

Job Strain, Employee Greed, and Employee Envy: Moderating Role of Self-Monitoring in the Banking Sector of Pakistan

Qlander Hayat* and Muhammad Mehdi Raza Naqvi†

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analytically analyze the relationships among Job Strain, Employee Greed, and Employee Envy, along with moderating role of Self-Monitoring. Data, collected from 645 bank employees, was analyzed through PROCESS procedure. The analysis revealed a significant mediating role of Employee Greed in the relationship of Job Strain and Employee Envy, and the significant moderating role of Self-Monitoring on the relationship of Employee Greed and Employee Envy. The study bridges the gap in the literature of person-environment fit theory, by incorporating the mechanism of employee greed and employee envy. In the practical milieu, the study explains greed phenomenon in a novel cultural context, suggesting human resource managers to better understand employee psychology.

Keywords: Employee Greed; Employee Envy; Person-Environment Fit Theory

Introduction

“Greed, acquisitiveness, dishonesty, cruelty and violence were for so many generations useful to animals and men that not all our laws, our education, our morals and our religions can quite stamp them out; some of them, doubtless, have a certain survival value even today” Will Durant, (2011, p. 63).

The organizational literature is full of the scandals due to the employee greed, the managers at giant companies like; Enron, WorldCom, and Tyco; lie, cheat and stole a huge capital from workers, shareholders (Richards, 2009). Even the consumer could not escape from manager’s greed, as Volkswagen has done recently, by using defeat devices in carbon dioxide emissions levels in their cars (“Volkswagen says 800,000 cars may have false CO2 levels - BBC News,” 2015). There is a lack of empirical investigation on the concept typically in the organizational setting (Wang & Murnighan, 2011). Greed had been of

* Qlander Hayat, PhD Scholar, Capital University of Science & Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan. E-mail: qlanderhayat@gmail.com.

† Dr. Sayyed Muhammad Mehdi Raza Naqvi, Associate Professor, Department of Management And Social Sciences, Capital University of Science & Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan. E-mail: razanaqvi@cust.edu.pk

primary concern from decades, when is it likely to disclose? What are its antecedents? What are the consequences of greed? Can it serve as a drive to envy? These are some questions, which are of primary concern regarding understanding of greed for managers. Finding answers of these questions this study uses the literature to build and integrate a model of employee greed. The model captures the dynamics of employee greed and demonstrates how employees indulge in greed and how this greed has different outcomes. Furthermore, the study provides insights into important future research in this area.

Considering greed provides many areas of organizational life and highlights many behaviors, problems, and dysfunctions that usually occur in organizations, but, unfortunately empirical investigation of greed is lacking in the literature, except the few studies (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015; Seuntjens, Zeelenberg, van de Ven, & Breugelmans, 2015; Wang, Malhotra, & Murnighan, 2011; Wang & Murnighan, 2011). In the organizational theory, the determinants of greed are also lacking, the studies found that job strain can cause the greed (Caplan, 1971; Edwards & Van Harrison, 1993) but it lack the empirical evidences. Similarly, the outcomes of greed such as, envy has been found by different researchers (Robertson, 2001) in isolation but these variables are not comprehensively modeled together in industrial psychology. Most of the empirical investigations regarding associations between these variables are formed in different socio-cultural contexts. There is a need to know the associations of above-mentioned variables in an integrated model that could explain the antecedents and outcomes of greed. This model will add evidence to the body of knowledge from nonwestern countries like Pakistan, because, management philosophies, and techniques should be developed according to socio-cultural context (Hofstede, 1984).

“Greed is as old as the hills” (Brassey & Barber, 2009). The roots of the concept “Greed” in the literature can be traced in the first literary work of humankind as in Homer’s comics and the epic of Gilgamesh. Greed thesis can also be found in different classics and latest literatures of the disciplines, such as philosophy, sociology, psychology, religion or theology, economics, finance, law, leadership and medical. However, in industrial psychology the concept is still under its development. The scholars treat greed as a dispositional component (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015; Seuntjens, Zeelenberg, Breugelmans, & van de Ven, 2014; Seuntjens et al., 2015; Veselka, Giammarco, & Vernon, 2014), and defined it as “the experience of desiring to acquire

more and the dissatisfaction of never having enough” (Seuntjens et al., 2014).

