 (i.e. less than or equal to one year) deviate more than those in a longer leadership relationship.  
9  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 \*\*\* Please insert Table 3 about here. \*\*\*

15  
16 \*\*\* Please insert Figure 1 about here. \*\*\*

## 17 18 19 20 21 **Discussion**

22  
23 A deeper understanding of the antecedents of employee deviance enables organisations to  
24 prevent the negative consequences of such behaviours. This study analysed two important  
25 factors with presumably opposing effects on employee deviance, i.e. abusive supervision and  
26 PSM. In line with our hypotheses, we find a positive link between abusive supervision and  
27 employee deviance, whereas the relationship between PSM and such behaviours is negative.  
28  
29 The results of this study highlight the downsides of inappropriate leadership and establish  
30 PSM as a counterbalance to the negative behavioural implications of such leadership. In addi-  
31 tion, our moderation hypothesis provides evidence for stronger effects of PSM in public and  
32 non-profit sector settings.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Regarding the enhancing effect of abusive supervision on employee deviance, our re-  
44 sults confirm previous findings in the literature (Martinenko *et al.*, 2013; Schyns and Schil-  
45 ling, 2013). Since abusive supervision is itself a type of deviance because it purposefully dis-  
46 regards organisational norms and causes harm to employees, the findings establish a cascad-  
47 ing effect such that deviant behaviours trickle down the organisational hierarchy. This high-  
48 lights the crucial role of supervisory behaviours for the overall pursuit of goals and adherence  
49 to rules in organisations. Accordingly, when employee deviance is to be prevented, both the  
50 selection and training of supervisors should aim to avoid or to reduce abusive behaviours.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 However, previous studies (including ours) have examined the relationship between abusive  
4 supervision and employee deviance almost exclusively as a downward process in the organi-  
5 sational hierarchy that flows from supervisors to subordinates. Only recently, researchers have  
6 acknowledged the reciprocal nature of this relationship and have shown that abusive supervi-  
7 sion might also be a response to deviant behaviours of subordinates (Lian *et al.*, 2014). Future  
8 research should examine this reverse process in greater depth.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Deviant behaviours are not only a matter of interpersonal relationships in organisa-  
17 tions, but also a question of employees' individual dispositions. While some previous studies  
18 have investigated the influence of personality traits such as the Big Five on deviant behav-  
19 iours (Bolton *et al.*, 2010; Mount *et al.*, 2006; Salgado, 2002), this study is the first to intro-  
20 duce PSM to this field of research. The negative impact of PSM suggests that recruiters are  
21 well advised to consider the extent to which applicants are public service motivated as this  
22 will have an impact on deviant behaviours of employees. However, the negative effect of  
23 PSM on employee deviance only holds for employment in the public and non-profit sector,  
24 where the P-O fit of public service motivated employees is presumably higher than in the pri-  
25 vate sector.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 A particularly interesting finding of our study is that this negative effect reverses when  
39 individuals are employed in the private sector (Figure 1). In this case, deviant behaviours in-  
40 crease with the level of PSM. We assume that public service motivated people share the goals  
41 and values of profit-oriented organisations to a lower degree, which decreases organisational  
42 identification and commitment and, in turn, increases deviant work behaviours. This result is  
43 remarkable because it shows that, somewhat paradoxically, a pro-social motivation (such as  
44 PSM) can lead to anti-social behaviour (such as employee deviance) when people are at the  
45 wrong workplace. Social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and self-discrepancy theory (Hig-  
46 gins, 1987) suggest that the dynamics of this relationship are triggered by a threat to an em-  
47 ployee's desired identity. In the case of a public-service motivated employee, membership in  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 a profit-seeking organization may create a perceived gap to the desired identity as someone  
4 who contributes to the common interest. A threatened or damaged identity leaves the employ-  
5 ee frustrated and in turn facilitates deviance from organizational norms (Lawrence & Robin-  
6 son, 2007). Employee deviance, then, is revengeful behaviour that aims to recover one's so-  
7 cial identity. This effect has been established for workplace stressors such as financial and  
8 social working conditions as well as organizational power and control (Lawrence & Robin-  
9 son, 2007; Robinson & Bennett, 1997). The results of our study suggest that the mission of an  
10 organization can create frustration that is expressed in workplace deviance, too.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 We cannot conclude from our findings that human resource managers in the private  
21 sector should avoid recruiting and selecting applicants who are strongly public service moti-  
22 vated, since PSM has been shown to be slightly beneficial for performance (Warren and  
23 Chen, 2013). However, private organizations can provide opportunities for constructive re-  
24 sponses of public-service motivated members (Lawrence & Robinson, 2007), for example by  
25 giving these employees the opportunity to spend some hours of work for community services.  
26  
27 Moreover, the P-O fit cannot only be increased by selection and socialisation on the part of  
28 the people, but also by fitting the organisation to the people. To address the needs of employ-  
29 ees with high levels of PSM, and thus to capitalise on their desire for contributing to society,  
30 PSM-aligned goals and values could be more emphasised even in profit-seeking organisa-  
31 tions. This gives another justification for practices of corporate social responsibility (CSR),  
32 which we expect to reduce deviant behaviours by those members of private organisations who  
33 are strongly public service motivated.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 In spite of these findings, we acknowledge several limitations to our study. First, our  
50 study builds on a convenience sample in a cross-sectional research design. This limits both the  
51 representativeness of the results and the opportunities to make causal claims. Future research  
52 could strive for validation of our results with larger datasets and in longitudinal designs. Se-  
53 cond, a potential problem in cross-sectional datasets is common method bias (CMB). The  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 latter arises when dependent and independent variables are measured simultaneously with the  
4  
5 same instrument, which might lead to inflated variances. In order to mitigate this potential  
6  
7 bias, we have considered it at the design stage of the survey following guidelines provided by  
8  
9 Podsakoff *et al.* (2003; 2012) and Conway and Lance (2010). For example, we separated the  
10  
11 abusive leadership questions from the PSM items and inserted demographic questions and  
12  
13 control variables in-between. We further used various scales. Since it was an online adminis-  
14  
15 tered survey, we had the option to randomise all items, which we did. We also relied on well-  
16  
17 validated and reliable scales for all constructs, which also mitigates CMB to some extent. In  
18  
19 addition, Siemsen *et al.* (2012, p. 472) analytically prove that “common method bias can be  
20  
21 effectively controlled by including other independent variables, which exhibit small bivariate  
22  
23 correlations ( $\leq .30$ ) among each other and whose measures suffer from CMV.” This is the case  
24  
25 in our set of variables. Thus, considering the preventive measures applied at the design stage  
26  
27 and the heuristics suggested by Siemsen *et al.* (2010), we have no reason to believe that CMB  
28  
29 negatively affects the conclusions of our work. Third, the results pertaining to the subdimen-  
30  
31 sions of PSM presented in Model II should be taken with caution. Since we decided to use a  
32  
33 global measure of PSM to analyse the main relations of interest in this study, the number of  
34  
35 items per PSM dimension is low. Thus, these estimations should be considered as an addi-  
36  
37 tional robustness check only because short measures have been criticised for low validity and  
38  
39 reliability.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **Conclusions**

