A Mediator Role of Perceived Organizational Support in Workplace Deviance Behaviors, Organizational Citizenship and Job Satisfaction Relations: A Survey Conducted With Artificial Neural Network

Kürşad Zorlu^{ai} Canan Baştemur^b

^aAssociate Prof.Dr. Ahi Evran University, Kirsehir, Turkey

^bVisiting Professor University of South Carolina, Columbia, USA

Abstract

The aim of the research is to estimate the effect of workplace deviance behavior on organizational citizenship and job satisfaction and to put forward the mediator role of the organizational support perception in possible relations. The information based on hypothetical and literature are provided in the research principally and then the research part including the questionnaire applied to the employees of Kirsehir Municipality is presented. The validity and reliability tests have been performed successfully and the artificial neural network method has been used as the analysis method. In parallel with the averages and correlation values of the variables in the analysis the Artificial Neural Networks have been modelled by determining the inputs and outputs. In accordance with the findings obtained the workplace deviance behavior has a negative impact on the organizational citizenship and job satisfaction and the organizational support perception can take the mediator role as a relative for eliminating the abovementioned effect. When the artificial neural networks' being used as the analysis method and the difficulties in measuring the workplace deviance behavior are taken into consideration it can be stated that the findings obtained have at a certain level of originality in terms of management discipline.

Keywords: Organizational Deviance, Organizational Citizenship, Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, Artificial Neural Network.

JEL: B 25, D03, D23

© 2014 Published by SSBFNET

ⁱ Associate Prof.Dr. Ahi Evran University, 40 200, Kirsehir, Turkey. (0386) 211 4250

1. Introduction

Enhancing organizational life, ensuring success continuity and improving employee's performance levels are research topics that have been getting importance day by day. In this context, not only positive behavioral variables in the working place should be examined, but also negative behavioral variables in order to carry today's organizations into the future on the basis of efficiency and productivity. According to research, seventy-one percent of employees have been exposed to rude behaviors and twenty-four percent of women employees have been harassed in five years (Ferris, Brown & Heller, 2009: 279). Similar research shows us an increase of forty percent of robbery and abuse victims in working places between 2005 and 2007. According to Bourke (1994), the economic price of these behaviors is 10 dollars each and a total of 120 billion dollars lost for all organizations (Dunlop & Lee, 2004: 69). In regards to Murphy's assumption (1993), employees lost motivation because of these behavioral deviations in workplaces. It is also mentioned that 200 million dollars of financial loss in the USA and 600 million dollars of financial loss in England occurred in the public sector (Harris & Ogbonna, 2006: 543; Taylor, 2007). Therefore, workplace deviance behaviors, which have a negative effect on motivation, morale, welfare and the perception of employees, have been researched more recently (Lian, Ferris & Brown, 2012: 117). Despite this, workplace deviance behaviors can be held as an essential variance. Because this field is so sensitive, there is a little field research (İqbal, Arif & Badar, 2012: 2129).

Workplace deviance behaviors are defined as behaviors that threaten organizations and employees by intentionally breaking the positive rules in organizations. These negative behaviors can be insults, discrimination, lies, and rudeness, leaving work without permission, making work slow, and not taking care of the workplace.

The subject of deviance behaviors is very important for organizations and it has relative effects on the variables of efficiency, quality, productivity, organizational success, job satisfaction, and loyalty. It has already been specified to what extent the impacts of workplace deviance behaviors has on employees' organizational citizenship perception and that the levels of job satisfaction are very important research subjects, however there are some difficulties in context to empirical studies. Job satisfaction, defined as employees' negative or positive emotional reactions to their job, their workplace, service and encountered behaviors, can increase organizational citizenship level and also the will of obeying the rules of employees. Organizational citizenship can be defined as the extra efforts of employees, except for given formal and obligatory duties at work. It will be best for this article to determine how organizational support factors have a role on the possible effects of workplace deviance behaviors. Employees have different expectancies from organizations than do organizations have from the employees. Fulfilling these expectancies mutually makes the organization more peaceful. It is possible to avoid negative behaviors in workplace with employees supported by the decisions and the implications of employers (Ozdevecioglu, 2004: 97).