In general the dispositions are “indeed, alive and well”, these are psychological characteristics, not physical characteristics of individuals (e.g. gender, race). In other words dispositions are the characteristics which cannot be measured objectively, these are basically the tendencies in response of a particular situation, under some situations these become the explanation of behavior and vary in their usefulness, temporal stability and their state of activation (House, Shane, & Herold, 1996, p. 205). Dispositions captured the interest of scholars and practitioners for decades, personality researchers have been interested in studying the dispositions of the employees in workplace. The main reason for the interest of the employee's dispositions is due to their deep impact on, attitude (Luthans, 2011, p. 150), and the variance in individual's behavior (House et al., 1996). In the personal dispositions array, greed and envy are the new addition.

Greed is a concept, which is with humans since their existence. Greed has been discussed in the classics of almost all primary disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, theology, economics and sociology, but in sophism fashion, unfortunately the empirical investigation of the concept is lacking in the literature (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015; Mugellini, Isenring, & Killias, 2017; Seuntjens et al., 2014, 2015; Takacs Haynes, Campbell, & Hitt, 2017; Wang et al., 2011; Wang & Murnighan, 2011). More specifically in industrial psychology the greed as a dispositional component is an entirely new concept and psychologists have highlighted that dispositional greed has both positive and negative outcomes and there is a need to empirically investigate and theorize the concept (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015; Seuntjens et al., 2015). In search of the antecedents of greed there were no study found except some experimental studies. Wang et al., (2011) conducted a study on economics students by using money allocation task (the dictator game) and found that economic education play a role in promoting greed. Same is true in explaining the outcomes of greed, there are many factors indicated in the literature, but no scientific evidence is found. Hence, the first gap in the literature that the study is going to address is a comprehensive theoretical and empirical analysis, in examining the concept of greed.

Person-environment theory is a prominent theory of industrial psychology and has been extensively examined in the literature (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Caplan, 1987; Caplan & Harrison, 1993; Edwards, 1991, 1996; Edwards, Caplan, & Van Harrison, 1998; Edwards & Rothbard,

1999, 1999; French & Caplan, 1972; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001, 2001). Researchers found that the unfit or mismatch of the person and the environment cause strain and this strain leads to unmet demands (Edwards et al., 1998). This perspective of person-environment misfit is unexplored in the literature. Hence, the second gap in the literature that this study is going to address is a comprehensive theoretical and empirical analysis, in examining the concept of greed and job strain in the light of person-environment misfit perspective.

The problem to be investigated in this study was the antecedents and consequences of employee greed in the banks of Pakistan. Particularly, how do job strain effect greed, and in which way this greed influences the envy, in banks of Pakistan? The study investigated the greed in the banking sector of Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Banking sector of Pakistan is a backbone of the economy, and it is playing a vital role in the development of the economy. The managers in the banks are always eager to know, why their employees are greedy, and what are the consequences of this greed?

The study provides a significant contribution at both scholarly and pragmatic level. On the scholarly level, this study contributed in the literature in two ways; firstly, it has examined the phenomenon of greed based on person-environment misfit perspective. Secondly, this research had developed and tested an integrated model for employee greed, which predicted the antecedents of greed and the outcomes of greed as well. On the pragmatic level, this study developed a theory of greed in a novel cultural context so that human resource managers can use the findings in making decision of their human resource practices in their typical socio-cultural context.

Literature Review

Greed

Defining the greed is a difficult task because intrinsic feelings lose their meaning when we give words to them (Robertson, 2001, p. 23). The concept is discussed widely in literature and perceived differently by different people and in different context (Brassey & Barber, 2009). Scholars associated different words with it, such as gluttony, covetousness, avarice and rapacity (Taylor, 2011), cupidity (Tickle, 2004), material possessions or acquisitiveness (Brassey & Barber, 2009), pleonexia and philargyria in Greek (Newhauser, 2000), and concupiscence in French (Dommen, 2011). Greed is also known as an unpleasant, dangerous, passionate, and excessive desire (Robertson, 2001), intrinsically evil desire (Borchert, 2006), disordered affections of

the heart (Mitchell & Project Muse., 2011), craving for material possession, physical and psychological comfort, physical and psychological pleasure, celebrity, approval, anything desirable (Borchert, 2006) and private gain (Hoeffler, 2011). Greed is an old word and its roots can be found in old English word “grædig” of prehistory German origin, meaning, “an overwhelming desire to have more of something such as money than is actually needed”, (“Microsoft Encarta World English Dictionary,” 1987), “an overwhelming desire to have more of something such as money than is actually needed” (“Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary,” n.d.). The meaning of the word greed in old dictionaries cluster around “Consumption” and in the current dictionaries as “Material Consumption” (Robertson, 2001). This detailed literature review informs about the greed and to move forward in the investigation of greed typically in organizational setting. Operational definition of the employee greed in the literature and the concept or the purpose of this study is presented in the following section.

