



# Kent Academic Repository

**Moon, Chanki, Morais, Catarina, Randsley de Moura, Georgina and Uskul, Ayse K. (2021) *The role of organisational structure and deviant status in employee's reactions to and acceptance of workplace deviance*. International Journal of Conflict Management, 32 . pp. 315-339. ISSN 1044-4068.**

## Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/82727/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

## The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-03-2020-0036/full/html>

## This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

## DOI for this version

## Licence for this version

CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

## Additional information

## Versions of research works

### Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

### Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal** , Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

### Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact [ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).



**The Role of Organizational Structure and Deviant Status in  
Employees' Reactions to and Acceptance of Workplace  
Deviance**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Conflict Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJCMA-03-2020-0036.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	organizational structure, status, workplace deviance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Abstract

**Purpose:** To examine the role of deviant status (lower vs. higher rank) and organizational structure (vertical vs. horizontal) on individuals' responses to workplace deviance.

**Design/methodology/approach:** Two studies ( $N = 472$ ) were designed to examine the role of deviant status and organizational structure in responses to workplace deviance. Study 1 ( $N = 272$ ) manipulated deviant status and organizational structure. Study 2 ( $N = 200$ ) also manipulated deviant status but focused on participants' subjective evaluations of the organizational structure of their workplace.

**Findings:** Study 1 found that participants reported lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and higher turnover intentions when they imagined being confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by a manager (vs. by a subordinate), regardless of the type of organizational structure. Study 2 extended this finding by showing that the indirect effect of organizational structure (vertical vs. horizontal) on turnover intention via job satisfaction and organizational commitment was moderated by deviant status: when the deviant's status was higher, working in a vertical (vs. horizontal) organization was associated with decreased job satisfaction and commitment, which in turn was associated with a higher level of turnover intentions.

**Originality/value:** The findings broaden our understanding of how individuals respond to deviance at the workplace, by simultaneously considering the effects of organizational structure (vertical vs. horizontal) and deviant status (upward vs. downward directions of deviance).

**Keywords:** organizational structure, status, workplace deviance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention

**Paper type:** Research paper.

1  
2  
3  
4 Employee mistreatment is common. Recent statistics highlight that half of American  
5  
6 employees have left a company due to problems concerning mistreatment by their managers  
7  
8 (Harter and Adkins, 2015; Herrera, 2018). In a recent high-profile case, the CEO of Uber was  
9  
10 caught on camera arguing with an employee (a driver) regarding the company's fares – being  
11  
12 especially aggressive towards the employee, which constitutes a form of workplace deviance.  
13  
14 The video went viral on the internet focusing on the CEO's outburst which was widely  
15  
16 criticized, and for which he later apologized. Research finds that in organizational settings,  
17  
18 such examples of mistreatment are more commonly directed downwards to subordinates than  
19  
20 upwards (from subordinates to superiors) (e.g., Cortina *et al.*, 2001).  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 There is emerging evidence that downward mistreatment such as abusive supervision  
26  
27 might be associated with organizational structure. For example, the negative impact of  
28  
29 abusive supervision of subordinates (downward) on contextual performance of subordinates  
30  
31 (e.g., job dedication) is weaker in more horizontally structured organizations compared with  
32  
33 vertically structured ones (Aryee *et al.*, 2008). However, Aryee *et al.* (2008) did not consider  
34  
35 upward mistreatment. In addition, previous investigations have made more reference to the  
36  
37 primary role of status than to the organizational structure in relation to such deviance (e.g.,  
38  
39 “rule-breaking”, “cheating”, “free riding”, “being late for meetings”, “verbally abusing a co-  
40  
41 worker”; see Abrams *et al.*, 2013; Fiddick and Cummins, 2007; Karelaiia and Keck, 2013;  
42  
43 Pinto *et al.*, 2010; Randsley de Moura and Abrams, 2013).  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 In the present research, we set out to examine how reactions to mistreatment are  
49  
50 affected by type of organizational structure and the status of the person displaying workplace  
51  
52 deviance vis-à-vis the person who is the target of the deviant act. We focus on one common  
53  
54 example of workplace deviance, namely mistreatment in the form of incivility, which is  
55  
56 defined as “low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in  
57  
58 violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Deviant behaviors (e.g., incivility) are  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others” (Andersson  
5  
6 and Pearson, 1999, p. 457). Specifically, we investigated whether the status of the deviant  
7  
8 person (upwards vs. downwards deviance) in conjunction with organizational structure  
9  
10 (horizontal vs. vertical) affects the way individuals’ reactions to incivility on a) psychological  
11  
12 perception and affective outcomes (acceptability and discomfort of deviant behaviors) and b)  
13  
14 workplace related outcomes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover  
15  
16 intention).

### 21 **Power, workplace mistreatment and its consequences**

22  
23 Facing a deviant behavior by a high-status member, such as a leader, is likely to be  
24  
25 linked to power - an asymmetrical control over resources and other persons' outcomes  
26  
27 (Anderson and Brion, 2014; Emerson, 1962; Fiske, 2010; Keltner *et al.*, 2003). Power and  
28  
29 status are closely associated and mutually reinforcing (Fragale *et al.*, 2011; Magee and  
30  
31 Galinsky, 2008) because the distribution of resources may be determined by status within  
32  
33 groups (French and Raven, 1959), and individuals’ power may be derived from their  
34  
35 membership in high social status subgroups (Hogg and Abrams, 1988).  
36  
37

38  
39 Indeed, social hierarchies and leadership positions in organizations tend to provide  
40  
41 both power and status to leaders or people in higher occupational position (Keltner *et al.*,  
42  
43 2003; Messé *et al.*, 1992). Therefore, in organizations, research on power has focused on  
44  
45 examining the negative consequences of deviant behavior by individuals who hold power in  
46  
47 their group or in society (e.g., Bargh *et al.*, 1995; Fiske, 1993). Many researchers have found  
48  
49 that repeated exercise of power can lead to subordinate derogation (Georgeson and Harris,  
50  
51 2006), socially inappropriate behavior (e.g., Dubois *et al.*, 2015; Lammers *et al.*, 2010;  
52  
53 Olekalns *et al.*, 2014; Yap *et al.*, 2013), aggression (Fast and Chen, 2009), corruption (Maner  
54  
55 and Mead, 2010; Kipnis, 1972), abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), and incivility  
56  
57 (Hershcovis *et al.*, 2017; Pearson *et al.*, 2000).  
58  
59  
60

Furthermore, studies have found injurious effects of workplace mistreatment on targeted employees. For example, Pearson *et al.* (2000) found qualitative evidence for being a target of rude behaviors resulting in decreased commitment to the organization and work efforts, wasted work time, and increased turnover intentions. In a similar vein, Cortina and colleagues (2001) reported that experiences of interpersonal mistreatment were associated with lower job satisfaction, increased job withdrawal, and greater psychological distress. In a meta-analysis, Hershcovis and Barling (2010) found that deviant behaviors instigated by supervisors had a stronger impact than aggression instigated by co-workers on several organizational outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, affective commitment and turnover intention). Similarly, other studies found that the effects of workplace deviance on health-related outcomes (e.g., strain) and workplace-related outcomes can vary by the deviant's status (Oore *et al.*, 2010; Laschinger *et al.*, 2009).

### **Deviance, Deviant Status, and Reactions to deviance**

In organizations, employees expect that their leaders should take responsibility for the well-being of their employees (Hollander, 1992; ~~Hollander and Julian, 1969~~; Messick *et al.*, 1983). Accordingly, leaders who behave in a deviant manner are likely to be perceived as deviating from social expectations (see Karelaia and Keck, 2013), and this deviation can lead to strong negative feelings towards such leaders (Abrams *et al.*, 2014; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997; Wahrman, 1970). Consistent with this idea, prior studies have found that high-status actors (e.g., manager or leader) cheating on a low-status victim (e.g., subordinate) are evaluated more harshly than low-status actors cheating on high-status victims (Fiddick and Cummins, 2007). However, there is also evidence that individuals may accept deviance from high-status group members, such as problematic leaders (Shapiro *et al.*, 2011). Moreover, previous research on the relationship between norm violation and negative emotions finds that how negative people feel when they face an act of deviance is shaped by the perceived

1  
2  
3  
4 acceptability of that deviant act (e.g., Moon *et al.*, 2018) which, in turn, can affect their  
5  
6 reactions to that deviant act. In line with this, past research showed that negative affect was  
7  
8 elicited by violation of expectations (e.g., Topolinski and Strack, 2015). In the present  
9  
10 research, we examined affective response to deviance focusing on discomfort, defined as  
11  
12 unpleasant subjective state (similar to stress and anxiety), as a psychological outcome of  
13  
14 experiencing deviant behavior at work place (Li *et al.*, 2016; Moon *et al.*, 2018) keeping with  
15  
16 past research that has demonstrated the impact of downward mistreatment such as abusive  
17  
18 supervision on employee's psychological distress (Li *et al.*, 2016). Discomfort as work-  
19  
20 related stress has also been shown to impact on work-related processes such as turnover  
21  
22 intentions (Hoel *et al.*, 2003; Laschinger *et al.*, 2009). Furthermore, individuals' immune,  
23  
24 cardiovascular, and metabolic systems can be impacted by stressors such downward deviance  
25  
26 as indicated by the allostatic load model of stress (Ganster and Rosen, 2013). Discomfort,  
27  
28 defined as unpleasant subjective state (similar to stress and anxiety), is an important outcome  
29  
30 of deviant behaviors (Moon *et al.*, 2018) that can subsequently impact on workplace related  
31  
32 outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Hoel *et al.*, 2003; Laschinger *et al.*,  
33  
34 2009).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Reactions to deviance can also be impacted by the status of the person displaying the  
42  
43 deviance. As such, we might expect different responses if the outburst towards the Uber  
44  
45 driver would have been displayed by a co-worker and not by the CEO. What is less clear is  
46  
47 whether the broader context impacts on reactions to workplace deviance. Specifically, in the  
48  
49 following studies we examined the role of organizational structure in the relationship between  
50  
51 the status of the actors in displays of workplace deviance and workplace related  
52  
53 consequences.  
54  
55