In this study, the authors' aim is to determine the effects of workplace deviance behaviors on organizational citizenship and job satisfaction and to examine the mediator role of perceived organizational support factor. In the research, workplace deviance behaviors are approached with regards to employees. Firstly, conceptual information

related to variables is given, then findings are analyzed with a new method in Management and Organization known as Artificial Neural Networks (ANN).

2. Literature Review

Not obeying the rules intentionally in workplaces has negative effects on both individual and social levels. So research has begun on the relationships between these behavioral deviances and organizational citizenship. In previous research, there was a meaningful relationship between employees' behavior deviances and organizational citizenship levels (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010; Bowling, 2010; Yen & Teng, 2012). Workplace deviance behaviors have negative effects on success and general activities of the organization. In the research on food organizations by Dunlop and Lee (2004) negative relationships between organizational citizenship and workplace deviance behaviors were proved (both WDBI and WDBO).

In literature reviews, it has been found that there was a positive relationship between perceived organizational support, organizational citizenship and job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Chiang & Hsieh, 2012). However, there was a negative relationship between workplace deviance behaviors, job satisfaction and organizational support perception (Ferris, Brown & Heller, 2009; Lan, Ferris & Brown, 2012). Unhappiness, unwillingness and dissatisfaction in work life, affected negatively the lives of employees. This situation can occur to breakdown friendships and to create deviance behaviors. Moreover, deviance behaviors have negative effects on all members of organizations (Demir & Türüncü, 2010: 67).

Liao, Joshi and Chuang (2004) showed that there is no strong relationship between personality types, loyalty, organizational support and workplace deviance behaviors (both two dimensions). Organizational support perception can be antecedents of many organizational behaviors as a variable (Turunc & Celik, 2010: 212).

2.1 Workplace Deviance Behaviors

Workplace Deviance Behaviors consist of negative behaviors resulting in members of organization deliberately violating organizational norms and non-formal rules (Ferris, Brown & Heller, 2009: 280). According to another definition, it is defined as acts:

Omitted by organizational members that have, or are intended to have, the effect of damaging coworkers, managers or the organization itself (Vardi & Wiener, 1996: 153). Organizational deviance behaviors can be evaluated as intentional behaviors that employees showed to restrain general operation and organizational activities (Lawrence & Robinson, 2007: 379). According to Robinson and Bennet (1995), workplace deviance behaviors are evaluated as a factor that threatens the future of the organization and the positive dispositions of organization members intended to the organization. Workplace deviance behaviors are of two types; those intended by a person (WDBI) and intended by the organization (WDBO). WDBI is harassment, physical assault and rude behaviors. WDBO is leaving work without permission, working slowly, stealing and other reasons (Yen & Teng, 2012: 2). Workplace deviance behaviors can occur as a result of the reaction of the employees that perceive disappointment, inequality, lack of inspection and threats in the organization (Avcı, Kucukusta & Tutuncu, 2007: 474).

2.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as the satisfaction level that employees have for their job and their organization (Spector, 1996: 214). Babin and Boles explain job satisfaction as “an individual’s reaction to the job experience”. (Babin & Boles, 1998: 82; Watson, Thompson & Meade, 2007: 2).

Expectations and wills for enhancing job satisfaction of employees have a role on increasing service and opportunities that are provided by employers. Therefore, employers should find out what ways the employees are motivated to keep different variables that affect job satisfaction under the control (Orucu& Esenkal, 2005: 145-146).

Performance, productivity and behavioral relationships are the subjects that come into prominence in previous research on job satisfaction which are seen as emotional notions. The factors of job satisfaction are salary, workplace conditions, promotion opportunities, quality of work, and relationships in the workplace (Iskan & Sayin, 2010: 198-200).

2.3 Organizational Citizenship

The notion of organizational citizenship was started as an emotional notion in the beginning of 1980 and after that it has been one of the most popular research topics (Chiang& Hsieh, 2012: 180; Bateman & Organ, 1983: 587; Gurbuz & Yuksel, 2009: 179). Studying the notion of organizational citizenship as a variable lately is parallel with the necessity of improvement technology and competition in human resource department. Organizational citizenship is defined as extra efforts of employees - except for their compulsory and casual responsibilities. Agreeable employees always try to find solutions instead of creating problems (Organ, 1988: 4; Motowidlo, 2000:119).