48  
49 Research on personnel selection has for a long time focussed on the identification of candi-  
50  
51 dates who are likely to engage in desirable work behaviours. This study contributes to a more  
52  
53 recent stream of research that pays increasing attention to undesirable, deviant behaviours at  
54  
55 the workplace with detrimental effects on organisational performance. The results show that  
56  
57 these behaviours are to be prevented on the part of both supervisors and subordinates. PSM  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 may help to prevent the negative side effects of deviant behaviours, but this only holds for  
4  
5 employees in the public and non-profit sector. In profit-seeking organisations, PSM is even  
6  
7 positively related to deviant behaviours. This highlights the paramount importance of P-O fit  
8  
9 in the selection and socialisation of personnel.  
10

## 11 12 13 14 **References**

15  
16 Andersen, L. B., Pallesen, T., & Pedersen, L. H. (2011), "Does ownership matter? Public ser-  
17  
18 vice motivation among physiotherapists in the private and public sectors in Denmark."  
19  
20 *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 10-27.  
21

22  
23 Andersen, L.B. and Serritzlew, S. (2012), "Does public service motivation affect the behavior  
24  
25 of professionals?", *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp.  
26  
27 19-29.  
28

29  
30 Aquino, K., Lewis, M.U. and Bradfield, M. (1999), "Justice construct, negative affectivity,  
31  
32 and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test", *Journal of Organiza-*  
33  
34 *tional Behaviour*, Vol. 20, pp. 1073-1091.  
35

36  
37 Ashforth, B.E. (1997), "Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of ante-  
38  
39 cedents and consequences", *Canadian Journal of Administrative Science*, Vol. 14, pp.  
40  
41 126-140.  
42

43  
44 Avey, J.B., Wu, K. and Holley, E. (2015), "The influence of abusive supervision and job em-  
45  
46 beddedness on citizenship and deviance", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 129 No. 3,  
47  
48 pp. 721-731.  
49

50  
51 Bellé, N. (2013), "Experimental evidence on the relationship between public service motiva-  
52  
53 tion and job performance", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 143-153.  
54

55  
56 Bellé, N. (2014), "Leading to Make a Difference: A Field Experiment on the Performance  
57  
58 Effects of Transformational Leadership, Perceived Social Impact, and Public Service  
59  
60 Motivation", *Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 109-136.

