Full Length Article

Open Access

Effect of High Involvement Work System on Employee Counterproductive Work Behavior: A Mediating Role of Psychological Capital

Waqas Mujahid Shah¹, Sheikh Raheel Manzoor², Muhammad khalil ur Rahman³

¹Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Commerce and Management Sciences, University of Malakand

²Lecturer, Institute of Business and Management Sciences, Agricultural University Peshawar

³Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Commerce and Management Sciences, University of Malakand

ABSTRACT

Psychological capital with sub-concepts of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism (HERO) is organized as a general primary ability that measured the important motivation of human beings, thinking process, and struggle for success at the workplace. This study focused on the mediating effect of psychological capital in the relationship between high involvement work system and employees' counterproductive work behaviors. Questionnaires were used to measure the concepts of about 200 respondents. The social exchange, leader-member exchange, and self-determination theories were used to generate the study hypotheses. The hierarchical linear regression model was used to test the study hypotheses. The result of the study demonstrated that the high involvement work system significantly affects employees' psychological capital and employee's counterproductive work behaviors. Moreover, the result shows that psychological capital significantly mediates in the relationship with a high involvement work system and counterproductive work behaviors. Practical implications of the result were presented along with the number of limitations and directions for future study.

Keywords: Psychological Capital, High Involvement Work System, CWB's

1. INTRODUCTION

The power of positive thinking is the root of a healthy mind; a healthy mind generates a positive attitude towards achieving some basic goals and objectives which are essential for livelihood (Bakhtiar et al., 2018). "An individual's positive psychological state of development is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward

Address of Correspondence

Waqas Mujahid Shah
mujahidshah287@yahoo.com

Article info

Received Jan 03, 2021
Accepted March 26, 2021
Published March 28, 2021

goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) to succeed; and (4) when affected by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success” (Behraves, Tanova & Abubakar, 2019; Vaught, 2015; Luthans et al., 2007). Self-efficacy (confidence), optimism, hope, and resilience when combined represent what is termed psychological capital. Psychological capital is specially organized to affect the self-motivated process that triggers the adaptive programming of mind category, desire, objective, norms, and self-control strategy. Psychological capital is a science of positivity in the workplace which brings out the concept of HERO (hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism) in employees there-by developing and nurturing positivity for gains in positive well-being and fewer counterproductive work behaviors (Yang & Treadway, 2018; Vaught, 2015; Luthans et al., 2007).

Fox et al., (2001) stated that counterproductive work behaviors are such types of behaviors that significantly violate the norms and principles of the organization, as a result, the performance of employee decrease and results in increasing negative behaviors such as absenteeism, withdrawal from work, cyberloafing, late coming, property sabotage, etc. Organizations, therefore, strive to yield the best from their employees and this entails recruiting the best employees who feel and think positive while developing their potentials towards better productivity and responsible work behaviors in the organization. Organizations make every effort to improve employees’ behaviors, skills, performance, and psychological capital by giving them the power of autonomy to make decisions while sharing information in a participatory atmosphere for better services and processes (Griep & Vantilborgh, 2018; Luthans et al., 2007).

The process of involving and rewarding employees in the ordinary day running of the organization is known as a high involvement working system. Working system with higher involvement has been given much attention by researchers in the early 21st century and still gaining grounds in present-day studies. According to Rodger et al., (2005), a working system with higher involvement of employees needs more input from the workers of an organization and also allows the organization to improve their inborn capabilities much more effectively and efficiently. A high involvement work system

gives employees power, opportunity, and reward to develop and utilize their skills in exercising their job effectively (Vaught, 2015). This makes them feel positive about themselves (Psychological Capital) and wants to stay in the organization to continue to cherish and develop their talents, thereby exhibiting lesser counterproductive work behaviors because they consider the organization good for their personal and occupational enrichment (Messori & Micossi, 2018).

According to Wazir et al., (2014) very limited amount of research work had been done in the context of psychological capital and counterproductive work behavior in Asian countries specifically in Pakistan (Vaught, 2015). Recent research studies on counterproductive work behaviors indicated the future research directions to add specifically psychological capital as a mediating variable that influences counterproductive work behavior (Vaught, 2015; Al-qasmi and Manzoor, 2015; Manzoor et al., 2014; Wazir et al., 2014). To fill this literature gap, the current study explores the effect of a high involvement work system towards counterproductive work behavior with the inclusion of psychological capital as a mediator. Counterproductive behavior has a negative influence on a different aspect of work-life resulting in low productivity, low morale, higher absenteeism, and cyberloafing (Vaught, 2015; Manzoor et al., 2014). These behaviors have immense detriments towards the organizational work setting (Behraves, Tanova & Abubakar, 2019; Bakhtiar et al., 2018). Besides that counterproductive work behavior unconstructively affect the goal of the group and the performance of the organization.