Operational Definition of Employee Greed

After reviewing the extensive literature, it is difficult to define greed typically in organizational settings, but in this study, researchers define employee greed as “the inappeasable desire in the employees to acquire more rewards, benefits, and resources, financial or others”. This definition is general in nature and parallel with the existing literature, such as, Haynes, Campbell, & Hitt (2014) defined greed in organizational context as the “the desire for and pursuit of extraordinary material wealth”. Similarly, Krekels and Pandelaere (2015) defined greed as “an insatiable desire for more resources, monetary or others”. The operational definition of employee greed has three main features, first, inappeasable desire feature states that employee greed is an intrinsic component which can never be satisfied. Second, acquiring component is related to possession and acquisitiveness; it means the greedy employees are always eager to covetousness. Finally, rewards, benefits, and resources means the compensation and benefits either financial or others, an employee want to gain from the organization or others.

The definition of employee greed as an inappeasable desire in the employees to acquire more rewards, benefits and resources, financial or others was informed by incorporating the prominent features of greed presented in the greed literature. Where it is stated that the greedy employees always desire to gain more rewards e.g. compensation and benefits (Haynes et al., 2014).

Job Strain and Envy

Different perspectives had been found on the definition of the strain but there is a little agreement on definitions among scholars (Barsky, Thoresen, Warren, & Kaplan, 2004). Strain and stress are sometimes confused with each other, so in order to solve this problem the study follows the definitions of both concepts from ISO 10075 standards which are related to the mental work load. According to ISO(International Standards Organization) mental strain is, “the immediate effect of mental stress within the individual (not the long-term effect) depending on his/her individual habitual and actual preconditions, including individual coping styles”, and mental stress “the total of all assessable influences impinging upon a human being from external sources and affecting it mentally” (“ISO 10075:1991(en), Ergonomic principles related to mental work-load — General terms and definitions,” 2016). So we can say that, psychological strain is a negative judgment about one’s self (anxiety, irritation, depression, dissatisfaction, and turnover intention) results of stressful force or factors known as stressors(role conflict, role ambiguity) (Barsky et al., 2004; Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; Mohr, Müller, Rigotti, Aycan, & Tschan, 2006).In other words, it can be said that psychological irritation is an instance of the psychological strain. Mohr et al. (2006) described a well description of psychological strain in the light of irritation. Moreover they explained the construct “irritation” and said that it deals with the uncertainty and reaction, when individual get into a situation which is different from its desired situation it is called uncertainty and in response of this uncertain situation individual act in a specific way,it’s called reaction. Desire outcomes are known as the goals (Robbins & Coulter, 2012), so it can be said now that the discrepancy among the goals (uncertainty) leads to mental impairment (reaction) and this psychological state can be thought as an irritation. Mohr et al. (2006) also describe the main two dimensions of irritation, one is cognitive irritation also known as rumination and the other is emotional irritation also known as irritability. The cognitive irritation is a class of cognizant contemplations that spin around a typical instrumental composition and that repeat without prompt natural requests requiring the musings, and emotional irritation is psychological condition of losing the impetus to accomplish a specific goal.

Organizations are social entities and employees make social comparison with other employees and when employees feel others are superior, they fall in envy (van de Ven & Zeelenberg, 2014). This implies when people perceive lack of something they become envious.

Envy can be better understood by example when people see a colleague's promotion or a new car they become envious (a result of the social comparison). "The word *invidere*, to envy," literally means "to look at someone with hostile intent," and it sheds etymological light on the close relationship between the abstract vice "envy" and the much-feared phenomenon of the Evil Eye" (Newhauser, 2007). Richard H. Smith is a popular author of envy and he defined envy as, sensibly characterized as an offensive, regularly excruciating feeling portrayed by sentiments of mediocrity, antagonistic vibe, and disdain brought about by a consciousness of a wanted characteristic delighted in by someone else or gathering of persons (Smith & Kim, 2007). In simple words it can be said that envy is the unpleasant, painful emotion which is evoked when we make comparisons with others unfavorably and everyone from us make it regardless of the culture (Smith & Kim, 2007). Envy has three components, feelings of inferiority, hostility, and resentment due to the characteristics gained by someone else.

In the literature the envy is treated as a form of stress, even scholar treat envy as the stress (R. Vecchio, 2005), its mean the job strain and envy are thought to be highly associated concept (Dogan & Vecchio, 2001; R. P. Vecchio, 1997, 2000). On the other way, psychological strain can cause many attitudes and behaviors in the workplace such as, absenteeism, turnover (Gupta & Beehr, 1979) and performance (Beehr et al., 2000). So from notions, it is postulated that the job strain is the source of envy. The people who suffer from job strain become envious with other people.