### 56 **Organizational Structure**

57  
58  
59 Organizational structure is defined as the total of the ways in which the work is  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 divided into different tasks, achieving coordination (Mintzberg, 1979). The most widespread  
5  
6 distinction in organizational structure is that of vertical (mechanistic) versus horizontal  
7  
8 (organic) structural forms (e.g., Ambrose and Schminke, 2003; Aryee *et al.*, 2008; Burns and  
9  
10 Stalker, 1961; Slevin and Covin, 1997). Vertical organizational structures tend to be rigid,  
11  
12 hierarchical, tight and formalized, characterized by centralized power/control/authority and  
13  
14 decision-making, rigid communication channels, and require a strict adherence to formal  
15  
16 rules and regulations. In contrast, horizontal organizational structures tend to be more  
17  
18 flexible, decentralized, in which adherence to formal rules and procedures is less emphasized,  
19  
20 and managers and subordinates can work together to make decisions (Ambrose and  
21  
22 Schminke, 2003; Aryee *et al.*, 2008; Burns and Stalker, 1961; Campbell *et al.*, 2004; Rahman  
23  
24 and Zanzi, 1995; Schminke *et al.*, 2000). Thus, the vertical organizational structure would  
25  
26 exacerbate the power imbalance between leaders and subordinates that facilitates more  
27  
28 deviant behaviors by high-ranking individuals than by low-ranking individuals. In contrast,  
29  
30 the horizontal organizational structure would reduce the power imbalance between leaders  
31  
32 and subordinates that minimize the tendency of leaders to act in oppressive and abusive ways  
33  
34 towards their subordinates.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Organizational structure has been found to impact on important outcomes in the  
42  
43 workplace. For example, when the organizational structure is less centralized and formalized,  
44  
45 social interaction among members of the organization is more favorable (Chen and Huang,  
46  
47 2007). Moreover, a vertical organizational structure can nurture a sense of powerlessness  
48  
49 leading to decreased interpersonal facilitation and job dedication in the context of abusive  
50  
51 supervision (Aryee *et al.*, 2008; related to H4 and H6).

52  
53  
54  
55 Given the association between power dynamics and the characteristics of vertical  
56  
57 versus horizontal organizational structures (cf. Flynn *et al.*, 2011; Magee and Galinsky, 2008;  
58  
59 Moon *et al.*, 2018), mistreatment from high-ranking individuals may also be viewed as being

1  
2  
3  
4 more common and more acceptable in vertical (vs. horizontal) organizational contexts  
5  
6 [\(related to H2b and H5\)](#). Therefore, we expect that type of organizational structure will affect  
7  
8 the psychological and behavioral outcomes provoked by displays of workplace deviance from  
9  
10 a leader versus a subordinate.  
11  
12

### 13 **Overview of the Present Research and Hypotheses**

14  
15 Existing literature highlights the effects of undesirable acts of workplace deviance  
16  
17 (mistreatment, deviance, incivility) on psychological perceptions and affective outcomes for  
18  
19 individuals (e.g. Moon *et al.*, 2018; Porath and Pearson, 2012) and workplace related  
20  
21 outcomes (e.g., Barnes *et al.*, 2015; Hershcovis and Barling, 2010; Oore *et al.*, 2010;  
22  
23 Laschinger *et al.*, 2009). As such, we have focused on these two categories of outcomes in  
24  
25 the present studies: a) *psychological perception and affective outcomes* (acceptability and  
26  
27 discomfort of deviant behaviors) and b) *workplace related outcomes* (job satisfaction,  
28  
29 organizational commitment and turnover intentions).  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Across two studies we examined the role of status and organizational structure in  
35  
36 individuals' responses to displays of workplace deviance. Participants either imagined  
37  
38 working in an experimental vignette (Study 1) or we recruited participants who reported  
39  
40 working (Study 2) in a workplace with horizontal or vertical organizational structure. We  
41  
42 expected that the negative effects of deviant behaviors on the two categories of outcomes  
43  
44 would be affected by organizational structure (horizontal vs. vertical) and deviant status  
45  
46 (manager vs. subordinate) and tested the following predictions:  
47  
48  
49

50 *H1*. Workplace deviance displayed by managers will lead participants to experience  
51  
52 more discomfort than workplace deviance displayed by a lower (subordinate) or equal  
53  
54 (peer; Study 1 only) status deviant (*H1a*: main effect of deviant status). This effect will  
55  
56 be stronger in horizontally structured organizations than in vertically structured  
57  
58 organizations (*H1b*: deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect).

59 *H2*. Acceptability of deviant behavior from managers will be greater than from  
60  
61 subordinates or peers (Study 1 only) (*H2a*: main effect of deviant status), *and* workplace

1  
2  
3  
4 deviance will be judged as more acceptable in the vertical (vs. horizontal) organization  
5 structure condition (H2b: deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect).  
6  
7

8 *H3.* Lower levels of job satisfaction, less organizational commitment and higher turnover  
9 intentions will be reported by participants in the vertical (vs. horizontal) organization  
10 structure (H3a: main effect of organizational structure), and when the workplace deviant  
11 behavior is displayed by a manager (vs. subordinate or peer) (H3b: main effect of deviant  
12 status).  
13  
14

15  
16 *H4.* A deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect is also expected in  
17 relation to workplace related outcomes, such that participants will report less job  
18 satisfaction, less organizational commitment and higher turnover intentions when the  
19 deviant is a manager, especially in the vertical structure compared to the horizontal  
20 structure.  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 Previous research has shown that individuals' perception of mistreatment is affected  
26 by the interaction between cultural context and deviant status. Given the role of national  
27 cultural context moderating the effect of acceptability on emotional reactions (e.g., Günsoy,  
28 2019; Moon *et al.*, 2018), we expected a similar moderation effect but with organizational  
29 structure.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 *H5.* Acceptability of deviant behavior will mediate the relationship between deviant  
37 status and discomfort, and this indirect path will be moderated by type of organizational  
38 structure.  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 We further explore whether the indirect effect of deviant status x organizational  
44 structure interaction via job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover intention  
45 would be observed. This is explored given the relationships between the organizational  
46 outcomes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention, with job  
47 satisfaction and organizational commitment playing the role of predictors of turnover  
48 intentions (e.g., Abrams and Randsley de Moura, 2001; Halbesleben, 2010; Randsley de  
49 Moura *et al.*, 2009; see Harrison *et al.*, 2006 for a review).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *H6. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment will mediate the relationship*  
5 *between deviant status x organizational structure interaction and turnover intentions.*  
6  
7  
8

9 In order to assist with the interpretation of the results, we will first describe in detail  
10 the methodology of both Studies 1 and 2 and then present the results of both studies together.  
11  
12

### 13 **Method: Study 1**

14  
15  
16 In Study 1, we manipulated organizational structure (horizontal vs. vertical) and  
17 deviant status (manager vs. subordinate vs. peers) using an experimental vignette  
18 methodology (EVM) to test causal effects (cf. Aguinis and Bradley, 2014; Allen *et al.*, 2014).  
19 We asked participants to imagine themselves working in an organization structured vertically  
20 or horizontally and then to read a vignette describing a deviant behavior exhibited by a  
21 colleague at work who held a position as manager or was a subordinate or a peer.  
22  
23 Subsequently, participants reported their discomfort in the face of deviant behavior,  
24 acceptability of deviant behaviors, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover  
25 intentions in the imagined context.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Participants and Design**

37  
38  
39 To reach a diverse sample (in terms of gender, age, job occupation), a total of 276  
40 participants from the United States were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical Turk<sup>®</sup> (MTurk;  
41 cf. Buhrmester *et al.*, 2011) who completed an online survey presented as a study on  
42 managing relationships in organizational contexts. Four participants who failed the attention  
43 check question were excluded, leaving a sample of 272 American participants for analyses  
44 ( $M_{age}=34.79$ ,  $SD_{age}=11.17$ ; 118 women; ethnic background: 74% White American, 7%  
45 Hispanic, 6% White (other), 6% African American, 2% Mixed, 3% Asian American, 1%  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Black (other), 1% Asian (other)).<sup>1</sup> Participants were assigned randomly to one of six  
5  
6 conditions in a 2 (organizational structure: horizontal vs. vertical) x 3 (deviant status:  
7  
8 manager vs. subordinate vs. peer) between-participants design.

### 11 Procedure

12  
13 Participants were asked to imagine themselves being hired by a reputable company,  
14  
15 'ABC Inc.', which was described as a 'global leading company' and 'top 10 global brand'.  
16  
17 The company was described as a place where 'most job seekers would like to work' and as  
18  
19 having a 'fair' and 'trusting' work environment. The general description of the company was  
20  
21 adopted from Moon *et al.* (2018).  
22  
23

24  
25 Next, participants were assigned randomly to read one of two paragraphs that  
26  
27 depicted the organizational structure as either vertical or horizontal. The scenarios were also  
28  
29 adapted from Moon *et al.* (see 2018; Study 2):  
30  
31

32 *Vertical organization.* In this condition, 'ABC Inc.' was described as having a 'clear  
33  
34 hierarchy' and that 'those in subordinate positions are expected to be aware of the  
35  
36 existing ranks and show respect towards managers'. Moreover, 'the company puts  
37  
38 strong emphasis on compliance and rule following; as a result, managers and their  
39  
40 decisions are hardly challenged by their subordinates'.  
41  
42

43 *Horizontal organization.* In this condition, 'ABC Inc.' was described as having 'no  
44  
45 clear hierarchy structures' and that 'those in authority treat subordinates with respect  
46  
47 and do not pull rank'. Moreover, 'the company puts strong emphasis on equality and  
48  
49 critical thinking; as a result, managers and their decisions are often challenged by  
50  
51 their subordinates'.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

---

57  
58  
59 <sup>1</sup> Participants could pass the attention check by doing the following: 'To show that you have read instructions,  
60 please ignore the question below about how you are feeling and instead check only 'Nervous'.

To manipulate status, participants read one of three imaginary scenarios involving either a manager or a subordinate or a peer putting forward a request. In the adapted scenario (Moon *et al.*, 2018), participants read that their colleague starts to behave badly in the office after they declined their colleagues' request. For example, this colleague stopped replying to emails, saying hello when entering to a room, and stopped talking using forms of polite request. The scenario was accompanied by a visual ladder to provide an illustration of the hierarchical relationship between the participant and the requester, who was depicted as equidistantly lower (subordinate) or higher (manager) or equal (peer) on the ladder. This was to ensure that all participants had a comparable understanding of the requester's status.