- 1  
2  
3 Bolton, L.R., Becker, L. K. and Barber, L. K. (2010), "Big Five trait predictors of differential  
4 counterproductive work behavior dimensions", *Personality and Individual Differences*,  
5 Vol. 49 No. 5, pp. 537-541.  
6  
7  
8
- 9 Bottomley, P., Mostafa, A., Gould-Williams, J. and León-Cázares, F. (2015), "The Impact of  
10 Transformational Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: The Contin-  
11 gent Role of Public Service Motivation", *British Journal of Management*, in press,  
12 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-8551.12108/pdf>.  
13  
14  
15
- 16 Brænder, M. and Andersen, L.B. (2013), "Does deployment to war affect public service moti-  
17 vation? A panel study of soldiers before and after their service in Afghanistan", *Public*  
18 *Administration Review*, Vol. 73 No. 3, pp. 466-477.  
19  
20  
21
- 22 Brehm, S.S. and Brehm, J.W. (1981), *Psychological Reactance: A Theory of Freedom and*  
23 *Control*, Academic Press, New York, NY.  
24  
25  
26
- 27 Brewer, G.A. and Selden, S.C. (1998), "Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evi-  
28 dence of the public service ethic", *Journal of Public Administration Research and The-*  
29 *ory*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 413-440.  
30  
31  
32
- 33 Brislin, R.W. (1970), "Back translation for cross-cultural research", *Journal of Cross-Cultural*  
34 *Psychology*, Vol. 1 No 3, pp. 185-216.  
35  
36  
37
- 38 Burton, J.P. and Hoobler, J.M. (2011), "Aggressive reactions to abusive supervision: The role  
39 of interactional justice and narcissism", *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 52,  
40 pp. 389-398.  
41  
42  
43
- 44 Christensen, R.K. and Wright, B.E. (2011), "The effects of public service motivation on job  
45 choice decisions: Disentangling the contributions of person-organization fit and person-  
46 job fit", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 723-  
47 743.  
48  
49  
50
- 51 Conger, J.A. (1990), "The dark side of leadership", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 19 No. 2,  
52 pp. 44-55.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Conway, J. M. and Lance, C.E. (2010), "What reviewers should expect from authors regard-  
4  
5 ing common method bias in organizational research", *Journal of Business and Psychol-*  
6  
7 *ogy*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 325-334.  
8
- 9  
10 Detert, J.R., Treviño, L.K., Burris, E.R. and Andiappan, M. (2007), "Managerial modes of  
11  
12 influence and counterproductivity in organizations: A longitudinal business-unit-level  
13  
14 investigation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, pp. 993-1005.  
15
- 16  
17 Dineen, B. R., Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2006), "Supervisory guidance and behav-  
18  
19 ioral integrity: relationships with employee citizenship and deviant behavior." *Journal*  
20  
21 *of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91 No. 3, pp. 622-635.  
22
- 23  
24 Getha-Taylor, H. and Haddock-Bigwarfe, A. (2014), "Public service motivation and willing-  
25  
26 ness to collaborate: An examination in the context of homeland security", *Evidence-*  
27  
28 *based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 80-95.  
29
- 30  
31 Giauque, D., Ritz, A., Varone, F., Anderfuhren-Biget, S. and Waldner, C. (2011), "Putting  
32  
33 public service motivation into context: a balance between universalism and particular-  
34  
35 ism", *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 77 No. 2, pp. 227-253.  
36
- 37  
38 Göbel, M., Vogel, R. and Weber, C. (2013), "Management research on reciprocity: A review  
39  
40 of the literature", *Business Research*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 34-53.  
41
- 42  
43 Gruys, M.L. and Sackett, P.R. (2003), "Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive  
44  
45 work behavior", *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp.  
46  
47 30-42.  
48
- 49  
50 Higgins, E.T. (1987), "Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect", *Psychological Re-*  
51  
52 *view* Vol. 94 No. 3, pp. 319-340.  
53
- 54  
55 Hoel, H. and Cooper, C.L. (2001), "Origins of bullying: Theoretical frameworks for explain-  
56  
57 ing workplace bullying", in Tehrani, N. (Ed.), *Building a Culture of Respect: Managing*  
58  
59 *Bullying at Work*, Taylor & Francis, London, pp. 3-19.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hoffman, B.J. and Woehr, D.J. (2006), "A quantitative review of the relationship between  
4 person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol.  
5 68 No. 3, pp. 389-399.  
6  
7  
8
- 9  
10 Houston, D.J. (2011), "Implications of occupational locus and focus for public service moti-  
11 vation: Attitudes toward work motives across nations", *Public Administration Review*,  
12 Vol. 71 No. 5, pp. 761-771.  
13  
14  
15
- 16 Jørgensen, T.B. and Bozeman, B. (2007), "Public values: An inventory", *Administration &*  
17 *Society*, Vol. 39, pp. 354-381.  
18  
19
- 20  
21 Kjeldsen, A.M. and Jacobsen, C.B. (2013), "Public service motivation and employment sec-  
22 tor: Attraction or socialization?", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theo-*  
23 *ry*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 899-926.  