The objective of the study is to measure the mediating effect of psychological capital in the relationship between a high involvement work system and counterproductive work behaviors. This research study assists the organizations to improve their employees' positive psychological capital by encouraging a high involvement work system process thus it reduces the propensity of counterproductive work behaviors. This research contributes to human resource management research because it is one of the pioneer studies to find out the mediating effect of psychological capital in the relation between high involvement work system and counterproductive work behaviors in KPK, Pakistan.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. High Involvement Work System (HIWS), Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB's), and Psychological Capital

High Involvement Work System can be defined as the process of giving the right of information, power, knowledge, and rewards to work independently or autonomously of control of direction and management (Lawler, 1994). It can also be defined as “an attempt to improve organizational performance by increasing the range of actions, decisions or relationships for which employees are intended to be responsible” (Yang & Treadway, 2018; Guy, 2003). Other researchers defined a High Involvement Work System as “a holistic work design that includes interrelated core features such as involvement, empowerment, development, trust, openness, teamwork, and performance-based rewards that were lead to higher productivity, quality, employee and customer satisfaction, market and financial performance (Harmon et al., 2003).

A high involvement work system was introduced to encourage employees' participation and involvement in every step or process in the organization to enhance organizational performance and employees' wellbeing ((Behraves, Tanova & Abubakar, 2019; Cummings and Worley, 2001). According to (Pfeffer, 1998) a high involvement system of work is made to treat people as in such a way in which they invested rather than controlling cost. Summing the four mixed concepts of information, knowledge, reward, and power above constitutes a High Involvement Work System, which is interdependent to each other because: “Power without knowledge, information, and rewards are likely to lead to poor decisions (Harmon et al., 2003). Information and knowledge without power lead to frustration because people cannot use their expertise (Harmon et al., 2003). Rewards for organizational performance without power, knowledge, and information can lead to frustration and lack of motivation because people cannot influence rewards (Harmon et al., 2003). Information, knowledge, and power without rewards for organizational performance are dangerous because nothing was ensured that people exercised their power in ways that contributed to organizational

effectiveness (Lawler, 1986).

The purpose of a high involvement work system is to give courage to the employees to take part in what theory of modern management calls a consistent culture of improvement, the aim being to induce greater performance through pro-activity and adaptation that are thought to characterize the requirement of modern work (Griffin et al., 2007). Therefore, for this study, a high-involvement work system was defined as the processes to provide employees with (1) information about the organizational performance, (2) performance-based rewards, (3) skills and knowledge that enables the workers to contribute and to understand the performance of the organization and (4) power of decision making that has an impact on organizational performance and direction of goals (Griffin et al., 2007). Therefore, high involvement work system empowers the employees in decision making, enhance their knowledge; skills and information that they need to for winning reward (Boxall et al., 2011).

2.2. Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Counterproductive work behaviors could be defined as “intended actions of an employee in organizational that violate the organization standard and principal which are a threat for the wellbeing of the organization (Bennett et al., 2000). Counterproductive work behavior could also be defined as planned actions on part of a member of an organization viewed by the organization as contrary to its reasonable interests (Gruys et al., 2003). Thus, counterproductive work behavior indicates the way workers negatively react to the organizations which might be resolved to malfunction of an organization and with huge losses in performance. Some of these behaviors include absenteeism, property sabotage, cyber-loafing, incivility, revenge, violence at the workplace and theft, etc (Vardi et al., 2004).

Fox et al., (2001) have mentioned in their study that counterproductive work behaviors are pessimistic actions of the workers toward colleagues and organizations, examples of activities defined as counterproductive includes employee withdrawal, drug abuse, sabotage, and theft (e.g., lateness and absenteeism), and violence (Spector et al., 2006) when they were fully committing acts that the aims to harm the organizations or people associated within them. For this study, we consider counterproductive work

behavior as those behaviors that disrupt norms of an organization that directly affects the wellbeing of the organization (CWB-O) and or its members or supervisors (CWB-S) (Jones, 2009). This study focuses on counterproductive work behaviors because it is essential to know the extent to which employees' deviant behaviors are subdivided within their task realization and organizational norms.