Strengthening organizational citizenship behavior has positive results on customer relationship. It has also positive effects on employees’ expectations (Tang & Tang, 2011: 5; Bowen, Gilliland & Forger 1999: 19). Different research findings show that organizational citizenship behaviors are very important to both public and private sectors. The factors of organizational citizenship behaviors, like the intentions of leaving, absences, customer satisfaction, efficiency, and productivity, are the subjects that organizations must examine.

Workplace deviance behaviors can occur two ways – against individuals and against the organizations themselves. The possible effects of sub-factors are examined both individual and organizational. So in this study, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has two different sub factors like “individual” (OCBI) and “organizational” (OCBO) from Runhaar, Konermann and Sanders (2013) who adapted from William and Anderson (1991). OCBI includes generally the activities and the efforts of employees volunteering and helping each other. OCBO involves the positive results of these efforts for the whole organization.

2.4 Organizational Support Perception

Organizational support perception is defined as given importance employees’ expectations, to be supported and to be wanted their goodness by organization managers (Eisenberger et al., 1986:501). Organizations, who support their employees, encourage emotions and thoughts of employees to be valued, to be supported in their happiness and

sadness, and to be paid for their efforts. Organizational support not only affects the roles of employees in the workplace, but also work life. Performances in the organization are affected by trust to the employees' abilities, subsidiarity, flexibility and initiative. Spreading organizational support among the employees increases the behaviors contributing organizations. According to Blau's (1964) social exchange theory, employees see their extra efforts as moral and material awards that can be gained from the organization in future. Employees are loyal and hardworking because of their belief that the organization activities are useful for themselves. When organizations start to support and invest into their employees, this is the beginning of social exchange with the employees (Turunç & Çelik, 2010: 211; Kaplan & Ogut, 2012: 389).

3. Research and Method

3.1 Research Model and Purpose

In this research, the purpose of the authors is to specify the effects of workplace deviance behaviors on job satisfaction and organizational support perception, and to examine the mediator role of organizational support perception on that relationship. The model of research regarding the hypothesis can be seen in Figure 1. Within the scope of this research, the information about data collecting, participants' demographics, the process of scale development, validity, and reliability analyses are given. Moreover, findings with a result of the ANN method are explained. The findings are generally original when it is considered that there are limitations and some difficulties about measuring the workplace deviance behaviors objectively as one of the variables of this study. This study can be accepted as original because the ANN method, which has just been started to be used as a method in organizational research, is preferred to be used in this study.

Figure 1: Two-Phased Research Model

3.2 Hypotheses

Regarding literature review, the research hypotheses are below.

Table 1. Research Hypotheses

H1	There is a negative relationship between Workplace Deviance Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship
	H1a: There is a negative relationship between WDBI and OCBI.
	H1b: There is a negative relationship between WDBI and OCBO.
	H1c: There is a negative relationship between WDBO and OCBI.
	H1d: There is a negative relationship between WDBO and OCBO.
H2	There is a negative relationship between Workplace Deviance Behavior and Job Satisfaction.
	H2a: There is a negative relationship between WDBI and the level of job satisfaction.
	H2b: There is a negative relationship between WDBO and the level of job satisfaction.
H3	Organizational Support Perception has a mediator role between Workplace Deviance Behaviors and Job Satisfaction.
	H3a: Organizational Support Perception has a mediator role between WDBI and job satisfaction.
	H3b: Organizational Support Perception has a mediator role between WDBO and job satisfaction.
H4	Organizational Support Perception has a mediator role the relationships between WDB and OC.
	H4a: Organizational Support Perception has a mediator role the relationships between WDBI and OCBI.
	H4b: Organizational Support Perception has a mediator role the relationships between WDBO and OCBO.
H5	There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction organizational citizenship.
H6	There is a positive relationship between organizational support perception and organizational citizenship.
H7	There is a positive relationship between organizational support perception and job satisfaction.