24  
25  
26
- 27 Kristof, A.L. (1996), "Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations,  
28 measurement, and implications", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 1-49.  
29  
30
- 31  
32 Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D. and Johnson, E.C. (2005), "Consequences of indi-  
33 viduals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group,  
34 and person-supervisor fit", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 58 No. 2, pp. 281-342.  
35  
36  
37
- 38 Lawrence, T.B. and Robinson, S.L. (2007), "Ain't misbehavin: Workplace deviance as organ-  
39 izational resistance", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 378-394.  
40  
41  
42
- 43 Lee, Y.J. and Wilkins, V.M. (2011), "More similarities or more differences? Comparing pub-  
44 lic and nonprofit managers' job motivations", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 71  
45 No. 1, pp. 45-56.  
46  
47  
48
- 49 Lee, Kibeom, and Allen, N.J. (2002), "Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace  
50 deviance: the role of affect and cognitions." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 87  
51 No.1, pp. 131-142.  
52  
53  
54
- 55  
56 Lewis, G.B. and Frank, S.A. (2002), "Who wants to work for the government?", *Public Ad-*  
57 *ministration Review*, Vol. 62 No. 4, pp. 395-404.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Lian, Ferris, D.L., Morrison R. and Brown, D.J. (2014), "Blame it on the supervisor or the  
4 subordinate? Reciprocal relations between abusive supervision and organizational devi-  
5 ance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 99 No. 4, pp. 651-664.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Liu, J., Kwan, H.K., Wu, L. and Wu, W. (2010), "Abusive supervision and subordinate su-  
11 pervisor-directed deviance: The moderating role of traditional values and the mediating  
12 role of revenge cognitions", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*,  
13 Vol. 83, pp. 835-856.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Mackey, J.D., Frieder, R.E., Perrewé, P.L., Gallagher, V.C. and Brymer, R.A. (2015), "Em-  
19 powered employees as social deviants: The role of abusive supervision", *Journal of*  
20 *Business Psychology*, Vol. 30, pp. 149-162.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Martinenko, M.J., Harvey, P., Brees, J.R. and Mackey, J.D. (2013), "A review of abusive su-  
26 pervision research", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 34, pp. 120-137.  
27  
28  
29  
30 Mitchell, M.S. and Ambrose, M.L. (2007), "Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and  
31 the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs", *Journal of Applied Psychology*,  
32 Vol. 92 No. 4, pp. 1159-1168.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Mount, M., Ilies, R. and Johnson, E. (2006), "Relationship of personality traits and counter-  
38 productive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction", *Personnel Psy-*  
39 *chology*, Vol. 59, pp. 591-622.  
40  
41  
42  
43 O'Leary, R. (2010), "Guerrilla employees: Should managers nurture, tolerate, or terminate  
44 them?", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp. 8-19.  
45  
46  
47  
48 Pedersen, M. J. (2013), "Public Service Motivation and Attraction to Public Versus Private  
49 Sector Employment: Academic Field of Study as Moderator?" *International Public*  
50 *Management Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 357-385  
51  
52  
53  
54 Perry, J.L. and Wise, L.R. (1990), "The motivational bases of public service", *Public Admin-*  
55 *istration Review*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 367-373.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Perry, J. L. (1996), "Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 6 No.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 (1), pp. 5-22.
- 9  
10 Perry, J.L., Brudney, J.L., Coursey, D. and Littlepage, L. (2008), "What drives morally committed citizens? A study of the antecedents of public service motivation", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 445-458.
- 11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Perry, J. L. (2014), "The motivational bases of public service: foundations for a third wave of  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 research", *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 34-47.
- 23  
24  
25 Petrovsky, N. and Ritz, A. (2014), "Public service motivation and performance: A critical  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 perspective", *Evidence-based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, Vol. 2  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 No. 1, pp. 57-79.
- 41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2012), "Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 539-569.
- 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 Bennett, R.J. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its nature and its causes, in Lewicki, R.J., Sheppard, B.H. & Bies, R.J. (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organization*, Vol. 6. JAI, Greenwich, CT, pp. 3-27.
- Sackett, P.R. and DeVore, C.J. (2002), *Counterproductive Behaviors at Work*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.