H₁: If the level of job strain in employees is high, then there will be more envy in the employees.

Job Strain and Greed

Psychological strain can cause many attitudes and behaviors in the workplace such as, absenteeism, turnover (Gupta & Beehr, 1979) and performance (Beehr et al., 2000). Person-environment fit theory possess that if the person's characteristics match the environment characteristics there would be no strain and if they don't match there will be a psychological, physiological or behavioral strain in employees (Caplan, 1971; Edwards & Van Harrison, 1993). Moreover strain promotes greed (Robinson & Murphy, 2009). Therefore, from these theoretic notions, it can be said that person-environment fit leads to strain and this strain can cause greed in employees.

H₂: If the level of job strain in employees is high, then employees will feel high level of greed.

Mediating Role of Greed

The relationship of greed and envy is as old as we are, the whole Christian's literature on seven deadly sins is based on the notion that greed causes all other sins, and from these sins envy is one. Many scholars had declared that, greed and envy are associated with each other (Hamman, 2013) and some scholars more specifically said that greed causes envy (Robertson, 2001). There is a view that greedy people indulge in social comparisons and always consider and want what others receive (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015). Therefore, from this theoretical underpinning it can be said that, people who are greedy become more envious than the people who are not greedy.

H₃: Greed mediates the relationship of job strain and envy.

Moderating Role of Self-Monitoring

The degree to which people deliberately develop public appearances is known as self-monitoring (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986; Snyder & Simpson, 1984). People high in self-monitoring are thought to regulate their expressive self-presentation for wanted public appearances, and in this way be exceedingly receptive to social and interpersonal prompts of situational fitting exhibitions. People low in self-monitoring are thought to need either the capacity or the inspiration to so manage their expressive self-presentations. Their expressive practices, rather, are thought to practically mirror their own particular continuing and transitory internal states, including their trait, dispositions, attitude and emotions (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). Various theories, worried, among others, the determinants of specificity and consistency in social conduct, the starting points of linkages in the middle of demeanors and activity, the flow of social collaboration, and the nature and outcomes of conceptions of self, have taken after from these essential introductory propositions (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). The other perspective of self-monitoring in the literature is related to cognitive aspects of self-monitoring, and implies that human are capable of monitoring their learning and thinking phenomena (Ghanizadeh, 2017).

Self-monitoring theories' main emphasis was, high self-monitors are thought to regulate their inner states such as, cognition, traits, dispositions, and attitudes. Moreover, the only control over evil desires such as lust, greed, and envy is self-control (Baumeister & Juola Exline, 1999). Parallel with this theme, scholars has also argued that greed can only be organized by our willpower (Robertson, 2001, p. 23). So in the same manner it can be stated that self-monitoring moderates the dispositional variables such as greed and envy. Thus, this study hypothesizes that:

H₄: Self-Monitoring moderates the relationship of job strain and greed.

H₅: Self-Monitoring moderates the relationship of greed and envy.

Theoretical Framework

Theoretical framework is a spirit of the research and describes the researcher's point of view on the formulation and investigation of the research problem by associating different variables with reference to the theory or literature (Imenda, 2014). In formulation of the greed phenomena with reference to the person-environment theoretical perspectives, it has been observed that employee become greedy due to job strain, and greedy employees become envious in the organization. In description of above mention process, the relationships of the said variables are arranged in a schematic diagram known as a theoretical framework (M. N. K. Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2012) and have been given below.



Figure 1: Theoretical Framework

Methodology

This study was based on mixed method inquiry paradigm by using qualitative and quantitative tools to examine the phenomenon of greed. The utmost aim of the study was to analytically examine the antecedents and outcomes of greed by testing the hypothesized relationships of different variables with greed, so we can say that the study is causal-explanatory. In other words, parsimoniously stating, this study used the causal-explanatory field survey design because this was the most appropriate approach, which can meet the research objectives and can answer the research questions of the study. The causal-explanatory studies have the advantages to collect quantitative data and to test the data by using different statistical tools in order to establish and to accept or reject the hypothesized relationships of different variables (M. Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009, p. 140) and to answer the “why” and “how” questions (Cooper & Schindler, 2014, p. 127). Because this study is designed to know the answer of the following questions, why and when employees indulge in greed and how will this effect envy? Therefore, the causal-explanatory field survey is the most appropriate approach for this.