3.3. Data Collection Tool and Sampling

A questionnaire was used as a data collection tool in this study. There were questions about demographic features and statements about research variables like “workplace deviance behaviors”, “organizational citizenship”, “job satisfaction” and “organizational support perception”. Research sampling was from Kirsehir City Hall employees. 500 employees were working in Kirsehir City Hall on the date which the questionnaires were implemented. After obtaining formal permissions, questionnaires were distributed to 250 employees. 145 questionnaires were returned. 129 questionnaires were answered. 52% of the questionnaires were returned.

3.4. Scale Development

In the scope of the research there are 4 variables. 11 statements, which Runhaar, Konermann, and Sanders (2013) adapted from William and Anderson (1991), were used with the aim of specifying Organizational Citizenship Behaviors as one of the variables. One statement, whose factor loading was under 0.40, is removed and OCBI and OCBO sub-factors were specified. 5 statements used for organizational support perception were taken from Chiang and Hsieh (2012). Factor loadings of all statements were enough. Bennett and Robinson (2000) developed 19 statements whose validity was tested to specify organizational deviance behaviors. 15 of them were used in this study. 4 statements were not included considering the sensitivity of the participants. 4 statements whose factor loadings were over 0.40 was determined under individual deviance behaviors sub-factor, 8 statements over 0.40 was under organizational deviance behaviors sub-factor. 4 statements in the job satisfaction scale were adapted by Lambert, Hogan and Griffin (2007). 5 Likert Scale like “never”, “rarely”, “sometimes”, “mostly” and “always” was used in questionnaire forms for organizational deviance behaviors. On the other hand, 5 Likert Scale was preferred like “1=strongly disagree”, “2=disagree”, “3=neither agree nor disagree”, “4=agree”, “5=strongly agree” for other variables. Statements used for variables were translated from English to Turkish and back to English to control convenience.

3.5. Method

The ANN method was used in this study to examine the possible relationships between variables. The MATLAB program was preferred for analyses. SPSS 15.0 was used to specify correlation values and for validity and reliability tests. The feed-forward back propagation algorithm for ANN was used in this study. 7 models were created to test the research hypothesis. First examined were the possible effects of two dimensions of deviance behaviors on OCBI and OCBO in the first and the second models. Also examined was the mediator role and how to change when the organizational support perception variable was included in this model. Secondly the possible effects of two dimensions of deviance behaviors on job satisfaction with the mediator role when organizational support perceptions factor was included in this model were researched. Lastly the prediction of the possible effects of two dimensions of organizational citizenship variable (OCBI-OCBO) on job satisfaction was attempted. The relationships between deviance behaviors and job satisfaction were examined in model 5 and the mediator role of organizational support perception was examined in model 6. The relationships between organizational citizenship and job satisfaction in

model 7 were researched. It is required that the organizational support perception variable decreases the possible negative effects of other variables and continues its own effects to support the mediator role of the organizational support perception when this variable is included in the model (Baron & Kenny, 1986). 250 iterations were used in the models created. R parameter (an independent variable or the percentage of variables explain a dependent variable) should be taken into consideration because of the unique structure of ANN and its working style when it is implemented in the relationships among variables. Subjective effects of more than one variable in the model are required to evaluate this. R parameter should be used as the most important tool, especially when one dependent variable and one independent variable, were examined. According to this, organizational support perception is an independent variable which can explain the job satisfaction as a percentage of 0.84 (R parameter), and RMSE value (0.12). The explanation rate of organizational citizenship behavior is 0.86 for R parameter and RMSE value is 0.10. The findings gained from ANN and the correlation values of related variables, are similar.

3.5.1 ANN Method and Its Main Features

ANN is a new method for the management and organization fields. Most the studies that use the ANN method are medical, engineering, finance and marketing. There were just a few studies (Tung, Huang, Chen & Shih, 2005; Lane & Scott, 2007; Wong, Wong & Chin, 2011; Montagno, Sexton & Smith, 2002; Goul, Shane & Tange, 1986) between 1988-2011 in the field of management and organization by using ANN method to specify the relationships between variables (Zorlu, 2013: 136). ANN creates solutions for the thinking, observation and experimental learning abilities of a normal person. ANN is used to examine the complex relationships between independent and dependent variables (Zorlu, 2011). ANN occurs by a large number of process factors connected each other in a parallel structure. ANN consists of the compounds of artificial neurons. The part of neurons is called "layer". Input neurons form the input layer and output neurons form the output layer. If ANN consists of single layer, it is called "single layer". If ANN consists of more than one layer, it is called "multi-level" (Hamzacebi, 2011:17-26).