- 1  
2  
3 Salgado, J. (2002), "The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behavior",  
4  
5 *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 10 No. 1-2, pp. 117-125.  
6  
7  
8 Schat, A.C.H., Desmarais, S. and Kelloway, E.K. (2006), "Prevalence of workplace aggres-  
9  
10 sion in the U.S. workforce: Findings from a national study", in Kelloway, E.K., Barling,  
11  
12 J. and Hurrell, J.J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Violence*, Sage Publications, Thou-  
13  
14 sand Oaks, CA, pp. 47-89.  
15  
16 Schyns, B. and Schilling, J. (2003), "How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis  
17  
18 of destructive leadership and its outcomes", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp.  
19  
20 138-158.  
21  
22  
23 Siemsen, E., Roth, A. and Oliveira, P. (2010), "Common method bias in regression models  
24  
25 with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol.  
26  
27 13 No. 3, pp. 456-476.  
28  
29  
30 Spector, P.E. and Fox, S. (2005), "The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work  
31  
32 behaviour", in Fox, S. and Spector, P.E. (Eds.), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: In-*  
33  
34 *vestigations of Actors and Targets*, American Psychological Association, Washington,  
35  
36 D.C., pp. 151-174.  
37  
38  
39 Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1986), "The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour", in  
40  
41 Worchel, S. & Austin, W.G. (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Nelson-Hall,  
42  
43 Chicago, IL, pp. 7-24.  
44  
45  
46 Tepper, B.J. (2000), "Consequences of abusive supervision", *Academy of Management Jour-*  
47  
48 *nal*, Vol. 43, pp. 178-190.  
49  
50  
51 Tepper, B.J. (2007), "Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and re-  
52  
53 search agenda", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 261-289.  
54  
55  
56 Tepper, B.J., Carr, J.C., Breaux, D.M., Geider, S., Hu, C. and Hua, W. (2009), "Abusive su-  
57  
58 pervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 analysis”, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 109, pp. 156-  
4  
5 167.
- 6  
7 Tschirhart, M., Reed, K.K., Freeman, S.J. and Anker, A.L. (2008), “Is the grass greener? Sec-  
8  
9 tor shifting and choice of sector by MPA and MBA graduates”, *Nonprofit and Volun-*  
10  
11 *tary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 668-688.
- 12  
13  
14 Vandenberg, W. (2011), “Who wants to deliver public service? Do institutional antecedents  
15  
16 of public service motivation provide an answer?”, *Review of Public Personnel Admin-*  
17  
18 *istration*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 87-107.
- 19  
20  
21 Verquer, M.L., Beehr, T. A. and Wagner, S.H. (2003), “A meta-analysis of relations between  
22  
23 person-organization fit and work attitudes”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 63  
24  
25 No. 3, pp. 473-489.
- 26  
27  
28 Wang, R. and Jiang, J. (2014), “How narcissistic employees respond to abusive supervision:  
29  
30 Two roles of narcissism in decreasing perception and increasing deviance”, *Psychologi-*  
31  
32 *cal Reports: Employment Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 115 No. 2, pp. 372-380.
- 33  
34  
35 Warren, D.C. and Chen, L. (2013), “The relationship between public service motivation and  
36  
37 performance”, in Ringquist, E. (Ed.), *Meta-Analysis for Public Management and Policy*,  
38  
39 Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 442-474.
- 40  
41  
42 Wei, F. and Si, S. (2013), “Tit for tat? Abusive supervision and counterproductive work be-  
43  
44 haviors: The moderating effects of locus of control and perceived mobility”, *Asia Pacif-*  
45  
46 *ic Journal of Management*, Vol. 30, pp. 281-296.
- 47  
48  
49 Wright, B.E. (2007), “Public service and motivation: Does mission matter?”, *Public Admin-*  
50  
51 *istration Review*, Vol. 67 No. 1, pp. 54-64.
- 52  
53  
54 Wright, B.E., Moynihan, D.E. and Pandey, S.K. (2012), “Pulling the levers: Transformational  
55  
56 leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence”, *Public Administration Re-*  
57  
58 *view*, Vol. 72 No. 2, pp. 206-215.
- 59  
60