After reading the scenario, participants completed a series of measures which we describe below.

## Materials

**Organizational structure manipulation check.** Participants responded to four manipulation check items that assessed participants' impressions of the level of hierarchy in the organizational setting of ABC (e.g., 'To what extent is the power unequally distributed between the seniors and the juniors at ABC?'; 1= *not at all* to 7= *very much so*;  $\alpha = .95$ ).

**Deviant status manipulation check.** Participants responded to two manipulation check items that probed impressions of relative rank vis-à-vis the deviant (1= *has much less power and influence than me* to 7= *has much more power and influence than me* and 1= *enjoys much less status and respect than me* to 7= *enjoys much more status and respect than me*;  $r(270) = .88, p < .001$ ).

**Discomfort caused by deviant behaviors.** ~~Discomfort, defined as unpleasant subjective state (similar to stress and anxiety), is an important outcome of deviant behaviors (Moon et al., 2018) that can subsequently impact on workplace related outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Hoel et al., 2003; Laschinger et al., 2009).~~ Participants

1  
2  
3  
4 indicated how uncomfortable this situation would make them feel using a 7-point scale  
5  
6 (“Please rate how uncomfortable this situation would make you feel”; 1= *not uncomfortable*  
7  
8 *at all* to 7= *very uncomfortable*).

11 **Acceptability of deviant behaviors.** Participants answered three questions using a 7-  
12  
13 point scale to indicate how acceptable, appropriate, and tolerable they considered the  
14  
15 deviant’s behaviors to be (e.g., “How acceptable/appropriate/tolerable it would be for this  
16  
17 person to behave in the ways indicated above?”; 1= *completely unacceptable / inappropriate*  
18  
19 */ intolerable* to 7= *perfectly acceptable / appropriate / tolerable*;  $\alpha = .92$ ).

22 **Job satisfaction.** A commonly used job satisfaction scale developed by Warr *et al.*  
23  
24 (1979) was employed to assess participants’ job satisfaction (see Heritage *et al.*, 2015) with  
25  
26 regard to 10 aspects of the organization (e.g. “the freedom to choose your own method of  
27  
28 working”; “your immediate boss”; “the amount of responsibility you are given”) (1=  
29  
30 *extremely dissatisfied*, 7= *extremely satisfied*). Responses were averaged to compute a Job  
31  
32 Satisfaction score ( $\alpha = .94$ ).

36 **Organizational commitment.** To keep the length of the questionnaire brief, we  
37  
38 selected three items from the 15-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ;  
39  
40 Mowday *et al.*, 1979): “I would be willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that  
41  
42 normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful”, “I would feel very  
43  
44 little loyalty to this organization”, and “It would take very little change in my circumstances  
45  
46 to cause me to leave this organization” (1= *completely disagree* to 7= *completely agree*;  $\alpha$   
47  
48 = .56).<sup>2</sup>

52 **Turnover intention.** Two items adopted from Randsley de Moura *et al.*’s (2009)  
53  
54 turnover intention scale were used to measure participants’ intention to leave the organization  
55  
56

---

58 <sup>2</sup> We included all three items in calculating the index for organizational commitment because the average inter-  
59 item correlation was .295.  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 (“I would be considering the possibility of leaving this organization”, and “If a similar job  
5 offer was on the table, I would consider to leave the organization” (1= *completely disagree* to  
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  
 $7 = \textit{completely agree}$ ,  $r_{SB}(270) = .90, p < .001$ ).

### Method: Study 2

In Study 2, we have replicated Study 1, slightly changing the methodology to address the hypothetical nature of Study 1. For Study 2, we recruited participants who were in employment and asked them to describe the organizational structure of the company in which they were employed. In this study, we focused on manager and subordinate conditions only due to the lack of differences between subordinate and peer conditions in Study 1 as will be described later. As in Study 1, participants read a vignette describing deviant behaviors exhibited by a colleague at their organization and indicated their reactions to these behaviors. We tested the same hypotheses as in Study 1.

### Participants and Design

A total of 230 participants were recruited online from the United States using Amazon Mechanical Turk<sup>®</sup>. The study was only available for participants who have not participated in the previous study. Six respondents were excluded for failing the attention check question. Based on the inter-raters' agreement of 1, we also excluded 24 respondents who did not clearly identify the structure of their organization as either vertical or horizontal in the description (e.g., ‘There is a hierarchy structure, but the subordinates have some input in decisions and much freedom to do their jobs’) or who did not provide valid responses to the question (e.g., ‘it is a construction company’). The remaining sample of 200 American participants was included in the analyses reported below ( $M_{age}=35.72$ ,  $SD_{age}=11.17$ ; 88 women; ethnic background: 68% White American, 10% White (other), 8% Asian American, 6% African American, 5% Hispanic, 2% Mixed, 1% Black (other), 1% Other, 1% Asian (other); current occupation status: 17% Professional, 14% Administrative, 14% Manager,

1  
2  
3  
4 12% Education, 12% Other, 11% Sales/Marketing, 11% Self-employed, 7% Trade/labor, 6%  
5  
6 Medical, the other occupation status represented in the sample each accounted for < 5% of  
7  
8 the sample).  
9

## 10 11 **Procedure**

12  
13 Participants were first asked to read two paragraphs that explained characteristics of a  
14  
15 vertical versus a horizontal organizational structure in the workplace (we used the same  
16  
17 descriptions employed in Study 1). Next, using these descriptions, participants were asked to  
18  
19 describe the organizational setting in which they were employed at that time and then to rate  
20  
21 five items assessing participants' perceived level of hierarchy in their organizational setting  
22  
23 (the same four items for the organizational structure manipulation check were used in Study 1  
24  
25 and 1 new item was added 'how would you classify the organization in terms of structure';  
26  
27 1= *completely vertical* to 7= *completely horizontal*). Next, participants were assigned  
28  
29 randomly to imagine themselves occupying the role of a manager or a subordinate in their  
30  
31 organization and read one of the two imaginary scenarios about a colleague in a manager or a  
32  
33 subordinate role requesting help with 'writing a proposal' due 'tomorrow' as in Study 1.  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 39 **Materials**

40  
41 **Manipulation check.** The same deviant status manipulation check was used as in  
42  
43 Study 1,  $r(198) = .90, p < .001$ .  
44

45  
46 **Dependent variables.** As in Study 1, participants responded to items assessing their  
47  
48 perceived organizational structure ( $\alpha = .87$ ), discomfort in the face of deviant behavior,  
49  
50 acceptability of deviant behaviors ( $\alpha = .91$ ), job satisfaction ( $\alpha = .92$ ), organizational  
51  
52 commitment ( $\alpha = .66$ ),<sup>3</sup> and turnover intentions [ $r_{SB}(198) = .91, p < .001$ ].  
53  
54

## 55 56 **Results and Discussion**

57  
58  
59 <sup>3</sup> Internal consistency of organizational commitment was slightly lower than .70. However, the average inter-  
60 item correlation was .393. Hence, we used all three items as a measurement for organizational commitment.

All ANOVAs reported below used organizational structure (horizontal vs. vertical) and deviant status (Study 1: manager vs. subordinate vs. peer; Study 2: peer condition was excluded) as independent variables unless indicated otherwise. We report the results of Studies 1 and 2 back-to-back unless indicated otherwise. Hypotheses and outcomes for Study 1 and Study 2 are summarized in Table 1. Table 2 presents the correlations between the study variables, and Table 3 displays descriptive statistics.

### Manipulation Checks and Preliminary Analysis

**Organizational structure.** In Study 1, a t-test with type of organizational structure (horizontal vs. vertical) as the independent variable and the composite perceived organizational culture measure as the outcome variable revealed that participants in the vertical condition perceived the organization to be more hierarchical ( $M=6.16$ ,  $SD=0.90$ ) than did participants in the horizontal condition ( $M=2.24$ ,  $SD=1.09$ ),  $t(270) = 32.38$ ,  $p < .001$ , Hedges'  $g = 3.94$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[3.68, 4.16]$ . Thus, our manipulation of organizational structure worked as expected.

**Perceived Organizational Structure.** In Study 2, we did not manipulate organizational structure, instead we measured participants' perceived organizational structure of their current organization. A t-test was conducted with participants' descriptions of their current organizational structure (coded 0= horizontal, 1= vertical) as the independent variable and the composite perceived verticality level of organizational structure as the outcome variable. The result revealed that participants who identified their organizational structure as being vertical indicated that their organization was more hierarchically structured ( $M=5.56$ ,  $SD=0.85$ ) than did participants who identified their organizational structure as being horizontal ( $M=3.18$ ,  $SD=0.89$ ),  $t(198) = -18.99$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-2.62, -2.13]$ , Hedges'  $g = 2.73$ . In addition, the mean scores for both vertical and horizontal organizational structures were significantly different from the scale midpoint ( $M_{vertical} > 4.0$ ,  $M_{horizontal} < 4.0$ ),

$t_{\text{vertical}}(119) = 19.97, p < .001, CI_{95\%}[1.40, 1.70]$ , and  $t_{\text{horizontal}}(79) = -8.29, p < .001, CI_{95\%}[-1.02, -0.63]$ .

**Deviant status.** In Study 1, an ANOVA with the manipulation check items concerning deviant status revealed a significant main effect of deviant status,  $F(1, 266) = 265.46, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .67$ , demonstrating that participants evaluated the manager as having more power and status ( $M=5.62, SD=1.05$ ) than the subordinate ( $M=2.47, SD=1.26; CI_{95\%} = 2.87$  to  $3.42$ ) or the peer ( $M=3.98, SD=.60; CI_{95\%}[1.37, 1.91]$ ). Participants also evaluated the peer as having more power and status than the subordinate ( $CI_{95\%}[1.24, 1.78]$ ).