ANN can conclude the problems that are hard to solve by classical and statistical methods easily and reliably. Researchers often use questionnaires to measure the relationships between variables to evaluate the people's behaviors. The complicated data gained from the questionnaires can be analyzed by ANN. ANN's method harmonizes the learning ability with the ability that computers can make mathematical process easily and without any problems (Pao, 2008; Zorlu, 2012: 3017).

Figure 2: Basic Neural Structure. From “Modeling and prediction of surface roughness in turning operations using artificial neural network and multiple regression method”, by İ. Asiltürk, M. Çunkaş, 2011, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(5), p. 5828. Reprinted with permission.

3.5.2. Estimation of the Effects of ANN

Values used in ANN give opportunities to compare variables relatively and comparatively. Because of the limitations in research, it is required that the value of any variables in multivariate models compares with the other variables' value, which is in the same context, to reveal the significance level. The values gained from ANN are (0) and (1) or (0) and (-1). It can be interpreted that values from 0 to 1 mean a positive effect or increasing, values from 0 to -1 mean a negative effect or decreasing (Zorlu, 2012: 3019).

3.6. Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability tests were implicated for the statements and the scales. Cronbach Alpha parameters used in the reliability test were over (α):0.70 for all factors. Factor analyses were done for validity and the statements, whose factor loadings are over 0.40, were removed from the analyses. Factor distributions and factor loadings with Cronbach Alpha parameters were given in Table 2.

Table 2: Validity and Reliability Results

Variables	Factor Loadings					
OCBI (α): ,887						
I help my busy colleagues or instead of absent colleagues.	,881					
I help the people with over scheduled.	,869					
I help new employees before they ask.	,851					
I help the people who are not in their spot for a long time.	,685					
I take my time to listen the problems and concerns of my colleagues.	,683					
OCBO (α): ,857						
I do more job without asking for my department.		,622				
I come to office early.		,607				
I attend non-compulsory presentations and meetings.		,870				
I help to organize the meetings.		,878				
I always update myself about my job and my organization		,591				
Organizational support perception (α): ,938						
My organization considers my point of views.			,856			
My organization thinks my goodness.			,940			
My organization respects my goals.			,925			
My organization helps to solve my problems.			,883			
My organization forgives me when I make a mistake.			,872			
Job satisfaction (α): ,920						
I love my job more than average.				,864		
I usually go to work and do my job willingly.				,888		
I have a pleasure job.				,931		
I feel myself happily and satisfied at work.				,911		
WDBI (α): ,789						
To tease to someone at the workplace					,702	
To make a conversation to make other people sad at the workplace					,784	
To discriminate at the workplace					,766	
To make a practical joke at the workplace					,697	
WDBO (α): ,922						
To humiliate the other people						,667
To dream or not to work instead of working						,709
To take a break for many times						,870
To be late without permission						,795
To be untidy and dirty						,663
Not to take into consideration to tasks come from managers						,737
To work intentionally slowly						,863
Not to take care of work.						,756

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Demographical Features

Gender, age, position, staff status, service time, education and marital status were required to be filled in the questionnaires to specify the participants' demographical features. 76.7 % of the participants were men; 23.3% of them were women and 64% of them were in the age between 26 and 35.45% of participants had a high-school degree. Regarding service time, 56% had been working less than 5 years. 71.3% were married. 51.2 % had been working as a public officer. When looking at the distribution of positions that they worked, 67% of them were low level employees.