1  
2  
3 Wright, B.E. and Christensen, R.K. (2010), "Public service motivation: A test of the job at-  
4 traction-selection-attrition model", *International Public Management Journal*, Vol. 13  
5  
6  
7 No. 2, pp. 155-176.  
8

9  
10 Wright, B.E., Christensen, R.K. and Isett, K R. (2013), "Motivated to Adapt? The Role of  
11 Public Service Motivation as Employees Face Organizational Change", *Public Admin-  
12 istration Review*, Vol. 73, pp. 738-747.  
13  
14

15  
16 Zellars, K.L., Tepper, B.J. and Duffy, M.K. (2002), "Abusive supervision and subordinates'  
17 organizational citizenship behaviour", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table I.** Sample characteristics

Total		150	100.00%
Age	≤40	120	80.00%
	>40	30	20.00%
Gender	Female	64	42.67%
	Male	86	57.33%
Language	German	96	64.00%
	English	54	36.00%
Employment	Part-time	47	31.33%
	Full-time	103	68.67%
Leader gender	Female	57	38.00%
	Male	93	62.00%
Duration of leadership relationship	≤1 year	66	44.00%
	>1 year	84	56.00%
Organisation type	Public	66	44.00%
	Nonprofit	65	43.33%
	Private	19	12.67%
Number of employees	1-9	26	17.33%
	10-49	30	20.00%
	50-249	34	22.67%
	≥250	60	40.00%