In Study 2, participants evaluated the colleague in the manager condition as having more power and status ( $M=5.87, SD=0.81$ ) than the colleague in the subordinate condition ( $M=2.62, SD=1.31$ ),  $F(1, 196) = 473.46, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .71$ . The differentiation between the manager and the subordinate role was significant in both types of organizational structures, albeit more pronounced in the vertical organizational structure [ $F(1, 196) = 484.24, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .71$ ] than in the horizontal organizational structure [ $F(1, 196) = 102.70, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .34$ ], resulting in a significant interaction,  $F(1, 196) = 36.60, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .16$ . Thus, our manipulation of deviant status worked as expected in both studies.

### Dependent Variables (Hypotheses Testing)

**Discomfort caused by deviant behaviors (H1a and H1b).** The results of Study 1 revealed a significant main effect of deviant status,  $F(1, 266) = 4.34, p = .014, \eta_p^2 = .032$ ; participants reported that they would experience greater discomfort when confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by a manager compared with by a subordinate ( $p = .010; CI_{95\%} [0.13, 0.96]$ ) or a peer ( $p = .013; CI_{95\%}[0.11, 0.94]$ ), supporting our hypothesis (H1a). There was no difference in imagined discomfort between subordinate and peer conditions,  $p = .916$ . Other (main and interaction) effects were not significant,  $F(1, 266) = 0.36, p = .549$ , and  $F(1,$

266) = 0.75,  $p = .474$ , respectively. Therefore, H1b (deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect) was not supported.

Consistent with Study 1, the results of Study 2 revealed a significant main effect of deviant status,  $F(1, 196) = 14.15, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ; participants reported that they would experience greater discomfort if confronted with a deviant behavior displayed by a manager compared with by a subordinate, supporting H1a. There was no significant main effect of organizational structure,  $F(1, 196) = 1.44, p = .231$ , and no deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect,  $F(1, 196) = 2.82, p = .095, \eta_p^2 = .014$ . Therefore, once again, H1b was not supported.

**Acceptability of deviant behaviors (H2a and H2b).** In Study 1, the main effects of organizational structure,  $F(1, 266) = 1.18, p = .279$ , and deviant status,  $F(1, 266) = 0.74, p = .479$ , and the interaction effect between the two independent variables,  $F(1, 266) = 0.67, p = .514$ , were not significant. Thus, H2a and H2b were not supported and H5 was therefore not tested in Study 1. However, absolute scores for acceptability indicated that workplace deviance was perceived as unacceptable, regardless of the condition (the mean was below the scale midpoint (4.0);  $M = 2.06, SD = 1.26, t(271) = -25.43, p < .001, CI_{95\%}[-2.09, -1.79]$ ).

Unlike Study 1, Study 2 showed that the main effect of organizational structure was significant,  $F(1, 196) = 5.02, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .025$ , indicating that participants who reported working in a horizontally structured organization felt deviant behaviors to be more acceptable than did those working in a vertically structured organization. The main effect of deviant status (H2a was not supported),  $F(1, 196) = 0.94, p = .333$ , and the deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect (H2b was not supported),  $F(1, 196) = 2.25, p = .135, \eta_p^2 = .011$ , were not significant. As in Study 1, we found that the mean score for acceptability ( $M=2.30, SD=1.34$ ) was significantly lower than the scale midpoint (4.0),

1  
2  
3  
4 indicating that workplace deviance was perceived as unacceptable,  $t(199) = -17.99, p < .001,$   
5  
6  $CI_{95\%}[-1.89, -1.52].$   
7

8  
9 **Job satisfaction (H3a, H3b, and H4).** Study 1 revealed a significant main effect of  
10 organizational structure,  $F(1, 266) = 96.82, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .047$ ; participants who imagined  
11 working in the horizontal organizational structure reported higher job satisfaction than did  
12 participants who imagined working in the vertical organizational structure, supporting H3a.  
13  
14 The main effect of deviant status was also significant,  $F(1, 266) = 10.80, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$ ;  
15 participants reported lower job satisfaction when they imagined being confronted with  
16 deviant behaviors displayed by a manager compared to either by a subordinate ( $p < .001$ ;  
17  $CI_{95\%}[-0.95, -0.35]$ ) or a peer ( $p < .001$ ;  $CI_{95\%}[-0.86, -0.26]$ ); the difference between peer and  
18 subordinate conditions was not significant ( $p = .545, CI_{95\%}[-0.21, 0.39]$ ), supporting H3b  
19 (main effect of deviant status). The deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect  
20 was non-significant,  $F(1, 266) = 1.44, p = .239$ . Therefore, H4 was not supported.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 In Study 2, the main effect of deviant status was not significant,  $F(1, 196) = 0.12, p$   
35  $= .732$ , which did not support H3b. However, as expected (H3a), the main effect of  
36 organizational structure was significant,  $F(1, 196) = 9.21, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .045$ , indicating that  
37 job satisfaction was higher among those working in a horizontal organizational structure  
38 compared with to those working in a vertical organizational structure. Unlike Study 1, the  
39 interaction between organizational structure and deviant status was significant,  $F(1, 196) =$   
40  $5.43, p = .021, \eta_p^2 = .027$ . Further analysis revealed that participants working in a vertical  
41 organizational structure reported lower job satisfaction when they imagined being confronted  
42 with deviant behaviors displayed by the manager than did participants working in a  
43 horizontal organizational structure,  $F(1, 196) = 14.04, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .067$ ; this difference  
44 was not significant when the deviant was the subordinate,  $F(1, 196) = 0.26, p = .614$ . The  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

other simple effects were not significant,  $F_{\text{vertical}}(1, 196) = 2.47, p = .118, F_{\text{horizontal}}(1, 196) = 2.97, p = .086$ . Thus, H4 was supported for job satisfaction in Study 2 (cf. Figure 1).

**Organizational commitment (H3a, H3b, and H4).** In Study 1, the main effect of organizational structure was significant,  $F(1, 266) = 53.25, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .17$ ; participants who imagined working in the horizontal organizational structure reported higher commitment than did participants who imagined working in the vertical organizational structure, supporting H3a. As expected (H3b), the main effect of deviant status was also significant,  $F(1, 266) = 2.94, p = .055, \eta_p^2 = .022$ ; participants reported lower commitment when they imagined being confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by a manager compared to by a subordinate ( $p = .019$ ;  $CI_{95\%}[-0.77, -0.07]$ ), but not by a peer ( $p = .105$ ); there was no significant difference between peer and subordinate conditions,  $p = .45, CI_{95\%}[-0.22, 0.48]$ . The deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect was non-significant,  $F(1, 266) = 0.36, p = .698$ , and, therefore, H4 was not supported.

In Study 2, the main effects of deviant status and organizational structure were not significant,  $F(1, 196) = 0.13, p = .717, F(1, 196) = 4.40, p = .107$ , respectively. Thus, H3a and H3b were not supported. However, unlike Study 1, the interaction between organizational structure and deviant status was significant,  $F(1, 196) = 3.98, p = .047, \eta_p^2 = .020$ . Exploring the differences of organizational structure within each condition of deviant status revealed that participants working in a vertical organizational structure reported lower commitment when they imagined being confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by a manager than did participants working in a horizontal organizational structure,  $F(1, 196) = 5.54, p = .020, \eta_p^2 = .028$ ; this difference was not significant when the deviant was the subordinate,  $F(1, 196) = 0.20, p = .658$ . The other simple effects were not significant,  $F_{\text{vertical}}(1, 196) = 2.92, p = .089, F_{\text{horizontal}}(1, 196) = 1.39, p = .24$ . Thus, H4 was supported for organizational commitment in Study 2 (see Figure 2).

**Turnover intentions (H3a, H3b, and H4).** As predicted (H3a), Study 1 revealed a significant main effect of type of organizational structure,  $F(1, 266) = 61.02, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .19$ ; participants who imagined working in the vertical organizational structure reported higher turnover intention than did participants who imagined working in the horizontal organizational structure. The main effect of deviant status was also significant,  $F(1, 266) = 7.57, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ; participants reported higher turnover intention when confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by a manager compared to either by a subordinate ( $p = .002$ ;  $CI_{95\%}[0.26, 1.18]$ ) or a peer ( $p < .001$ ;  $CI_{95\%}[0.38, 1.29]$ ); there was no significant difference between peer and subordinate conditions ( $p = .626$ ), supporting H3b. The deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect was not significant,  $F(1, 266) = 1.35, p = .261$  (H4 was not supported).

In Study 2, the main effects of deviant status and organizational structure were not significant,  $F(1, 196) = 0.34, p = .562, F(1, 196) = 1.49, p = .224$ , respectively. Thus, H3a and H3b were not supported. However, unlike in Study 1, there was a significant deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect,  $F(1, 196) = 5.07, p = .025, \eta_p^2 = .025$ ; participants working in a vertical organizational structure reported higher turnover intention when they imagined being confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by the manager compared to the subordinate,  $F(1, 196) = 5.02, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .025$ ; this difference was absent among participants working in a horizontal organizational structure,  $F(1, 196) = 1.16, p = .283$ . Exploring the differences of organizational structure within each condition of deviant status revealed that participants working in a vertical organizational structure reported higher turnover intention when imagining being confronted with deviant behaviors displayed by the manager than did participants working in a horizontal organizational structure,  $F(1, 196) = 5.87, p = .016, \eta_p^2 = .029$ ; this difference was absent when the deviant

was the subordinate,  $F(1, 196) = 0.79, p = .779$ . Thus, H4 was supported for turnover intentions in Study 2 (see Figure 3).

### Mediation Analysis (Study 1: H5 and H6)

In Study 1, H5 was not tested because H2a and H2b were not supported. We also expected deviant status to predict turnover intentions mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and this relationship to be moderated by organizational structure (H6). As no interaction effects were found between deviant status and organizational structure, we did not test H6 directly. Instead, we conducted a mediation analysis separately for the two predictors (deviant status and organizational structure) for further exploration.