Data Collection Strategy

In order to collect the data about the variables under study the researcher used the survey strategy. Survey strategy is selected because it has the following advantages. Firstly, survey strategy is useful to model the relationships of different variables. Secondly, this strategy is useful for knowing the reasons for the modeled relationships of different variables. Thirdly, this strategy is use for deduction and help in answering the questions like, who, when, why and how. Fourthly, this strategy provides quantitative data so that inferences can be drawn easily. Fifthly, this strategy is useful when the concern of researcher is about generalization of results over the whole population, which is collected from sample. Finally, this strategy is economical (Sahu, 2013, p. 55). This study used the survey strategy, because this study was designed to model the different variables and wanted to answer the “why” and “how” questions (why do employees indulge in greed? and how does this greed influence envy?). This study was also concerned with the reason for the established relationships and wants to infer the results based on quantitative data, which can be economically collected from sample and can be generalize over the population. Therefore, the best strategy for this study was survey strategy.

Population and Sample

Greed prevails in both private and public sector and this study was designed to investigate the antecedents and outcomes of employee greed in banking sector organizations of Pakistan. So all the comercial banks listed in KSE (which are 23 and list is attached in appendix) were in the population of the study. Banks has divided the whole country in three regions (north, central and south) so the questionnaires was sent to banks of all regions through mail, courier, and by personal visit where possible.

Non-probability sampling was used in this study because the elements to be chosen for the study did not have the known occurrences and further we did not have any sample frame of the employees of commercial banks. The other reason to adopt the non-probability sampling is to cope with the research strategies (multi-source and time-lagged). The combination of three non-probability sampling techniques (convenience, judgmental, and snowball) were used. Total 1048 questionnaires were distributed, from which 681 were returned (65% response rate) and 645 questionnaires were useable and were included in the analysis.

Measures

To measure the key variables under study, the following instruments, which were already published in well-reputed journals and

having a good reliabilities and good model of fit, were used. In order to avoid the common scale anchors bias which is the repetitive use of the same anchors for all the variables in the questionnaire (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) the different variables were measured by using different anchors.

To measure the job strain, this study used the 3 items, self-reported cognitive irritation subscale of irritation scale aligned with previous studies (Widmer, Semmer, Kälin, Jacobshagen, & Meier, 2012) to measure psychological strain in work contexts, sample question is “Even at home I often think of my problems at work”, and the anchors to take the responses will be 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) proposed by (Likert, 1932). The total established reliability of the English version was 0.84.

To measure the employee’s tendency towards greed, this study used the seven item employee greed scale. In the scale 6 items are adapted from self-reported dispositional greed scale (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015). The established reliability of the scale was 0.81. The wording of the questionnaire were slightly modified to use the questionnaire in organizational setting. For instance the actual question of dispositional greed scale was “No matter how much I have of something, I always want more”, and were modified to “No matter how much I am offered the benefits, rewards and resources, financial and others by the organization, I always want more”. The responses were taken on five point format scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

To assess the envy, this study used the 8 items, self-reported dispositional envy scale (Smith, Parrott, Diener, Hoyle, & Kim, 1999), sample question is “The bitter truth is that I generally feel inferior to others” and the responses were taken on five point (Likert, 1932) format scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability of the scale was 0.86.

In order to measure self-monitoring this study adapted the eighteen-item uni-dimension measure of self-monitoring by (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Sample question is “I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end)”. The responses were taken on five point (Likert, 1932) format scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 1: Measuring Instruments and Reliabilities

| Variables | Instrument | Author/s | No of Items | Cronbach’s Alpha Value |
|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|------------------------|
|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|------------------------|

Future of Marketing and Management (FMM 2017)

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----|-------|
| Job Strain | Psychological Strain in Work Contexts | (Mohr et al., 2006) | 3 | 0.803 |
| Employee Greed | Dispositional Greed Scale | (Krekels & Pandelaere, 2015) | 6 | 0.768 |
| Envy | Dispositional Envy Scale | (Smith et al., 1999) | 8 | 0.892 |
| Self-Monitoring | Self-Monitoring Scale | (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986) | 18 | 0.826 |

Results and Findings

Data Screening

Before running the analysis, data was screened in MS Excell 2010. Firstly, case screening was done to search missing data in rows, unengaged responses and outliers. In search of missing data in rows, twenty (20) cases were found having missing values greater than twenty percent and were removed from the data. Fifteen (15) cases were deleted because of unengaged responses (Stdev.p <0.5). In search of outliers, job strain item no 4 (Emp_Strain 4) was having a value of 33 which was due to typographic error, and was replaced by 3 and item no 5 of envy (Emp_Envy 5) was having a value of 22 which was also due to typing error and was replaced by 2. Secondly, thirteen entries were found missing in Age, Employee Qualification, Employee Monthly Pay, and these were filled by using the mean value of that variable. Five entries were found blank in the Employee Greed, eight in Employee Strain, and three in Employee Self-Monitoring, and were filled by mode of those responses.