For Review Only

For Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Table II. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

	Mean	SD	Correlations															
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
1 Employee deviance	1.64	0.59	(0.91)															
2 Abusive supervision	1.73	0.84	0.22 *	(0.93)														
3 PSM	3.78	0.70	-0.30 *	0.11	(0.73)													
4 Job satisfaction	6.53	2.05	-0.21 *	-0.48 *	0.04	1												
5 Age >40 (d)	0.20	n/a	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	-0.12	1											
6 Gender (d; 1=male)	0.57	n/a	0.12	-0.04	0.12	0.08	-0.14	1										
7 Language (d; 1=English)	0.36	n/a	0.01	-0.03	-0.16	-0.18 *	0.18 *	-0.14	1									
8 Employment (d; 1= full-time)	0.69	n/a	0.01	0.02	-0.16 *	-0.06	0.19 *	0.00	0.09	1								
9 Leader gender (d; 1= male)	0.62	n/a	0.02	0.17 *	0.01	-0.12	0.05	-0.35 *	0.07	-0.24 *	1							
10 Leadership relationship ≤1 year (d)	0.44	n/a	0.18 *	-0.12	0.04	0.06	-0.31 *	0.00	-0.02	-0.10	0.05	1						
11 Public (d)	0.44	n/a	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.08	-0.04	-0.16	0.01	-0.04	0.16 *	0.03	1					
12 Nonprofit (d)	0.43	n/a	0.04	0.03	-0.17 *	-0.06	0.00	0.18 *	0.04	0.16	-0.10	0.01	-0.78 *	1				
13 Number of employees 1-9 (d)	0.17	n/a	-0.05	-0.02	-0.04	-0.03	-0.10	-0.14	-0.12	-0.15	0.00	0.02	-0.05	-0.08	1			
14 Number of employees 10-49 (d)	0.20	n/a	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.01	-0.13	0.13	0.01	-0.20	0.09	-0.04	0.13	-0.13	-0.23 *	1		
15 Number of employees 50-249 (d)	0.23	n/a	-0.02	-0.15	0.03	0.00	0.13	-0.08	0.03	-0.01	-0.03	-0.03	-0.16	0.07	-0.25 *	-0.27 *	1	

Notes: \* p<.05; Cronbach's Alpha in parentheses.


**Table III.** Multiple OLS Regressions (Standardised Coefficients; Robust Standard Errors);  
Dependent Variable: Employee Deviance

	Model I	Model II	Model III
<b>Hypotheses</b>			
Abusive supervision [H1]	0.231 **	0.217 *	0.248 **
Public service motivation [H2]	-0.371 ***		0.560 *
Public interest		-0.140	
Compassion		-0.041	
Self-sacrifice		-0.164 *	
Attraction to policy making		-0.199 **	
Public service motivation * Public [H3a]			-0.738 ***
Public service motivation * Nonprofit [H3b]			-0.595 **
<b>Individual</b>			
Job satisfaction	-0.124	-0.136	-0.084
Age >40 (d)	0.002	0.002	0.023
Gender (d; 1=male)	0.181 **	0.173 **	0.167 *
Language (d; 1=English)	-0.036	-0.054	-0.017
Employment (d; 1=full-time)	-0.013	-0.020	-0.037
<b>Leadership</b>			
Leader gender (d; 1= male)	-0.000	-0.005	0.020
Leadership relationship ≤1 year (d)	0.229 ***	0.215 **	0.243 ***
<b>Organisation</b>			
Public (d)	0.037	0.055	0.225 **
Nonprofit (d)	-0.039	-0.031	0.160
Number of employees 1-9 (d)	-0.008	-0.013	-0.020
Number of employees 10-49 (d)	0.099	0.091	0.098
Number of employees 50-249 (d)	0.081	0.078	0.040
N	150	150	150
R <sup>2</sup>	0.255	0.262	0.309
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.178	0.167	0.226
F-statistic	1.91 **	1.80 **	2.02 **

Note. \*\*\*: p<.01; \*\*: p<.05; \*: p<.10; <sup>a</sup>: VIF(min)=1.14, VIF(max)=3.05.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure 1.** Interaction effect of public service motivation and employment sector on employee deviance



View Only



**Appendix. Survey items of main constructs (English/German)****Abusive Supervision** (*Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007*)

My supervisor ...