2.3. Relationship between High Involvement Work System and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Researchers have conducted many studies to show the effect of high involvement work system and its effect on employees' behaviors in an organizational work setting and found out that high Involvement work system, were linked with both lower service costs and greater employee satisfaction that indicates that such actions pay off in both financial and humanistic terms (Harmon et al., 2003). This means that when organizations practice a high Involvement work system, employees feel happy and are satisfied in the way the organization values their contribution and effectiveness and this reduces counterproductive work behavior because they feel being fairly treated. This is so because many research studies show that employees who observe unfairness tend to involve in more counterproductive work behaviors (Aquino et al., 2004). Also, research shows that perceptions of employees of the effectiveness and presence of a high involvement work system increase multiple job approaches from affective commitment and job satisfaction to continuance commitment (Mendelson et al., 2011). Mendelson et al., 2011) went further to show that attitudes of employees are influenced by perceptions of practices of organizations that are designed to treat the workers as ordinary people rather than costs to be controlled and found support that high Involvement work system delivers high performance that includes personal sacrifice, work quantity, work quality, attendance, job performance and employee retention on behalf of the organization.

Using the Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX) as a theoretical base for the two concepts (high Involvement work system and counterproductive work systems), a researcher can assume that the presumed negative relationship between high Involvement work system and employees' counterproductive work behavior is based on the Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX). According to (Graen et al., 1975), LMX theory

considers the exchange between leaders and subordinates as consist of mutual trust, respect, liking, and reciprocal influence. High Involvement work system improves, institutes this mutual and reciprocal exchange between employees, supervisors, and organization which permit employees to value their contribution and allowing them to conceive fewer counterproductive work behavior (Mendelson et al., 2011). A high involvement work system can be assumed to consist of several individuals or teamwork processes related to role-taking; rule-making allows supervisors or managers to act positively or negatively to their subordinates (Harmon et al., 2003). According to the LMX theory, when employees have good/bad relationships with their supervisors or managers (high involvement work system), they reciprocate accordingly in their behaviors. Based on LMX framework, quality of the relationship that is developed among follower and a leader is predictive of outcomes at an organizational, group and individual levels of analysis (Graen et al., 1995).

Graen et al. (1995) investigates that relationship between leader and members of high-quality exchanges resulted in fewer turnover of employee, more positive evaluation of performance, better job attitudes, greater participation, etc; the researcher can assume that when organizations implement high Involvement work system, it reduces employees' counterproductive work behaviors because employees find themselves important, pivotal to the running and problem solving of the organization.

2.4. Psychological Capital

Psychological capital came from the concept of "positive psychology". According to (Seligman, 2000), positive psychology refers to subjective skills: satisfaction, hope, and optimism (for the future); well-being and contentment (in the past), and flow and happiness (in the present). Psychological capital is defined as "an individual's positive psychological state of development is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success" (Luthans et al., 2007).

Psychological capital resources like resilience, self-efficacy, hope and optimism could be illustrated as follows: efficacy is illustrated here as “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic et al., 1998). Hope could be defined as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (1) agency (goal-directed energy) and (2) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (Snyder et al., 1991). Optimism may be defined as “both a positivity-oriented future expectation (Carver et al., 2002) and an attribution style that interprets specific positive events through personal, permanent and pervasive causes, and negative events through external, temporary and situation-specific ones” (Seligman, 1998).

Resilience is “the capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, conflict, failure, or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility” (Luthans, 2002). Psychological capital as a combination of efficacy, hope, optimism, and resiliency is used as a point of focus for this research. Relationship between high Involvement work system and psychological capital little research has been carried out showing the effect of high involvement work systems on psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2007). It is for this reason that it is one of the main areas of focus in this study because it contributes to human resource management research. However, according to (Luthans et al., 2007) psychological capital is proposed particularly to result from dynamic practices that trigger the adaptive encoding of cognitive self-regulatory plans, affects, values, goals, expectancies, and categories. The Foundation of psychological capital is also drawn from the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997), which creates mutual connections among the environment, person, and past behavior.