Table 3: Demographical Features of the Participants

Features	F	%	Features	F	%
Gender			Age		
Male	99	76,7	Lower than 25	10	8
Female	30	23,3	26-35	69	64
Status			36-45	40	30
Permanent employees	8	6,2	46-55	10	8
Contracted employees	24	18,6	Education		
Officers	66	51,2	Primarily School	9	7
Company personnel	31	24	High School	58	45
Service Time			2 year degree	29	22,5
Lower 5 years	56	43,4	Bachelor	29	22,5
6-10 years	28	21,7	Graduate	4	3
11-20 years	26	20,2	Marital Status		
20 and more	19	14,7	Married	92	71,3
Position			Single	37	28,7
Vice Chairman	1	1			
Manager	8	7			
Chief	13	10			
Low level	87	67			
Other	19	15			
Total	129	100	Total	129	100

4.2. Correlation Values and Means

A correlation test was implemented to get pioneer information about the relationships among variables and to determine inputs and outputs (dependent and independent variables) in ANN correctly during the analysis process. Positive relationships between sub-factors, like perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship as seen Table 5, were perceived. Positive relationships between both sub-factors of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors were also observed. When we looked at workplace deviance behaviors, there was a negative and fluctuant relationship between both WDBI and WDBI and among the other research variables. The variable, which had the highest negative relationship, was job satisfaction. Within the frame of pioneer findings from correlation values, testing (the direction and level of interaction) the research hypothesis with

ANN was possible. When we looked at the mean, workplace deviance behaviors were under the mean (3) and WDBI was higher. The other variables were over the mean.

Table 4: The Results of Correlation Test, Means, Standard Deviation Values of Variables

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	2	3	4	5	6
Support	3,63	1,00	,696**	,538**	,590**	-,198*	-,290**
Satisfaction	3,99	0,86	1	,668**	,735**	-,317**	-,325**
OCBI	3,90	0,78		1	,878**	-,295**	-,259**
OCBO	3,91	0,79			1	-,252**	-,255**
WDBI	1,36	0,61				1	,669**
WDBO	1,27	0,66					1

**0,001 reliability level *0,05 reliability level

4.3. Findings Related to ANN

4.3.1. Affective Findings between Workplace Deviance Behaviors (WDB) and Organizational Citizenship (OCB)

Two levels of organizational deviance as an input OCBI and an output OCBO were used in the first step of the first model. It was estimated that OCBI was affected by individual deviance behaviors (-0.510) and organizational deviance behaviors (-0.489). In this relationship, the R explanation rate was 0.64 and RMSE value was 0.153). You can see the relationship between aimed value and estimated value for creating model in Figure 3.

Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 3: The Comparison between Estimations and Aimed Results for Model 1

It was estimated that WDBI affected OCBO (-0.364) and WDBO affected OCBO (-0.636) in model 2. RMSE value was 0.141 and R parameter was 0.68. In figure 4 it is shown that the comparison between estimations and aimed results in directed to the relationships between independent variables and OCBO.

Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 4: The Comparison between Estimations and Aimer Results for Model 2

4.3.2. The Mediator Effects of Perceived Organizational Support Factor

In this phase, organizational support perception, that is the point of view of two sub factors of OCB, is included as an independent variable in the model. In this context, individual deviance behavior affects OCBI (-0.48), to WDBO (-0.23) and to OSP (0.29). The explanation rate is 0, 80 and RMSE value is 0.12. Similar values are reached for OCBO as a dependent variable. It is found that explanation percent of (Zorlu, 2012a; 2012b) the model is 0.87 and RMSE value is 0.15. The comparison of aimed results and estimated results in Figure 5 and 6 when the perceived organizational support variable is included as an input is also shown.

Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 5: The Comparison between Estimations and Aimer Results for Model 3

Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 6: The Comparison between Estimations and Aimer Results for Model 4

4.3.3. Affective Findings between Deviance Behavior and Job Satisfaction

The individual deviance behaviors affecting job satisfaction (-710) and organizational deviance behaviors (-289) in the third model were created to define the possible relationships between deviance behavior and satisfaction levels of employees. The explanation percentage of the model to the dependent variable was 0.75 and RMSE value was

0.13. When organizational support variable was included in the model, job satisfaction was affected by WDBI (-0.080), WDBO (0.3530) and OSP (0.57).

The explanation rate of the model was 0.89 and RMSE value was 0.10. It is given the comparisons to aimed and estimated values related to each two phases of the model on Figure 7 and 8.

Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 7: The Comparison between Estimations and Aimer Results for Model 5

Straight line show Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 8. The comparison between estimations and aimed results for Model 6

4.3.4. Affective Findings between Organizational Citizenship and Job Satisfaction

OCBI and OCBO weremodeled as an input or an independent variable and job satisfaction was modeled as an output or a dependent variable to determine the possible relationship between OCB and job satisfaction. In this context, OCBI affected the job satisfaction (0.59). OCBO affected it (0.41). The explanation rate the model was 0.87 and RMSE value was 0.02. The comparison graphic is shown on Figure 9.

Straight line shows estimated variables; dotted line shows aimed variables.

Figure 9: The comparison between estimations and aimed results for Model 7

4.4. Hypothesis Acceptance Status

When the hypotheses created the relationships among variables in the research and were tested by the ANN method besides correlation values, all hypotheses were accepted except for H3b “Organizational support perception has a mediator role between organizational deviance behaviors and job satisfaction”.

5. Conclusion

The possible relationships between organizational deviance behaviors, organizational citizenship, and job satisfaction are examined in the research and the mediator role of organizational support perception as a variable is tried to find in this relationship. Workplace deviance behaviors are evaluated into two dimensions like individual and organizational deviance behaviors. On the other hand, organizational citizenship is evaluated by two different dimensions, such as organizational citizenship behaviors for individuals (OCBI) and organizational citizenship behaviors to the organization (OCBO). The workplace (organizational) deviance behaviors theme is used in many theoretical research but it is hard to research with an empirical aspect because of contents. The limitations which respondents have and the

difficulties in answering the questionnaires and statements objectively make the findings and results of this research more important.

Findings and results can be evaluated on two points. First are the results gained from the variables and the relationships among variables rest upon hypothesis. According to this, it is found that WDBI and WDBO affect negatively the two sub dimensions of organizational citizenship. It is understood that WDBI affects OCBI more and WDBO affects OCBO more. The mediator role of organizational support perception is examined to remove the negative effects and the mediator role is found for two sub-factors. Organizational support perception keeps positive effects when it is included in both models. The negative effects related to sub dimensions of the organizational support perception decreases relatively. In parallel to this, WDBI and WDBO affect negatively the employees' job satisfaction. When we look at the mediator role of organizational support perception, the mediator role is supported with regards to WDBI, and it is not supported in WDBO. The effects of two sub-dimensions of OCB on job satisfaction tried to estimate intended the relationships among variables and it is understood both of them affect positively and strongly. In the direction of these inferences, these suggestions can be possible:

Workplace deviance behaviors have negative and relative effects on organizational citizenship and job satisfaction

Organizational support perception can be used as a mediator variable to remove these negative effects

Support given by managers to the employees and the possible perception in this context can be useful to decrease the negative effects.

It is not possible that WDBO can be implicated on job satisfaction's effects.

The second essential result is that the ANN method is very new in the management and organization field. The ANN method can be used to estimate the relationships among organizational variables and to test the hypothesis that is created in this concept. More than one variable determines the input and one variable determines the output to reach the relative effect values and low RMSE, high R (explanation percentage) in this relationship. As specified in previous research (Zorlu, 2012a; 2012b), we can say that values lower as 0.20 in RMSE and higher than 0.60 in R parameter are more reliable.

References

- Asilturk İ., Çunkaş M.,(2011). "Modeling and prediction of surface roughness in turning operations using artificial neural network and multiple regression method", Expert Systems with Applications, 38(5), 5826-5832.
- Avcı, N., Küçükusta, D., & Tütüncü, Ö. (2007). Çeşme ulusal turizm sempozyumu bildiriler kitabı. *İşyeri sapma davranışı: Konaklama işletmelerinde bir uygulama* (pp. 472-480). Çeşme, İzmir.
- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2010). The additive value of positive psychological capital in predicting work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(2), 430-452.

- Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. S. (1998). Employee behavior in a service environment: A model and test of potential differences between men and women. *J Mark*, 62, 77-91.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in socialpsychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Bowen, D. E., Gilliland, S. W., & Folger, R. (1999). HRM and service fairness: How being fair with employees spills over to customers. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27(3), 7-23.
- Bowling, N. (2010). Effects of job satisfaction and conscientiousness on extra role behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(1), 119-130.
- Chiang, C.F., & Hsieh, T.S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 3, 180–190.
- Demir, M., & Tütüncü, Ö. (2010). Ağırlama işletmelerinde örgütsel sapma ile işten ayrılma eğilimi arasındaki ilişki. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 21(1), 64-74.
- Dunlop, P.D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 67-80.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington R., Hutchison S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 500–507.
- Ferris D., L, Brown, D.J., & Heller D. (2009). Organizational supports and organizational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(2), 279-286.
- Gürbüz, S., & Yüksel, M. (2008). Çalışma ortamında duygusal zeka: İş performansı, iş tatmini, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve bazı demografik özelliklerle ilişkisi, *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9, 174-190.
- Hamzaçebi, C. (2011). *Yapay sinir ağı (Artificial Neural Network)*. Bursa: Ekin Yayıncılık.
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2006). Service sabotage: A study of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), 543-558.
- Iqbal, M.Z., Arif, M.E., & Badar, S. (2012). A comparative study of deviant workplace behaviour of teaching staff of public and private universities of Punjab-Pakistan. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 2(12), 2128-2137.
- İşcan, Ö.F., & Sayın, U. (2010). Örgütsel adalet, iş tatmini ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişki, *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(4), 195-216.
- Kaplan, M., & Ögüt, A. (2012). Algılanan örgütsel destek ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin analizi: Otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1):387-401.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain't misbehavin: Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 378-394.

- Liao, H., Joshi, A.,& Chuang, A. (2004). Sticking out like a sore thumb: Employee dissimilarity and deviance at work. *Personel Psychology*, 57, 969-1000.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L.,& Brown, D. J. (2012). Does taking the good with the bad make things worse?How abusive supervision and leader-member exchange interact to impact need satisfaction and organizational deviance.*Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117, 41-52.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2000). Some basic issues related to contextual performance and organizational citizenship behavior in human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 115-126.
- Orucu, E.,& Esenkal, F. (2005). Konaklama řletmelerinde iřgören tatminini etkileyen faktörler(Bandırma ve Erdek Örneęi). *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(14), 142-166.
- Ozdevecioglu. M. (2004). Algılanan örgütsel desteęin iřten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 37(4), 97-115.
- Pao, Hisiao T. (2008). A comparison of neural network and multiple regression analysis in modeling capital structure.*Expert Systems with Applications*, 35, 720–727.
- Runhaar, P.,Konermann, J.,& Sanders, K. (2013). Teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour: Considering the roles of their work engagement, autonomy and leader member. *Exchange, Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 99-108.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior:Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment withperceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 774-780.
- Turunc, Ö.,& Celik, M. (2010). Çalışanların algıladıkları örgütsel destek ve iř stresinin örgütsel özdeşleşme ve iř performansına etkisi. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F, Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi*,17(2), 182-206.
- Vardi, Y.,& Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 151- 167.
- Watson, A. M., Thompson, L.F., &Meade, A.W.(2007). Measurement Invariance of the Job Satisfaction Survey across Work Contexts, *22nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, New York.[http://psymet.ced.ncsu.edu/conference-papers/Papers/GoalO\(SIOP07\).pdf](http://psymet.ced.ncsu.edu/conference-papers/Papers/GoalO(SIOP07).pdf)
- Yen, C.H.,& Teng, Y.E. (2012). The effect of centralization on organizational citizenship behavior and deviant workplace behavior in the hospitality industry.*Tourism Management*, 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.10.003>.
- Zorlu, K. (2012) Örgütsel adalet ve güven arasındaki ilişkiler kullanılarak yapay sinir aęları ve çoklu doğrusal regresyon yöntemlerinin karşılaştırılması, *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi*, 10,135-154.
- Zorlu, K. (2012). The perception of self-esteem and self-efficacy as transforming factors in the sources of role stress and job satisfaction relationship of employees: A trial of a staged model based on the artificial neural network method.*African Journal of Business Management*, 6(8), 3014-3025.doi: 10.5897/AJBM11.2345