The above analyses revealed how our main dependent measures, *job satisfaction*, *commitment*, and *turnover intention*, were affected by deviant status (manager vs. subordinate; the peer condition was excluded in the mediation analysis because it was not always distinguished from the subordinate condition in the above analysis) and organizational structure (horizontal vs. vertical). Based on these findings, we sought to examine the possibility of an indirect effect of deviant status and organizational structure via job satisfaction and commitment on turnover intention ~~(these variables were negatively correlated with turnover intention (DV),  $r_{\text{job-satisfaction}(178)} = -.54, p < .001, r_{\text{commitment}(178)} = -.62, p < .001$ ).~~ Following the procedure outlined in Hayes (2013, model 4), we explored two mediation models (*model 1*: deviant status (IV: coded 0 = subordinate, 1 = manager), turnover intention (DV); *model 2*: organizational structure (IV: coded 0 = horizontal, 1 = vertical), turnover intention (DV), given the interaction between organizational structure and deviant status was not significant. All continuous variables were standardized prior to the analysis in order to obtain standardized coefficients (see Friedrich, 1982). We generated 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals using 10000 bootstrap samples.

In model 1, as shown before, deviant status had a strong effect on perceived job satisfaction,  $b = -.52$ ,  $SE = 0.15$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-0.81, -0.23]$ , as well as organizational commitment,  $b = -.31$ ,  $SE = 0.15$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-0.60, -0.02]$ . Controlling for the two mediators, the effect of deviant status on turnover intention was no longer significant,  $b = .13$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-0.10, 0.35]$  vs.  $b = .40$ ,  $SE = 0.15$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[0.11, 0.69]$ . As expected, deviant status had an indirect effect on turnover intention via job satisfaction,  $b = .13$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[0.05, 0.27]$  and organizational commitment,  $b = .14$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[0.02, 0.30]$  (see Figure 4). These results demonstrate that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment fully mediated the relationship between deviant status and turnover intention. Thus, when the deviant was a manager, job satisfaction and commitment were decreased, which subsequently was associated with a higher level of turnover intention.

In model 2, as shown before, organizational structure had a strong effect on perceived job satisfaction,  $b = -.98$ ,  $SE = 0.13$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-1.24, -0.72]$ , as well as perceived commitment,  $b = -.75$ ,  $SE = .14$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-1.02, -0.47]$ . Controlling for the two mediators, the effect of organizational structure on turnover intention was no longer significant,  $b = .15$ ,  $SE = 0.13$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[-0.11, 0.40]$  vs.  $b = .72$ ,  $SE = 0.14$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[0.44, 0.99]$ . As expected, organizational structure had an indirect effect on turnover intention via not only job satisfaction,  $b = .24$ ,  $SE = 0.09$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[0.07, 0.43]$  but also commitment,  $b = .34$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $CI_{95\%}[0.19, 0.52]$  (see Figure 5). Once again, these results demonstrate that both job satisfaction and commitment fully mediated the relationship between organizational structure and turnover intention. Thus, imagining oneself as working in a vertical organization was associated with decreased job satisfaction and commitment, and in turn with a higher level of turnover intention.

### Mediation Analysis (Study 2: H5 and H6)

The previous analyses of Study 2 showed differences in the extent to which deviant behaviors exhibited by a manager or a subordinate were found to be acceptable in horizontal

1  
2  
3  
4 or vertical organizational structures. We also found that deviant status had a *direct* effect on  
5  
6 the discomfort experienced by participants when exposed to deviant behaviors. Following  
7  
8 these findings, we explored the possibility of an *indirect* effect via acceptability of deviant  
9  
10 behaviors (H5). To do so, we performed a *moderated mediation* analysis following the  
11  
12 procedure outlined in Hayes (2013, model 7). Deviant status served as predictor variable (IV:  
13  
14 coded 0 = subordinate, 1 = manager) and discomfort served as outcome variable (DV). In our  
15  
16 model, the index denoting acceptability of deviant behaviors served as mediating variable,  
17  
18 whilst organizational structure (coded 0 = horizontal, 1 = vertical) moderated the relationship  
19  
20 between the IV and the DV, and the IV and the mediators.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Controlling for the mediator, the *direct* effect of deviant status on perceived  
26  
27 discomfort was significant regardless of organizational structure,  $t_{\text{deviant status}}(198) = 4.55, p$   
28  
29  $< .001, b = .86, SE = 0.19, CI_{95\%}[0.49, 1.23]$ . The main effect of organizational structure and  
30  
31 the interaction between organizational structure and deviant status on acceptability were not  
32  
33 significant, but the main effect of organizational structure was significant,  $t_{\text{deviant status}}(198) = -$   
34  
35  $2.68, p = .008, b = -.71, SE = 0.27, CI_{95\%}[-1.24, -0.19]$ . Acceptability emerged as the reliable  
36  
37 predictor of feelings of discomfort,  $t_{\text{acceptability}}(198) = -2.99, p = .003, b = -.21, SE = 0.07,$   
38  
39  $CI_{95\%}[-0.34, -0.07]$ , with greater (lower) acceptability predicting lower (higher) levels of  
40  
41 discomfort. Importantly, this analysis revealed that organizational structure moderated the  
42  
43 *indirect* effect of deviant status on perceived discomfort via acceptability. For those working  
44  
45 in a horizontal organizational structure, deviant status did not affect participants' levels of  
46  
47 discomfort,  $b = .02, SE = 0.07, CI_{95\%}[-0.12, 0.18]$ . In contrast, for those working in a vertical  
48  
49 organizational structure, a manager exhibiting deviant behaviors elicited lower discomfort  
50  
51 than a subordinate exhibiting deviant behaviors as the former was perceived to be more  
52  
53 acceptable than the latter,  $b = -.10, SE = 0.09, CI_{95\%}[-0.21, -0.01]$ . Thus, H5 was supported.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Next, we tested H6. The previous analyses also established differences in how deviant  
5  
6 behaviors exhibited by a manager and a subordinate affected *job satisfaction* and  
7  
8 *organizational commitment* in horizontal and vertical organizational structures. We  
9  
10 performed a moderated mediation analysis (Hayes, 2013; model 8) to examine if these  
11  
12 possible mediators can account for differences in the way participants working in a horizontal  
13  
14 or vertical organization reported *turnover intention* (DV) in response to being confronted  
15  
16 with deviant behaviors exhibited by manager versus subordinate deviants. ~~Before running this~~  
17  
18 ~~analysis, we first examined the correlation between DV and mediators. Job satisfaction and~~  
19  
20 ~~organizational commitment were negatively and significantly correlated with turnover~~  
21  
22 ~~intention,  $r_{\text{job satisfaction}(198)} = -.62, p < .001, r_{\text{commitment}(198)} = -.66, p < .001.$~~

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Controlling for the mediators, the main effects of organizational structure, deviant  
28  
29 status and the interaction between organizational structure and deviant status were not  
30  
31 significant, but job satisfaction,  $t(198) = -6.03, p < .001, b = -.57, SE = 0.09, CI_{95\%}[-0.76, -$   
32  
33  $0.38]$  and organizational commitment,  $t(198) = -7.33, p < .001, b = -.57, SE = 0.08, CI_{95\%}[-$   
34  
35  $0.72, -0.42]$  emerged as the reliable predictors of turnover intention, with greater (lower) job  
36  
37 satisfaction and organizational commitment predicting lower (higher) levels of turnover  
38  
39 intention. Importantly, this analysis revealed that deviant status moderated the *indirect* effect  
40  
41 of organizational structure on turnover intention via job satisfaction and organizational  
42  
43 commitment. When the deviant's status was lower, organizational structure did not affect  
44  
45 participants' turnover intention,  $b_{\text{job satisfaction}} = .07, SE = 0.14, CI_{95\%}[-0.21, 0.36]$ , and  
46  
47  $b_{\text{commitment}} = -.07, SE = 0.16, CI_{95\%}[-0.40, 0.24]$ . However, when the deviant's status was  
48  
49 higher, vertical organizational structure elicited higher turnover intentions compared with  
50  
51 horizontal organizational structure as the former elicited lower job satisfaction,  $b = .53, SE =$   
52  
53  $0.18, CI_{95\%}[0.23, 0.91]$ , and organizational commitment,  $b = .41, SE = 0.20, CI_{95\%}[0.04,$   
54  
55  $0.86]$ , than the latter (see Figure 6). Therefore, H6 was supported.

## General Discussion

Across two studies, we examined the role of deviant status and organizational structure on participants' responses to workplace deviance. Specifically, we were interested in employees' acceptability and discomfort when facing deviant behaviors and its impact on their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. We tested how those perceptions would be moderated by the deviant status (subordinate *vs.* manager) and by organizational structure (horizontal *vs.* vertical). As expected, the results revealed that both deviant status *and* organizational structure impact on perceptions of deviance and organizational outcome variables.

These studies provide evidence for the role of organizational structure in employees' interpretations regarding deviance in the workplace. Previous literature has shown that the formality and hierarchy of vertical organizations has a stronger negative impact compared with horizontal organizations where formal rules and hierarchy are less emphasized (e.g., Aryee *et al*, 2008). Study 1 results were consistent with these past findings with participants working in a vertically structured organization reporting lower levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and higher turnover intentions than those employed in a horizontally structured organization (H3a and H3b).