According to (Ryan et al., 1997), the self-determination theory defines how the behavioral aspects of an individual are determined towards better performance and meeting their tendencies of growth. The researcher can assume based on the definition of a high Involvement work system as shown above that a high involvement work system is positively related to positive psychological capital. This is so because when organizations cultivate and use employees’ cognitive abilities as stipulated by the high Involvement

work system, this increases employees' perception of their psychological capital. The theory of self-determination states that when an individual feels positive about his/her potentials, he becomes motivated towards his work

2.5. Relationship between Psychological Capital and Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Norman et al., (2010) mentioned in their study that when the psychological capital of employees is high, they are identified most strongly with the organization and engaged in more organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational citizenship behavior is characterized by positive helping behaviors which are beneficial in the running of the organization (Avey et al., 2011). This positive attitude helps employee behaviors to reduce negativity at the workplace (Avey et al., 2011), research indicated that there exists a positive relationship between psychological capital and desirable employee attitudes, desirable employee behaviors (citizenship), and a significant negative relationship between psychological capital and undesirable employee attitudes (anxiety, job stress, and cynicism) and undesirable employee behaviors i.e. (cyber-loafing, absenteeism, work deviance, and turnover intentions). Also, Avey et al., (2011) in their study found that psychological capital was related positively to perform the extra role of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and negatively to counterproductive workplace behaviors, intentions to quit, and organizational cynicism.

2.6. Psychological Capital as Mediator

In many previous research studies psychological capital has been used as a mediating variable about trust and authenticating leading groups (Walumbwa et al., 2009); employee performance, and supportive organizational climate (Luthans et al., 2010). A research study of (Ngome, 2011) revealed that psychological capital significantly mediates the relationship between high involvement work system and counterproductive work behaviors. In KPK, Pakistan, none of the studies have focused on measuring the mediating effect of psychological capital on the high Involvement work system and counterproductive work behaviors. However, according to the social exchange theory, which conceptualizes social relationships in terms of mutual bonds and exchange processes that appear in social contact as persons who experience obligations to

respond (Blau, 1964). The researcher can assume that when an organization encourages employees to make better use of their skills and talents towards achieving better proficiency and productivity (high involvement work system), their psychological capital increases as they feel indebted to repay the organization for the trust and opportunity to develop and improve their abilities thereby reducing deviant work behaviors (Walumbwa et al., 2009). Social exchanges involve unspecified obligations; when one party (person) favors another person, there might arise some expectations of future return; workers try to make decisions at work that are long-lasting, with reciprocity pattern over time determining the perceived balance in exchanges (Blau, 1964). Thus, if employees feel their psychological capital is enhanced because of the high Involvement work system, then they may reciprocate by engaging in less counterproductive work behaviors. Hence based on the above literature the following hypotheses have been developed.

H₁: *High involvement work system has a significant effect on the counterproductive work behaviors of an employee.*

H₂: *High involvement work system has a significant effect on psychological capital.*

H₃: *Psychological capital has a significant effect on employees' counterproductive work behaviors.*

H₄: *Psychological capital mediates the relationship between high involvement work systems and counterproductive work behaviors.*

Hence based on the above study Following is the conceptual framework of the study.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Population

The faculty members of four public sector universities namely the University of Engineering and Technology Peshawar, The University of Agriculture Peshawar, Islamia College University Peshawar, and the University of Peshawar were taken as a universe of the study. These public sector universities are well-reputed, which is the reason behind the selection of these universities as a universe of study. The targeted population of the study was lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors working in mentioned universities.

3.2. Sample of the Study

The stratified sampling technique with a proportionate allocation method was used for data collection. The faculty members were selected on a random basis to reduce the biases. The 200 faculty members were selected by using the proportional allocation method as a sample from the selected universities suggested by (Cochran, 1977). The proportional allocation technique is defined as follows:

$$n_i = \frac{n}{N} \times N_i \text{-----(3.1)}$$

Where:

n = Required sample size N = Total number of faculty members

N_i = number of faculty members employed in the IT sampled university.

n_i = number of selected faculty from the IT sampled university.

The detail of faculty members from each of the i th universities is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Size Distribution		
University	Total Faculty	No. of Faculty Members
Islamia College University	220	30
University of Peshawar	596	80
University of Engineering and Technology	390	53
The University of Agriculture	272	37
Total	1478	200

3.3. Description of Variable

A detailed description of variable that uses in the given study is provided in the following sections:

3.1.1. Independent Variable

3.3.1.1 High Involvement Work System

The questionnaire items for the high Involvement work system were taken from the study of (Vaught, 2015). The 17 items were selected of HIWS which incorporate (power, reward, information, and knowledge) as the main features of a high involvement work system. Each item is measured by Likert scale ranging 5 point from (1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree).