Demographic Properties of Respondent

A total no of 513 respondents 79.5% were male and remaining were females (132, 20.5%). This is due to the culture of Pakistan were females are not encouraged to work. Majority of the respondents (333, 52%) were between the age group of 26-30, only 15 respondents were having age above 45. Most of the respondents (237, 37%) were gaining salary less than 30000, and 5 respondents were having salary above 110,000 Pakistani Rupees. Education was measured in years and it was observed that only 2, (0.3%) respondents were having PhD degree, 53 respondents (8.2%) were having 18 years of education, majority were having 16 years of education (298, 46%) or 14 years of education (250, 39%) and remaining (42, 6.5%) were having 12 years of education.

Table 2. Respondent's Characteristics

| Description | Range | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| Gender | Male | 513 | 79.5 |
| | Female | 132 | 20.5 |
| Age | 26-30 | 333 | 51.6 |

Future of Marketing and Management (FMM 2017)

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-----|------|
| | 31-35 | 200 | 31.0 |
| | 36-40 | 65 | 10.1 |
| | 41-45 | 32 | 5.0 |
| | Above 45 | 15 | 2.3 |
| Monthly Pay | Less Than 30000 | 237 | 36.7 |
| | 30001-40000 | 208 | 32.2 |
| | 40001-50000 | 109 | 16.9 |
| | 50001-60000 | 40 | 6.2 |
| | 60001-70000 | 11 | 1.7 |
| | 70001-80000 | 16 | 2.5 |
| | 80001-90000 | 7 | 1.1 |
| | 90001-100,000 | 7 | 1.1 |
| | 100,001-110,000 | 5 | .8 |
| | 110,001 or Above | 5 | .8 |
| Qualification | 12 Year | 42 | 6.5 |
| | 14 Year | 250 | 38.8 |
| | 16 Year | 298 | 46.2 |
| | 18 Year | 53 | 8.2 |
| | PhD | 2 | .3 |

Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to examine the factorability of the questionnaire, factor analysis were run on all the items of the questionnaire. In the first step, factor analysis were executed by using maximum likelihood without rotation proposed by (Field, 2013, p. 794). Several well-recognized criteria recommended in the literature(Field, 2013; Hair, 2014) were used. Firstly, 31 out of 40 items correlated at least 0.4 with one other item, suggesting reasonable factorability. Secondly, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.918, above the recommended value of 0.6, and Bartlett test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(780) = 9129.436$, $p < .01$). Thirdly, communalities were examined and found above 0.3. Fourthly, the scree plot, Eigen values and total variance explained were examined and it was decided to retain 7 factors for further analysis (Eigen values >1 , total variance explained = 46%, and on scree plot, point of inflexion was on 5, 6, and 7).

In the second step the factor analysis was run by using maximum likelihood, promax rotation, and coefficients greater than 0.4. The initial Eigen values showed that the first factor explained 25% variance, second factor explained 7%, third factor explained 6%, fourth factor explained 4%, fifth factor explained 3%, sixth and seventh factors explained 3% and 2% consecutively, and all these seven factors were having Eigenvalue greater than 1. Seven, six and five factor solutions were examined, using promax rotation of the factor loading matrix until clean

pattern matrix was achieved. Five factor solution, which explained 51% of the variance, was preferred due to its past theoretical support, the ‘leveling off’ of Eigen values on the scree plot after five factors, and the insufficient number of primary loadings and difficulty of interpreting the sixth and seventh factors.

During several steps, a total of nine items were deleted from the analysis due their inability to contribute in a simple factor structure and failed to meet a minimum criteria of having factor loading of 0.4. Two items of dispositional greed scale were deleted (Emp_Greed 05 and Emp_Greed 06) because these were reverse questions and not were loading properly. Six questions of self-monitoring scale were deleted (SM_01,SM_02, SM_03,SM_13, SM_14 and SM_15). One question from the Job Strain items (Emp_Strain 05) was deleted due to cross loadings. After deleting these above mentioned items a clean pattern matrix was achieved and mention below.

It is observed in the table 4.1, there are five factors which were, envy, greed, self-monitoring, cognitive and emotional strain consecutively. All the items having loading above 0.4. In the final solution, the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.920, above 0.6, and Bartlett test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(465) = 7245, p < .01$). In the factor correlation matrix all the factors correlations were below 0.7.