The role of deviant status was also important to understand how employees perceived workplace deviance. When facing workplace deviant behaviors displayed by a manager (*vs.* subordinate), participants reported lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and higher turnover intentions (Study 1). However, we did not observe a significant interaction effect between deviant status and organizational structure in Study 1. One potential reason for the lack of this interaction effect could be the hypothetical nature of the organizational structure; it is possible that the participants' own organizational experience might be buffered by the counter-hypothetical nature of organizational structure. For example, some participants

1  
2  
3  
4 may have felt that their organization was structured vertically (horizontally), but in the  
5  
6 experiment, they were allocated in the condition of a horizontally (vertically) structured  
7  
8 organization. To address this limitation, in Study 2, we relied on participants' own  
9  
10 organizational experience and their perceptions of the organization in which they were  
11  
12 employed to determine whether their experience was in line with a vertical or a horizontal  
13  
14 organizational structure. This study revealed that the organizational outcomes were affected  
15  
16 by the deviant status and its interaction with organizational structure.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Taken together, the results of Study 2 revealed that both organizational structure and  
22  
23 deviant status impact on workers' perceptions of deviance and shape the way they relate with  
24  
25 the organization. When facing deviance within the organization, participants working in a  
26  
27 vertically structured organization reported lower levels of job satisfaction, organizational  
28  
29 commitment, and higher turnover intentions than participants employed in a horizontally  
30  
31 structured organization, especially if the deviant occupies a higher hierarchical position (H4).  
32  
33 These results findings are consistent with previous research that found abusive supervision of  
34  
35 subordinates (downward) negatively affects organizational outcomes such as job dedication  
36  
37 and this relationship was stronger in a more vertically structured organization compared to a  
38  
39 horizontally structured one (Aryee *et al.*, 2008; see Hu and Liu, 2017 for a review).  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Furthermore, our research expands these findings by considering upward  
45  
46 mistreatment (from subordinate to manager). Specifically, we found that overall workplace  
47  
48 deviance is perceived as unacceptable, but compared with upward mistreatment, downward  
49  
50 mistreatment causes greater discomfort (H1a). Regardless of acceptability, there was still  
51  
52 negative consequences when facing workplace deviance, as participants reported lower job  
53  
54 satisfaction and organizational commitment, and higher turnover intentions. Consistent with  
55  
56 previous findings, the results showed that deviance within the workplace has a negative effect  
57  
58 on the relationship between the organization and the employee, namely by decreasing  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 employees' commitment to the organization and increasing their turnover intentions (e.g.  
5  
6 Pearson *et al.*, 2000). The fact that this impact was even more negative when the deviant  
7  
8 occupied a higher status position is also consistent with previous studies (e.g. Hershcovis and  
9  
10 Barling, 2010). Thus, our findings suggest more negative consequences for deviant leaders  
11  
12 compared to deviant members (i.e., subordinates and peers) within a group (Abrams *et al.*,  
13  
14 2013; Fiddick and Cummins, 2007; Karellaia and Keck, 2013; Pinto *et al.*, 2010). Our  
15  
16 findings from moderated mediation (H6) further confirmed that when the deviant's status was  
17  
18 higher (manager vs. subordinate), working in the vertical (vs. horizontal) organization is  
19  
20 associated with decreased job satisfaction and commitment, which results in a higher level of  
21  
22 turnover intention.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Importantly, we found that the downward (vs. upward) mistreatment path onto  
28  
29 discomfort was mediated by acceptability of deviant behaviors in the vertical organizational  
30  
31 structure only (H5; Study 2). These results are consistent with a recent study which has  
32  
33 demonstrated that individuals' perceptions of mistreatment by high and low status deviants  
34  
35 were affected by organizational context (see Moon *et al.*, 2018). Thus, the previous evidence  
36  
37 that individuals' reactions to deviance are different depending on the power and status held  
38  
39 by the deviant (e.g., Chekroun and Brauer, 2002; Porath *et al.*, 2008) can be extended by  
40  
41 considering the role of context, specifically the organizational structure. This result has  
42  
43 practical implications; they suggest that leaders may benefit from understanding how deviant  
44  
45 behavior is perceived according to the structure of the organization and the role of the  
46  
47 perpetrator. For example, it might be important for them to learn that the acceptability of  
48  
49 deviant behaviors differs according to the relative status of the deviants associated with  
50  
51 organizational contexts, as workplace deviance seems to be less unacceptable when displayed  
52  
53 by a leader than by an employee and when it occurs in a vertical organization. It is, however,  
54  
55 important to highlight that both downward and upward workplace deviances were not  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 perceived as permissible in both organizational structures. Hence, this practical possibility  
5  
6 should not be misused in the real world and professionals and officials should understand  
7  
8 cultural dynamics in organizational contexts.  
9

10  
11 In addition, this current research contributes to a growing body of research exploring  
12  
13 mistreatment in organizations by considering both upward and downward mistreatment.  
14  
15 Interest in downward mistreatment such as abusive supervision has mostly increased because  
16  
17 this trend might be caused by the fact that downward mistreatment is more commonly  
18  
19 observed compared to upward mistreatment in organizational contexts (cf. Cortina *et al.*,  
20  
21 2001; Lim and Lee, 2011; Tepper, 2007). However, downward mistreatment coexists in real  
22  
23 organizational life, but as the most serious type of deviant behavior (Black, 1976; cf., Cortina  
24  
25 and Magley, 2003). Thus, the present research is strengthened by testing both upward and  
26  
27 downward workplace deviance that can show the worker's psychology of how to react to  
28  
29 deviant behaviors that is directed from a colleague of higher (lower) status toward one of  
30  
31 lower (higher) status.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 In these studies, we have only focused on discomfort as a key emotional variable  
38  
39 because it may be implicated in workplace related outcomes such as job satisfaction and  
40  
41 turnover in response to subtle and blatant deviant behaviors in organizations (e.g., Hoel et al.,  
42  
43 2003; Laschinger et al., 2009; cf. Moon et al., 2018). However, it is important to note the  
44  
45 limitation to only that emotion because other emotions such as embarrassment, anger, fear  
46  
47 and sadness may also be experienced when faced with deviant behaviors in organizational  
48  
49 context (e.g., Hershcovis et al., 2017; Porath and Pearson, 2012). Also, the relationship  
50  
51 between individuals' normative reactions and organizational outcomes remains to be  
52  
53 investigated in future research. Future research should consider examining the role of specific  
54  
55 emotions to shed further light on employees' emotional reactions to workplace deviances in  
56  
57 hierarchical relationships. For example, based on the present findings, future research could  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 test the prediction that lower acceptability may lead to a sense of injustice and anger whereby  
5  
6 lower job satisfaction, commitment and higher turnover intention are occurred in horizontal  
7  
8 organizations. In contrast, in vertical organizations, decreased job satisfaction, commitment  
9  
10 and increased turnover intention may be caused by the influence of deviant status on  
11  
12 employees' self-efficacy, fear and frustration because it may be harder to escape or change a  
13  
14 high-status deviant's behavior than a low-status deviant's behavior.  
15  
16  
17

18 Finally, it would be interesting if future research would consider other factors that can  
19 impact on employee's turnover intention. For example, it would be interesting to consider the  
20 broader impact of personality and individual differences and their relationship to social  
21 context (i.e., organizational structure), as there is some evidence that employees' turnover  
22 intentions are associated with personality traits and job embeddedness (e.g., Albrecht and  
23 Marty, 2020; Hussain and Deery, 2018).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 **Conclusion**

33  
34 In conclusion, employee mistreatment has been treated as an important topic in  
35 organizational research. Yet more evidence for this topic is still required to understand it fully  
36 because employee mistreatment is associated with various social and contextual factors.  
37  
38 Thus, the present work focused on the impact that deviant status has different effects in  
39 different organizational structures regarding employee's deviant behaviors. Although,  
40 previous research has shown that negative organizational outcomes such as job dedication  
41 triggered by abusive supervision are associated with vertical organizational structures, not  
42 horizontal structures (e.g., Ayree *et al.*, 2008), this work did not consider the dynamics of  
43 deviant status. Importantly, our present research expanded these findings by examining the  
44 role of organizational structure and deviant status on worker's reactions in response to  
45 deviant behaviors, by considering both directions of deviance (upward and downward).  
46  
47 Furthermore, we revealed that subordinates' level of discomfort decreased due to the higher  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 level of acceptability for their manager's deviant behaviors when they are working in the  
5  
6 vertical (vs. horizontal) organizational structure. Thus, our findings contribute to the  
7  
8 understanding of the psychology of employees in relation to employee mistreatment, by  
9  
10 simultaneously considering the dynamics and effects of organizational structure and deviant  
11  
12 status.  
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

## References

- Abrams, D. and Randsley de Moura, G. (2001). "Organizational identification: Psychological anchorage and turnover", in Hogg, M. A. and Terry, D. (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts*, Psychology Press, Philadelphia, pp. 131-147.
- Abrams, D., Randsley de Moura, G. and Travaglino, G. A. (2013). "A double standard when group members behave badly: Transgression credit to ingroup leaders", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 105 No. 5, pp. 799-815.
- Abrams, D., Travaglino, G. A., Randsley de Moura, G. and May, P. J. (2014). "A step too far? Leader racism inhibits transgression credit", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 7, pp. 730-735.
- Albrecht, S. L. and Marty, A. (2020). "Personality, self-efficacy and job resources and their associations with employee engagement, affective commitment and turnover intentions", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 657-681.
- Ambrose, M. L. and Schminke, M. (2003). "Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 2, pp. 295-305.
- Anderson, C. and Brion, S. (2014). "Perspectives on Power in Organizations. Perspectives on Power in Organizations", *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 67-97.
- Andersson, L. M. and Pearson, C. M. (1999). "Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 452-471.
- Aryee, S., Sun, L. Y., Chen, Z. X. G. and Debrah, Y. A. (2008). "Abusive supervision and contextual performance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating

- 1  
2  
3  
4 role of work unit structure”, *Management and Organization Review*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp.  
5  
6 393-411.  
7  
8  
9 Bargh, J. A., Raymond, P., Pryor, J. B. and Strack, F. (1995). “Attractiveness of the  
10  
11 underling: An automatic power→ sex association and its consequences for sexual  
12  
13 harassment and aggression”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68 No.  
14  
15 5, pp. 768-781.  
16  
17  
18 Barnes, C. M., Lucianetti, L., Bhave, D. P. and Christian, M. S. (2015). ““You wouldn’t like  
19  
20 me when I’m sleepy”: Leaders’ sleep, daily abusive supervision, and work unit  
21  
22 engagement”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 58 No. 5, pp. 1419-1437.  
23  
24  
25 Burns, T. and Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. Tavistock Publications,  
26  
27 London.  
28  
29  
30 Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T. and Gosling, S. D. (2011). “Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new  
31  
32 source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data?”, *Perspectives on Psychological*  
33  
34 *Science*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 3-5.  
35  
36  
37 Campbell, S. L., Fowles, E. R. and Weber, B. J. (2004). “Organizational structure and job  
38  
39 satisfaction in public health nursing” *Public Health Nursing*, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 564-571.  
40  
41  
42 Chekroun, P. and Brauer, M. (2002). “The bystander effect and social control behavior: The  
43  
44 effect of the presence of others on people's reactions to norm violations”, *European*  
45  
46 *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 853-867.  
47  
48  
49 Chen, C. J. and Huang, J. W. (2007). “How organizational climate and structure affect  
50  
51 knowledge management—The social interaction perspective”, *International Journal of*  
52  
53 *Information Management*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 104-118.  
54  
55  
56 Cortina, L. M. and Magley, V. J. (2003). “Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following  
57  
58 interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace”, *Journal of Occupational Health*  
59  
60 *Psychology*, Vol 8 No 4, pp. 247-265.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H. and Langhout, R. D. (2001). "Incivility in the  
5 workplace: incidence and impact", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 6  
6  
7  
8  
9 No. 1, pp. 64-80.
- 10  
11 Dubois, D., Rucker, D. D. and Galinsky, A. D. (2015). "Social class, power, and selfishness:  
12  
13 When and why upper and lower class individuals behave unethically", *Journal of*  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 ~~Emerson, R. M. (1962). "Power-dependence relations", *American Sociological Review*, Vol.~~  
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
- Fast, N. J. and Chen, S. (2009). "When the boss feels inadequate Power, incompetence, and  
aggression", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 20 No. 11, pp. 1406-1413.
- Fiddick, L. and Cummins, D. (2007). "Are perceptions of fairness relationship-specific? The  
case of noblesse oblige", *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, Vol. 60  
No. 1, pp. 16-31.
- Fiske, S. T. (1993). "Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping",  
*American Psychologist*, Vol. 48 No. 6, pp. 621-628.
- Fiske, S. T. (2010). "Interpersonal stratification: Status, power, and subordination", In Fiske,  
S. T., Gilbert, D. T. and Lindzey, G. (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed.),  
Wiley, New York, NY, pp. 941-982.
- Flynn, F. J., Gruenfeld, D., Molm, L. D. and Polzer, J. T. (2011). "Social psychological  
perspectives on power in organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 56 No.  
4, pp. 495-500.
- Fragale, A. R., Overbeck, J. R. and Neale, M. A. (2011). "Resources versus respect: Social  
judgments based on targets' power and status positions", *Journal of Experimental*  
*Social Psychology*, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 767-775.

1  
2  
3  
4 French, J. and Raven, B. (1959). "The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright", In  
5  
6 Cartwright, D. (Ed.), *Studies in social power*, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor,  
7  
8 MI, pp. 150–167.

9  
10  
11 Ganster, D. C. and Rosen, C. C. (2013). "Work stress and employee health: A  
12  
13 multidisciplinary review", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 1085-1122.

14  
15  
16 Georgesesen, J. C. and Harris, M. J. (1998). "Why's my boss always holding me down? A  
17  
18 meta-analysis of power effects on performance evaluations", *Personality and Social*  
19  
20 *Psychology Review*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 184-195.

21  
22  
23 Georgesesen, J. and Harris, M. J. (2006). "Holding onto power: Effects of powerholders'  
24  
25 positional instability and expectancies on interactions with subordinates", *European*  
26  
27 *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 451-468.

28  
29  
30 Günsoy, C. (2019). "Rude bosses versus rude subordinates: How we respond to them depends  
31  
32 on our cultural background", *International Journal of Conflict Management*,  
33  
34 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-01-2019-0012>

35  
36  
37 Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2010). "A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with  
38  
39 burnout, demands, resources and consequences", In Bakker, A. and Leiter, M. P. (Eds.),  
40  
41 *Work engagement: Recent developments in theory and research*, Routledge, London, pp.  
42  
43 102-117.

44  
45  
46 Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A. and Roth, P. L. (2006). "How important are job attitudes?  
47  
48 Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time  
49  
50 sequences", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 305-325.

51  
52  
53 Harter J. and Adkins, A. (2015). "Employees want more from their managers", Available at:  
54  
55 [www.gallup.com/workplace/236570/employees-lot-managers.aspx](http://www.gallup.com/workplace/236570/employees-lot-managers.aspx) (Accessed 05  
56  
57 December 2019).

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process*  
5  
6 *analysis: A regression-based approach*, Guilford Press, New York, NY.  
7  
8  
9 Heritage, B., Pollock, C. and Roberts, L. D. (2015). "Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Warr,  
10  
11 Cook, and Wall's (1979) Job Satisfaction Scale", *Australian Psychologist*, Vol. 50 No. 2,  
12  
13 pp. 122-129.  
14  
15  
16 Herrera, T. (2018). "Ghosts, seagulls, and incompetents: How to deal with bad bosses",  
17  
18 Available at: [https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/06/smarter-living/how-to-deal-with-a-](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/06/smarter-living/how-to-deal-with-a-bad-boss.html)  
19  
20 [bad-boss.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/06/smarter-living/how-to-deal-with-a-bad-boss.html) (Accessed 05 December 2019).  
21  
22  
23 Hershcovis, M. S. and Barling, J. (2010). "Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace  
24  
25 aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators", *Journal of*  
26  
27 *Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 24-44.  
28  
29  
30 Hershcovis, M. S., Ogunfowora, B., Reich, T. C. and Christie, A. M. (2017). "Targeted  
31  
32 workplace incivility: The roles of belongingness, embarrassment, and power", *Journal of*  
33  
34 *Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 38 No. 7, pp. 1057-1075.  
35  
36  
37 Hoel, H., Einarsen, S. and Cooper, C. L. (2003). "Organizational effects of bullying", In  
38  
39 Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C.L. (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse*  
40  
41 *in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*, Taylor &  
42  
43 Francis, London, pp. 145-161.  
44  
45  
46 Hogg, M. A. and Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of*  
47  
48 *intergroup relations and group processes*. Routledge, London.  
49  
50  
51 Hollander, E. P. (1992). "Leadership, followership, self, and others", *The Leadership*  
52  
53 *Quarterly*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 43-54.  
54  
55 ~~Hollander, E. P., and Julian, J. W. (1969). "Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership~~  
56  
57 ~~processes", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 71 No. 5, pp. 387-397.~~  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Hu, L., and Liu, Y. (2017). "Abuse for status: A social dominance perspective of abusive  
5 supervision". *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 27 No. 2, 328-337.  
6  
7  
8  
9 Hussain, T. and Deery, S. (2018). "Why do self-initiated expatriates quit their jobs: The role  
10 of job embeddedness and shocks in explaining turnover intentions", *International  
11 Business Review*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 281-288.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Karelaia, N. and Keck, S. (2013). "When deviant leaders are punished more than non-leaders:  
17 The role of deviance severity", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 49 No.  
18 5, pp. 783-796.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H. and Anderson, C. (2003). "Power, approach, and inhibition",  
24 *Psychological Review*, Vol. 110 No. 2, pp. 265-284.  
25  
26  
27  
28 Kipnis, D. (1972). "Does power corrupt?", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
29 Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 33-41.  
30  
31  
32  
33 Lammers, J., Stapel, D. A. and Galinsky, A. D. (2010). "Power increases hypocrisy  
34 moralizing in reasoning, immorality in behavior", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 21 No.  
35 5, pp. 737-744.  
36  
37  
38  
39 Laschinger, H. K., Leiter, M., Day, A. and Gilin, D. (2009). "Workplace empowerment,  
40 incivility, and burnout: Impact on staff nurse recruitment and retention outcomes",  
41 *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 302-311.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Li, Y., Wang, Z., Yang, L. Q. and Liu, S. (2016). "The crossover of psychological distress  
47 from leaders to subordinates in teams: The role of abusive supervision, psychological  
48 capital, and team performance", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 21  
49 No. 2, pp.142-153.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 Magee, J. C. and Galinsky, A. D. (2008). "Social Hierarchy: The Self-Reinforcing Nature of  
5 Power and Status", *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 351-398.

6  
7  
8  
9 Maner, J. K. and Mead, N. L. (2010). "The essential tension between leadership and power:  
10 When leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest", *Journal of Personality  
11 and Social Psychology*, Vol. 99 No. 3, pp. 482-497.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y. and Leyens, J. (1988). "The "black sheep effect": Extremity  
17 of judgments towards ingroup members as a function of group identification",  
18  
19  
20  
21 *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 1-16.

22  
23 ~~Messé, L. A., Kerr, N. L. and Sattler, D. N. (1992). "But some animals are more equal than  
24 others": The supervisor as a privileged status in group contexts", In Worchel, S., Wood,  
25 W. and Simpson, J. A. (Eds.), *Group processes and productivity*, Sage, Newbury Park,  
26 CA, pp. 203-222.~~

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Messick, D. M., Wilke, H., Brewer, M. B., Kramer, R. M., Zemke, P. E. and Lui, L. (1983).  
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  
~~"Individual adaptations and structural change as solutions to social dilemmas", *Journal  
of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 294-309.~~

61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

43 Moon, C., Weick, M. and Uskul, A. K. (2018). "Cultural variation in individuals' responses  
44 to incivility by perpetrators of different rank: The mediating role of descriptive and  
45 injunctive norms", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 472-489.

50 Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M. and Porter, L. W. (1979). "The measurement of organizational  
51 commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 224-247.

55 Olekalns, M., Horan, C. J. and Smith, P. L. (2014). "Maybe it's right, maybe it's wrong:  
56 Structural and social determinants of deception in negotiation", *Journal of Business  
57 Ethics*, Vol. 122 No. 1, pp. 89-102.