3.4. Dependent Variable

3.3.4.1 Counterproductive Work Behaviors

Counterproductive work behavior was measured by using 13 items scale. The questionnaire items for counterproductive work behaviors were taken from the study of (Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Fox and Spector, 1999). Each items were measured by Likert scale ranging from ranging from 1 to 5 from (1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree).

3.5. Mediator

3.3.5.1 Psychological Capital

The questionnaire items for psychological capital comprised of 12 items for each subscale of efficacy, optimism, resilience, and hope were taken from the study of (Luthans, et al., 2007). Each items were measured by Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 from (1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree).

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Table 2. Demographic result			
Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	124.0	62.0	62.0
Female	76.0	38.0	100.0
Total	200.0	100.0	
Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent

Table 2.Demographic result			
Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	124.0	62.0	62.0
Female	76.0	38.0	100.0
18-28	166	83.0	83.0
29-39	32	16.0	99.0
40 and above	2	1.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	
Designation	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Lecturers	175	87.5	87.50
Assistant Professors	22	11.0	98.50
Associate Professors	3	1.50	100.0
Total	200	100.0	
Qualification	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Masters	185.0	92.50	92.50
MS/PhD	15.0	7.50	100.0
Total	200.0	100.0	

Table 2 above shows the collective percentage and number of female and male participants of the study. There were a total of 124 out of 200 male respondents which were about 62% of the sample size, while the female respondents were 76 out of 200 which represents 38% of the total sample size. Respondents with the age ranging from 18-28 years are 166 out of 200, which is 83% of the sample size. About 32 and 2 respondents have ages ranging from 29-39 and 40 and above years, which are 16% and 1% of the sample size respectively. Lecturers were found 175 of the total sample 200 and represent 87.5%. Assistant professor and Associate professor were found 22 and 3 of the total sample 200 which demonstrates 11% and 1.5% of the total sample 200. It is found that about 185 out of 200 of the respondents are having Master's Qualification, while about 15 out of 200 of the respondents are having an MS/Ph.D. qualification with the percentages of 92.5% and 7.5% respectively.

Table 3. Reliability and Validity Analysis

Variables	Cronbach's α	AVE	CR	N of Items
High involvement work system	.759	.56	.74	17
Counter productive work behavior	.726	.67	.79	13
Psychological capital	.801	.74	.73	12

AVE=Average Variance Extracted, CR=Composite Reliability

Above table 3 shows the reliability (Cronbach's alpha) and construct validity (AVE and CR) results for different variables. The variable was stated un-reliable if it has an alpha value less than 0.70 (Sekaran, 2007). Therefore, the above variables are reliable as they were having alpha values greater than 0.70. These three variables show that there is no problem with their reliability and the data thus, could be used for further analysis. Moreover, the construct validity was measure i.e. convergent validity and composite validity via AVE and CR. The standard or threshold value of AVE and CR is suggested by (Hair et al., 1998) i.e. AVE>.50 and CR>.70. The statistical result demonstrates that there is no issue of validity in the measurement instrument.

Table 4. Effect of High Involvement Work System on Counterproductive Work Behavior

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	9.216	.670		13.754	.000
HIWS	-1.391	.149	-.554	-9.363	.000
R square=.307, F-value=87.666, With p value=0.000					

Above the table, 4 which describes the effect of a high involvement work system on counterproductive work behavior was measured. From the ANOVA results, it is found that the p-value of F-statistics less than .05 indicates that the regression model is significant and fit. R-square shows that how much of the change in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. In the above result, the value of R-square is .307 or 30.7%, which means that about 30.7% of the change in counterproductive work behavior is explained by a high involvement work system. The regression coefficient of an independent variable is found negative i.e. -.554, which shows a negative relationship between the CWB's and HIWS. Thus, concluding the result that

one unit change in HIWS will decrease the CWB's by -1.391 units. So, the alternate hypothesis is accepted i.e. HIWS has a significant negative effect on CWB's. The result was consistent with a previous study (Ronald, 2012; Avey et al., 2011).