Table 3: Pattern Matrix^a

| | Factor | | | | |
|--------------|--------|------|------|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| EMP_ENVY_01 | .683 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_02 | .683 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_03 | .706 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_04 | .628 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_05 | .832 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_06 | .644 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_07 | .709 | | | | |
| EMP_ENVY_08 | .647 | | | | |
| EMP_GREED_01 | | | .864 | | |
| EMP_GREED_02 | | | .632 | | |
| EMP_GREED_03 | | | .681 | | |
| EMP_GREED_04 | | | .490 | | |
| EMP_SM_04 | | .554 | | | |
| EMP_SM_05 | | .586 | | | |
| EMP_SM_06 | | .611 | | | |
| EMP_SM_07 | | .424 | | | |
| EMP_SM_08 | | .558 | | | |
| EMP_SM_09 | | .506 | | | |
| EMP_SM_10 | | .590 | | | |

Future of Marketing and Management (FMM 2017)

| | | | |
|---------------|------|------|------|
| EMP_SM_11 | .434 | | |
| EMP_SM_12 | .538 | | |
| EMP_SM_16 | .428 | | |
| EMP_SM_17 | .490 | | |
| EMP_SM_18 | .463 | | |
| EMP_STRAIN_01 | | .660 | |
| EMP_STRAIN_02 | | .825 | |
| EMP_STRAIN_03 | | | .419 |
| EMP_STRAIN_04 | | .647 | |
| EMP_STRAIN_06 | | | .886 |
| EMP_STRAIN_07 | | | .542 |
| EMP_STRAIN_08 | | | .514 |

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Correlation Analysis

Table 5 represents the bivariate correlation analysis of the variables. The values of the correlation describe the association of the variables with each other. The dependent variable, envy is positively and significantly correlated with self-monitoring ($r = .569, p < .01$), greed ($r = 0.277, p < .01$) and strain ($r = 0.558, p < .01$). The mediating variable greed is significantly and positively related to the independent variable strain ($r = .558, p < .01$). The moderating variable self-monitoring is significantly and positively correlated with mediating variable greed ($r = .232, p < .01$) and independent variable strain ($r = .458, p < .01$).

Table 5. Correlations

| | Envy | SM | Greed | Strain |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Envy | 1 | | | |
| SM | .569** | 1 | | |
| Greed | .277** | .232** | 1 | |
| Strain | .558** | .458** | .410** | 1 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Conditional Process Analysis

Following (Hayes, 2009, 2013, p. 330; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007) Conditional Process Analysis is performed and reported in table 6. Conditional Process Analysis is an updated tool to assess the moderated mediation. The process is run by specifying the model no 58 (Hayes, 2013, p. Appendix A) and using the 5000 bootstrapping Two models are employed to assess the conditional process analysis also known as moderated mediation. First model with outcome variable of greed demonstrates, strain ($a_1 = .1627, p < .05$) holds significant

relationship with greed, supporting hypothesis no 2. Moderating variable self-monitoring ($a_2 = -.1850, p > .05$) possess insignificant relationship with greed, and its interaction term is also observed insignificant ($a_3 = .0849, p > .05$), against the hypothesis no 4. Expressly it is evident that self-monitoring does not moderate the relationship of strain and greed. However strain effects greed significantly in positive direction. Thus, the psychological strain being a strong predictor of dispositional greed, enforces employees to fall into greedy tendencies while serving job related tasks. This finding support the expected results and thereby seconds the implication of person-environment misfit theory. Employees suffering from strain indulge in unmet demands (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Edwards, Cable, Williamson, Lambert, & Shipp, 2006; Edwards et al., 1998).

Second model with envy as consequent variable is analyzed. Explanatory variable strain ($c = .4084, p < .05$) is evident as highly significant predictor of the consequent variable envy, supporting hypothesis no 1. Whereas greed ($b_1 = .2184, p < .05$) is also noted as significant explanatory variable of envy. On the other hand self-monitoring is found significant predictor of envy ($b_2 = .2177, p < .05$). The second order moderation (interaction term of self-monitoring and greed SMxGreed) is also observed significant ($b_3 = .0475, p < .05$), supporting hypothesis no 5. Accordingly results reveal the existence of moderating role of self-monitoring in the relationship of greed and envy. Employees with high self-monitoring traits are likely to control their greedy tendencies to promote envious behaviors.