- ... ridicules me.
- ... tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid.
- ... puts me down in front of others.
- ... invades my privacy.
- ... doesn't give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort.
- ... blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment.
- ... breaks promises he/she makes.
- ... makes negative comments about me to others.
- ... tells me I'm incompetent.
- ... lies to me.

Mein Vorgesetzter/meine Vorgesetzte ...

- ... macht mich lächerlich.
- ... wertet meine Gedanken oder Gefühle ab.
- ... macht mich vor Anderen runter.
- ... mischt sich in meine Privatsphäre ein.
- ... schätzt meinen Arbeitsaufwand nicht.
- ... schiebt Schuld auf mich, um selbst nicht in Verlegenheit zu kommen.
- ... hält ihre/seine Versprechen nicht.
- ... macht bei Anderen negative Bemerkungen über mich.
- ... unterstellt mir Inkompetenz.
- ... lügt mich an.

**Public Service Motivation** (*Giaouque et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2012*)

Meaningful Public Service is very important to me.

I am often reminded by daily events how dependent we are on one another.

Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.

I am prepared to make sacrifices for the good of society.

I am not afraid to go bat for the rights of others even if it means I will be ridiculed.

I am very interested in politics.

I like to discuss political subjects with others.

Mir ist es wichtig dass die öffentliche Verwaltung sinnvolle Aufgaben übernimmt.

Im Alltag werde ich oft daran erinnert, wie abhängig wir voneinander sind.

Etwas in der Gesellschaft zu verändern bedeutet mir mehr als persönliche Erfolge.

Ich bin bereit Opfer zu bringen, wenn sie dem Wohl der Gesellschaft dienen.

Ich habe keine Angst, mich für die Rechte anderer einzusetzen, auch wenn ich dafür belächelt werde.

Ich interessiere mich sehr für Politik.

Mit anderen über Politik zu diskutieren gefällt mir sehr.

**Employee Deviance** (*Aquino et al., 1999*)

I intentionally arrived late for work.

I called in sick when I was not really ill.

I took undeserved breaks to avoid work.

I made unauthorized use of organizational property.

I left work early without permission.

I lied about the number of hours I worked.

I worked on a personal matter on the job instead of working for my employer.

I purposely ignored my supervisor's instructions.

I made an ethnic, racial, or religious slur against a co-worker.

I swore at a coworker.

I refused to talk to a co-worker.

I gossiped about my supervisor.

I made an obscene comment or gesture at a co-worker.

I teased a co-worker in front of other employees.

Ich bin absichtlich zu spät zur Arbeit gekommen.

Ich habe mich krank gemeldet, obwohl ich nicht wirklich krank war.

Ich habe ungerechtfertigte Pausen gemacht, um meine Arbeit zu umgehen.

Ich habe ohne Erlaubnis Eigentum meiner Organisation benutzt.

Ich habe meine Arbeit ohne Erlaubnis früher verlassen.

Ich habe über die Anzahl meiner Arbeitsstunden gelogen.

Ich habe mich während meiner Arbeitszeit mit persönlichen Angelegenheiten beschäftigt anstatt für meinen Arbeitgeber zu arbeiten.

Ich habe absichtlich die Anweisungen meiner Vorgesetzten/meines Vorgesetzten ignoriert.

Ich habe eine/n Kolleg/in aufgrund ihrer/seiner Ethnie, Rasse oder Religion beleidigt.

Ich habe eine/n Kolleg/in beschimpft.

Ich habe mich geweigert, mit einer/einem Kolleg/in zu sprechen.

Ich habe über meine Vorgesetzte/meinen Vorgesetzten gelästert.

Ich habe eine obszöne Bemerkung oder Geste gegenüber einer/einem Kolleg/in gemacht.

Ich habe eine/n Kolleg/in vor anderen Mitarbeiter/innen auf den Arm genommen.