Table 5. Effect of High Involvement Works System on Psychological Capital					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.093	.290		.322	.748
HIWS	.994	.064	.740	15.461	.000
R square=.547;F-value=239.034 with p-value=0.000					
DV: PC					

The above table, 5 shows the effect of a high involvement work system on psychological was measured. From the ANOVA results, it is found that the p-value of F-statistics less than .05, which indicates the significance of the overall model. In the above results, the value of R-square is found .547 which means that about 54.7% of the change in psychological capital is explained by the High Involvement Work System. The regression coefficient of HIWS is found .740, which shows a 74% positive effect of HIWS on psychological capital. Thus, concluding that one unit change in HIWS will increase the psychological capital by .994 units. The alternative hypothesis is accepted that a high involvement work system has a significant positive effect on psychological capital. The result was consistent with the previous study (Ronald, 2012; Avey et al., 2011)

Table 6. Effect of Psychological Capital on Counterproductive Work Behaviour						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	6.712	.524		12.799	.000
	PC	-.852	.118	-.456	-7.208	.000
R Square=.208; F=51.953 with p value =0.000						
DV: CWB						

Above table 6 describes the effect of psychological capital on counterproductive work behavior was measured. From the ANOVA results, it is found that the p-value of

the F-test less than .05, which indicates the significance of the overall regression model. In the above result, the value of R-square is found .208 which means that about 20.8% of the change in counterproductive work is explained by psychological capital. The regression coefficient of psychological capital is found -.456, which shows a 45.6% negative effect of psychological capital on counterproductive work behavior. Thus, concluding that one unit change in psychological capital will decrease the counterproductive work behaviors by -.852 units. The alternative hypothesis is accepted that psychological capital has a significant negative effect on counterproductive work behavior. The result was consistent with the previous result of (Ronald, 2012).

Table 7. Coefficients					
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error		
	(Constant)	9.216	.670	13.754	.000
	HIWS	-1.391	.149	-9.363	.000
	(Constant)	9.198	.670	13.735	.000
	HIWS	-1.202	.221	-5.449	.000
	PC	-1.191	.264	-4.511	.000

Dependent Variable: CWB

R square .312 F value 44.585 with p value 0.000

The above table 7 shows the result of the analysis between the independent variable (high involvement work system) and dependent variable (counterproductive work behavior) taking psychological capital as a (Mediator). Beta values for HIWS change from (-9.36 to -5.44) and were found significant in both steps. According to a study conducted by (Barons and Kenny, 1986; Fatima, Imran, and Zaheer, 2010), if the relationship between dependent and independent variables is found significant in the first and second step, it means that the mediator variable partially or significantly mediates the relationship with independent and dependent variables, and if the relationship becomes insignificant it is an indication of full or insignificant mediation in relation with independent and dependent variables. The value of the high involvement work system in both steps is significant at $P < .000$ which is less than .05, so in that case, alternate hypotheses are accepted, psychological capital significantly mediates the relationship

with HIWS and CWBs. The result was consistent with the previous result of (Ronald, 2012).

5. DISCUSSION

The objective of the study was to examine the effect of a high involvement work system on counterproductive work behaviors in the relationship with psychological capital as a mediator. The psychological capital with sub-constructs of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism (HERO) is sorted out as a general essential capacity that deliberates the vital inspiration of individual, intuition process and for the accomplishment at the work environment. This study concentrated on the intervening effect of psychological capital in the association with high contribution work framework and representatives' counterproductive work practices. The hierarchal linear regression model was utilized to test the study theories. The effect of the concentrate exhibited that the high contribution work framework essentially influences representatives' psychological capital and worker's counterproductive work practices. Additionally, the result demonstrates that psychological capital altogether intercedes in the association with a high involvement work system and counterproductive work practices. Cronbach's Alpha was used to check the reliability of the data. The result indicated that all of the variables are reliable as their alpha values are greater than .70. The study also used Baron and Kenny's (1986) model for testing of mediation approach was use by the hierarchal regression model. Firstly, a researcher found the independent variable effect on a dependent variable, secondly, the effect of independent variable was checked with mediator variable, thirdly mediator has directly checked with the dependent variable and fourthly Independent variables relationships with dependent variable with the inclusion of mediator variable were checked. The result shows that a high involvement work system has a significant effect on counterproductive work behavior. The study also shows that psychological capital has significant relationships with a high involvement work system which creates interesting finding out because when organization practice high involvement work system it positively develops the employee psychological capital and achieved the objective of the organization. The result of the study was consistent with

the previous of (Behraves, Tanova & Abubakar, 2019; Bakhtiar et al., 2018; Yang & Treadway, 2018; Griep & Vantilborgh, 2018; Vaught, 2015; Ronald, 2012; Wazir et al., 2014). The result of the study also provided the theoretical base of the Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX).