- Oore, G. D., Leblanc, D., Day, A., Leiter, M. P., Spence Laschinger, H. K., Price, S. L., and Latimer, M. (2010). "When respect deteriorates: Incivility as a moderator of the stressor-strain relationship among hospital workers", *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol. 18 No. 8, pp. 878-888.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M. and Porath, C. L. (2000). "Assessing and attacking workplace incivility", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 123-137.
- Pinto, I. R., Marques, J. M., Levine, J. M. and Abrams, D. (2010). "Membership status and subjective group dynamics: Who triggers the black sheep effect?", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 99 No. 1, pp. 107-119.
- Porath, C. L. and Erez, A. (2009). "Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 109 No. 1, pp. 29-44.
- Porath, C. L. and Erez, A. (2007). "Does rudeness matter? The effects of rude behavior on task performance and helpfulness", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 1181-1197.
- Porath, C. L., Overbeck, J. R. and Pearson, C. M. (2008). "Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 38 No. 7, pp. 1945-1980.
- Porath, C. L. and Pearson, C. M. (2012). "Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. S1, pp. 326-357.
- Rahman, M. and Zanzi, A. (1995). "A comparison of organizational structure, job stress, and satisfaction in audit and management advisory services (MAS) in CPA firms", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 290-305.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Randsley de Moura, G. and Abrams, D. (2013). "Bribery, blackmail, and the double standard  
5  
6 for leader transgressions", *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Vol. 17  
7  
8 No. 1, pp. 43-52.
- 9  
10  
11 Randsley de Moura, G., Abrams, D., Retter, C., Gunnarsdottir, S. and Ando, K. (2009).  
12  
13 "Identification as an organizational anchor: How identification and job satisfaction  
14  
15 combine to predict turnover intention", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.  
16  
17 39 No. 4, pp. 540-557.
- 18  
19  
20 Shapiro, D. L., Boss, A. D., Salas, S., Tangirala, S. and Von Glinow, M. A. (2011). "When  
21  
22 are transgressing leaders punitively judged? An empirical test", *Journal of Applied*  
23  
24 *Psychology*, Vol. 96 No. 2, pp. 412-422.
- 25  
26  
27 Skarlicki, D. P. and Folger, R. (1997). "Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of  
28  
29 distributive, procedural, and interactional justice", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.  
30  
31 82 No. 3, pp. 434-443.
- 32  
33  
34 Slevin, D. P. and Covin, J. G. (1997). "Strategy formation patterns, performance, and the  
35  
36 significance of context", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 189-209.
- 37  
38  
39 Tepper, B. J. (2000). "Consequences of abusive supervision", *Academy of Management*  
40  
41 *Journal*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 178-190.
- 42  
43  
44 Tepper, B. J. (2007). "Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and  
45  
46 research agenda", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 261-289.
- 47  
48  
49 Topolinski, S. and Strack, F. (2015). "Corrugator activity confirms immediate negative affect  
50  
51 in surprise", *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 6, No. 134, pp. 1-8.
- 52  
53  
54 Triandis, H. C. and Gelfand, M. J. (1998). "Converging measurement of horizontal and  
55  
56 vertical individualism and collectivism", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
57  
58 Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 118-128.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Wahrman, R. (1970). "High status, deviance and sanctions", *Sociometry*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp.  
5  
6 485-504.  
7


8  
9 Yap, A. J., Wazlawek, A. S., Lucas, B. J., Cuddy, A. J. and Carney, D. R. (2013). "The  
10  
11 ergonomics of dishonesty the effect of incidental posture on stealing, cheating, and  
12  
13 traffic violations", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 24 No. 11, pp. 2281-2289.  
14

15  
16 Yzerbyt, V., Castano, E., Leyens, J. P. and Paladino, M. P. (2000). "The primacy of the  
17  
18 ingroup: The interplay of entitativity and identification", *European Review of Social*  
19  
20 *Psychology*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 257-295.  
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.* Organizational Structure x Deviant Status interaction for Job satisfaction (Study 2).

Error bars represent standard error.



*Figure 2.* Organizational Structure x Deviant Status interaction for Organizational Commitment (Study 2). Error bars represent standard error.




Figure 3. Organizational Structure x Deviant Status interaction for Turnover Intentions (Study 2). Error bars represent standard error.




Figure 4. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as mediators of the relationship between deviant status and turnover intention (Study 1). Total direct effect shown in parentheses.

\*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ .



Figure 5. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as mediators of the relationship between organizational structure and turnover intention (Study 1). Total direct effect shown in parentheses.

\*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .




Figure 6. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment as mediators of the relationship between deviant status x organizational structure and discomfort caused by deviant behaviors (Study 2). Total direct effect shown in parentheses.

\*\*\* $p < .001$ , \* $p < .05$ .

Table 1. *Summary of the Hypotheses in Studies 1 and 2, as well as the indication of whether they were supported or not.*

	Hypotheses	Supported in Study 1 (Yes/No)	Supported in Study 2 (Yes/No)
H1a	Workplace deviance displayed by managers will lead participants to experience more discomfort than workplace deviance displayed by a lower (subordinate) or equal (peer; Study 1 only) status deviant. [main effect of deviant status]	Yes	Yes
H1b	This effect will be stronger in horizontally structured organizations than in vertically structured organizations. [deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect]	No	No
H2a	Acceptability of deviant behavior from managers will be greater than from subordinates or peers (Study 1 only) [main effect of deviant status]	No	No
H2b	Workplace deviance will be judged as more acceptable in the vertical (vs. horizontal) organization structure condition associated with deviant status. [deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect]	No	No
H3a	Lower levels of job satisfaction, less organizational commitment and higher turnover intentions will be reported by participants in the vertical (vs. horizontal) organization structure. [main effect of organizational structure]	Yes	No
H3b	Lower levels of job satisfaction, less organizational commitment and higher turnover intentions will be reported by participants when the workplace deviant behavior is displayed by a manager (vs. subordinate or peer). [main effect of deviant status]	Yes	No
H4	A deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect is also expected in relation to workplace related outcomes, such that participants will report less job satisfaction, less organizational commitment and higher turnover intentions when the deviant is a manager, especially in the vertical structure compared to the horizontal structure. [deviant status x organizational structure interaction effect]	No	Yes
H5	Acceptability of deviant behavior will mediate the relationship between deviant status and discomfort, and this indirect path will be moderated by type of organizational structure. [Moderated mediation]	No	Yes
H6	Job satisfaction and organizational commitment will mediate the relationship between deviant status x organizational structure interaction and turnover intentions. [Moderated mediation]	No	Yes

Table 2.

*Intercorrelations, means, and standard deviations for study variables used in Study 1 and 2*

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Study 1							
1. Manipulation Check (OS)	—						
2. Manipulation Check (DS)	-.01	—					
3. Discomfort caused by deviant behavior	-.02	.19**	—				
4. Acceptability of deviant behavior	.03	.18**	-.32**	—			
5. Job satisfaction	-.47**	-.17**	-.08	-.02	—		
6. Organizational commitment	-.46**	-.09	-.00	-.16*	.60**	—	
7. Turnover intention	.48**	.17	.01	.15*	-.60**	-.66**	—
<i>M</i>	4.21	4.02	5.56	2.06	4.86	4.45	3.99
<i>SD</i>	2.20	1.63	1.42	1.26	1.21	1.30	1.76
Study 2							
1. Manipulation Check (DS)	—						
2. Perceived organizational structure	-.00	—					
3. Discomfort caused by deviant behavior	.30**	.06	—				
4. Acceptability of deviant behavior	.25**	-.04	-.18*	—			
5. Job satisfaction	-.09	-.36**	.01	-.05	—		
6. Organizational commitment	-.07	-.24**	.06	-.11	.60**	—	
7. Turnover intention	.11	.23**	.06	.07	-.62**	-.66**	—
<i>M</i>	4.24	4.60	5.52	2.30	4.90	4.33	4.03
<i>SD</i>	1.96	1.45	1.41	1.34	1.24	1.47	1.90

*Note.* Manipulation Check (OS) = Organizational Structure; Manipulation Check (DS) = Deviant Status

\*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ .

Table 3.  
Means (Standard Deviations) for the Dependent measures per condition (Study 1 and 2).

	Deviant Status	Organizational Structure	Discomfort	Acceptability	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	Turnover Intention
Study 1	Manager	Vertical	5.86 (1.68)	1.96 (1.20)	3.74 (1.03)	3.70 (1.12)	5.16 (1.38)
		Horizontal	5.96 (1.02)	2.30 (1.53)	5.18 (1.10)	4.74 (1.44)	3.83 (1.45)
		Total	5.91 (1.37)	2.14 (1.38)	4.49 (1.28)	4.24 (1.39)	4.47 (1.73)
	Peer	Vertical	5.46 (1.63)	2.01 (1.19)	4.38 (1.22)	3.90 (1.25)	4.62 (1.52)
		Horizontal	5.31 (1.22)	2.25 (1.17)	5.65 (0.69)	5.11 (1.11)	2.70 (1.45)
		Total	5.39 (1.45)	2.12 (1.18)	4.96 (1.19)	4.45 (1.33)	3.75 (1.76)
	Subordinate	Vertical	5.18 (1.45)	1.97 (1.34)	4.64 (1.07)	4.18 (1.08)	4.38 (1.50)
		Horizontal	5.54 (1.33)	1.89 (1.07)	5.57 (0.84)	5.10 (1.07)	3.17 (1.70)
		Total	5.37 (1.39)	1.93 (1.20)	5.12 (1.07)	4.65 (1.16)	3.76 (1.70)
	Total	Vertical	5.50 (1.61)	1.98 (1.24)	4.26 (1.17)	3.93 (1.17)	4.71 (1.50)
		Horizontal	5.61 (1.22)	2.14 (1.28)	5.46 (0.92)	4.98 (1.22)	3.26 (1.71)
		Total	5.56 (1.42)	2.06 (1.26)	4.85 (1.21)	4.45 (1.30)	3.99 (1.76)
Study 2	Manager	Vertical	6.13 (0.87)	2.35 (1.32)	4.53 (1.18)	4.00 (1.43)	4.52 (1.91)
		Horizontal	5.57 (1.28)	2.50 (1.46)	5.47 (1.18)	4.71 (1.61)	3.58 (1.77)
		Total	5.92 (1.07)	2.41 (1.37)	4.88 (1.26)	4.26 (1.53)	4.18 (1.90)
	Subordinate	Vertical	5.16 (1.17)	1.88 (1.07)	4.88 (1.29)	4.46 (1.56)	3.75 (1.99)
		Horizontal	5.07 (1.84)	2.60 (1.47)	5.00 (1.23)	4.33 (1.19)	4.04 (1.77)
		Total	5.11 (1.58)	2.19 (1.30)	4.93 (1.22)	4.40 (1.41)	3.88 (1.89)
	Total	Vertical	5.35 (1.23)	2.13 (1.23)	4.70 (1.24)	4.22 (1.51)	4.16 (1.98)
		Horizontal	5.63 (1.51)	2.55 (1.46)	5.22 (1.17)	4.50 (1.41)	3.73 (1.77)
		Total	5.52 (1.41)	2.30 (1.34)	4.90 (1.23)	4.33 (1.47)	4.03 (1.90)