6. CONCLUSION

The study shows the facts that a high involvement work system positively related to psychological capital in employees. This is a motivation because it shows that when organizations practice a high involvement work system, this builds and develops employees' psychological capital in a positive way. Also, it supports the concept of positive psychology, which showed that strong personal relationships have the greatest effect on satisfaction with life. Thus the high involvement work system creates a positive environment for employees' psychological enrichment. It also confirms the fact that the high involvement work system utilized the employee inner abilities, talent, and potential which shows that the result that the organization effectively and efficiently grows. This result further contributes to human resource management because it is one of a few studies which have successfully shown that empowering employees to make more decisions boost the information and knowledge level of the organization, thereby nurturing in employees a sense of positivity which is reflected in their positive psychological capital. A high involvement work system allows the employees to feel positive by valuing their participation in the running of the organization and this helps to develop their positive psychological capital, which in return reduces the propensity of counterproductive work behaviors in workplace settings.

6.1. Limitations

Due to financial and budget constraints, this study is limited in terms of generalizability because the data was only collected from four public sector universities of Peshawar, KPK, Pakistan. Moreover, due to the job profession and stiff schedule of the job the sample size was also small, and data was collected on a cross-sectional basis.

6.2. Future Research Area

In the future study, the same hypotheses will be tested in the pharmaceutical

industry of Pakistan via the intervention of some more moderator and mediator variables and data will be analyzed on a longitudinal basis.

REFERENCES

- Aquino, K., Galperin, B., and Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social status and aggressiveness as moderators of the relationship between interactional justice and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, pp-1001–1029
- Avey, J.B., Reichard, R., Luthans, F., and Mhatre, K.H. (2011). Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Positive Psychological Capital on Employee Attitudes, Behaviors, and Performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 2(1), pp-77-95.
- Bakhtiar, M. F. S., Radzi, S. M., Sumarjan, N., Kedin, N. A., & Azdel, A. A. (2018). HPWS Implementation in Five-star Hotels: Why Employees' Perception Matter?.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-reinforcement: The power of positive personal control. In P. G. Zimbardo and F. L. Ruch (Eds.), *Psychology and life* (9th ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Baron, R. M., and Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Behraves, E., Tanova, C., & Abubakar, A. M. (2019). Do high-performance work systems always help to retain employees or is there a dark side?. *The Service Industries Journal*, 1-21.
- Bennett, R. J., and Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, pp-349–360.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, IL. pp-352-372.
- Boxall, P. and Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. US Palgrave macmillan.
- Carver, G. T. (2002). The leader-member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry: A discourse analysis. *Communication Monographs*, 60, pp-322-349.
- Cummings, T. and Worley, C. (2001). *Organization Development and Change*, Mason, OH: South Western.
- Cummings., and Worley (2001). *Employee Involvement*. Szilagyi, J.D., Simon, E.A., Shipp, and K.
- Fatima, A., R. Imran and A. Zaheer, 2010. Emotional behaviors, conflict and member commitment to Intelligence and Job Satisfaction: Mediated by team-generated decisions. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 10(6): 612-620.
- Fox, N. A., Henderson, H. A., Rubin, K. H., Calkins, S. D., and Schmidt, L. A. (2001). Continuity and discontinuity of behavioral inhibition and exuberance: Psycho physiological and behavioral influences across the first four years of life. *Child Development*, 72, pp-1–21.
- Fox, S., and Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, pp-915–931.
- Fox, S., Spector, P.E., Miles, D., (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressor and organizational justice: some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 59 (3), pp-291–309.
- Graen, S. B. (1975). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis.

- Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26, pp-499-510.
- Graen, S. B., and Fritz, S. (1995). Does sex of dyad members really matter. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 3(1), pp-1-18.
- Graen, S. B., and Ryan, R. M. (1995). *Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Griep, Y., & Vantilborgh, T. (2018). Reciprocal effects of psychological contract breach on counterproductive and organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of time. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 104, 141-153.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., and Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, pp-327-347.
- Gruys, M.L., and Sackett, P.R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 2, pp-30-42.
- Guy, F. (2003). High-involvement work practices and employee bargaining power. *Employee Relations*, 25(4/5).
- Harmon, J., D. Scotti, S. Behson, G. Farias and R. Petzel, J. Neuman, L. Keashly (2003). "Effects of High-Involvement Work Systems on Employee Satisfaction and Service Costs in Veterans Healthcare", *Journal of Healthcare Management*, Vol. 48, No. 6: pp-1-14.
- Harmon, Joel, Scotti, Dennis J., Behson, Scott J., Farias, Gerard, Petzel, Robert, Neuman, Joel H., and Keashly, Loreleigh. (2003), The impacts of high-involvement work systems on staff satisfaction and service costs in veterans health care, *Academy of Management Proceedings*, pp-1-6.
- Jones, B. D., Llacer-Arrastia, S., and Newbill, P. B. (2009). Motivating foreign language students using self-determination theory. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(2), pp-171-189.
- Khatoon., B. and Manzoor, , S.R. (2014). Influential role of Psychological Capital on teacher's attitude. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), pp-77-88.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High Involvement Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. (1994). From job based to competency-based organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, pp-3-15.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C.M., and Avolio, B.J. (2007). *Meer (Eds.), Organization Development., and Change*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.
- Luthans, M. A. (2002). The adoption of high-involvement practices and processes in emergent and developing firms: A descriptive and prescriptive approach. *Human Resource Management*, 42(4).
- Luthans, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruusema, K., Goh, A., Kessler, S. (2010). The dimensionality of counter productivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, pp-446-460.
- Manzoor, S.R., Hassan, S., and Arif, S. (2014). Effect of psychological capital on emotional intelligence and counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(3), pp-88-100
- Mendelson, J.B., Luthans, F. and Youssef, C.M. (2011). The additive value of psychological capital in predicting workplace attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36 (2), pp-430-452.
- Messori, M., & Micossi, S. (2018). Counterproductive proposals on euro area reform by French and German economists. *CEPS Policy insight*, (2018/04).

- Norman, D. (2010). Good ideas going wrong. *Canadian HR Reporter*, 15(9) Carver, C., and Scheier, M. 2002. Optimism. In C.R. Snyder and S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology*: Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. pp-231-243.
- Pfeffer, R. W., and Ferketish, B. J. (1998). Creating a high-Involvement culture through a value-driven change process: *Development Dimensions International*.
- Rodger, M. F., and Carver, C. S. (2005). Effects of high involvement work on psychological and physical well-being: The influence of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 16, pp-201–228.
- Ronald, S. N. (2012). The mediating role of psychological capital on high involvement work system and counter productive work behaviours. *Master Thesis Human Resource Studies*. University of Tilburg, Netherland.
- Ronald, W. C. (2012). Job behavior, performance, and effectiveness. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage pp-271–326.
- Ryan, R. M., and Frederick, C. M. (1997). On energy, personality, and health: Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 65, pp-529–565.
- Sekaran, U. (2007). *Research method for business: A skill building approach*, 4th edition, John Wiley & Sons.
- Seligman, J. P. (2000). High-involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1).
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). Positive social science. *APA Monitor*, 29(4), pp-2-5.
- Snyder, C. R., Irving, L., and Anderson, J. R. (1991). Hope and health: Measuring the will and ways. In C. R. Snyder and D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Handbook of social and clinical psychology: The health perspective* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press. pp-285–305.
- Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruusema, K., Goh, A., Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counter productivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, pp-446-460.
- Stajkovic, J. P., Spell, C. S., and Ochoki Nyamori, R. (1998). Correlates and consequences of high involvement work practices: the role of competitive strategy. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(1).
- Vaught, M. H. M (2015). The effect of high involvement work systems and empowerment oriented leadership on job satisfaction and absence frequency, *Master Thesis*, Tilburg University
- Walumbwa, C. R., Irving, L., and Anderson, J. R. (2009). Hope and health: Measuring the will and ways. In C. R. Snyder and D. R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Handbook of social and clinical psychology: The health perspective* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press. pp-285–305.
- Wazir, S.A., and Manzoor, S.R. (2014). Influential role of Psychological Capital on Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), pp-12-25
- Yang, J., & Treadway, D. C. (2018). A social influence interpretation of workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 879-891.
- Yang, J., & Treadway, D. C. (2018). A social influence interpretation of workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(4), 879-891