Table 6. Regression Analysis

| | Consequent | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------|----------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|
| | M (Greed) | | | Y (Envy) | | | | |
| Antecedents | | Coeff | SE | p | | Coeff | SE | p |
| X (Strain) | a_1 | .1627 | .0793 | .0407 | c | .4084 | .1485 | .0061 |
| M (Greed) | - | - | - | - | b_1 | .2184 | .1075 | .0427 |
| W(SM) | a_2 | -.1850 | .1601 | .2483 | b_2 | -.2177 | .1022 | .0335 |
| MxW(SMxStrain) | a_3 | .0849 | .0454 | .0619 | | | | |
| MxW(SMxGreed) | - | - | - | - | b_3 | -.0475 | .0213 | .0261 |
| Constant | i_1 | 2.5712 | .4763 | .0000 | i_2 | .6317 | .4020 | .1166 |
| | | $R^2 = .1743$ | | | | $R^2 = .4416$ | | |
| | | $F(3,641) = 45.1148, p < .001$ | | | | $F(4,640) = 126.5166, p < .001$ | | |

Analyzing the conditional indirect effect (see table 7) of strain towards envy, it is found consistently positive and increases with self-monitoring along with greed. The results exhibit the conditional indirect effect at three values of the moderator variable (self-monitoring): the average (5.120), one standard deviation above the average (5.620) and one

standard deviation below the average (4.500) and verifying the results with bootstrapping method it is observed that all three values are different from zero and positive. Thus the confidence interval in bootstrapping do not occupy zero. This analysis describe that the mediating effect of greed in the relationship of strain and envy in the presence of moderator is positive, its mean greed plays a significant role along with different values of moderator. In conditional indirect effect the underlying phenomenon is a process procedure, which mean all the variables are tested simultaneously and the change is observed in the whole process. So it can be said that in this phenomenon the hypothesized relationships are considered true, because the greed is play a mediating role along with the moderator.

Table: 7 Coefficients for the conditional process model

| | SM | Effect | BootLLCI | BootULCI |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Greed | 4.500 | 0.344 | 0.147 | 0.634 |
| Greed | 5.120 | 0.525 | 0.308 | 0.828 |
| Greed | 5.620 | 0.670 | 0.378 | 1.059 |

***Bootstrapping of 5000**

Discussion

The study was an attempt to discover the conditional indirect relationship of job strain to envy through greed with different values of self-monitoring. The previous approaches to test mediation and moderation (Baron & Kenny, 1986) which were criticized (Hayes, 2009) in examining the moderated mediation are not used. The conditional process analysis was used to assess the phenomenon of greed as a process. The results support the hypothesis no1, job strain is positively and significantly predicts the envy in the employees. The hypothesis no 2, job strain has positive significant impact on greed is also accepted. The hypothesis no 3, greed plays a mediating role between the relationship of job strain and envy is also found significant. The hypothesis no 4, is not accepted, and it is found that self-monitoring is not moderating the relationship of job strain and greed. But the hypothesis no 5, is accepted, because self-monitoring is a statistically significant moderator of the relationship of greed and envy.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to analytically analyze the relationships among Job Strain, Employee Greed, and Employee Envy, along with moderating role of Self-Monitoring. The data containing six hundred and eighty one responses were gathered from the banking sector of Pakistan. The survey consisted of thirty items to measure the variables

under study framework. Data screening were performed prior to exploratory factor analysis and process procedure analysis (Hayes, 2013) thereafter. Two items were dropped from the analysis as suggested by exploratory factor analysis. Process procedure analysis revealed that employee suffering from job strain were more likely to indulge in envious dispositions through greedy tendencies. However the employees who employ self-monitoring were found less likely to engage in envious feelings. It is also noted that employees who felt greed through stain were unable to monitor themselves. These findings contribute in the literature of strain, greed, envy and self-monitoring in novel cultural context. It enhances the understanding of human resource practitioners while deterring the issues emerging from employees' psychological strain.

This study has some limitations, in reporting, data collection, sampling and time frame, further studies should incorporate these recommendations. All the variables in this study are based on self-reporting and the further studies should examine the said relationships of variables on the other's reporting measures. The data was collected from for-profit and service sector organizations further studies should collect data from not-for-profit organizations and from manufacturing or other types of organizations to validate the results. The sample was collected by using non-probability sampling techniques and it is recommended to examine the model by using probability sampling procedures so more vigorous and generalize results should be found. This study used the cross sectional time frame and further studies are required on longitudinal basis to examine the model.

References

- Baron, R. M., & 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*(6), 1173.
- Barsky, A., Thoresen, C. J., Warren, C. R., & Kaplan, S. A. (2004). Modeling negative affectivity and job stress: a contingency-based approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(8), 915–936. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.285>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Juola Exline, J. (1999). Virtue, personality, and social relations: Self-control as the moral muscle. *Journal of Personality*, *67*(6), 1165–1194.
- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(4), 391–405.
- Borchert, D. M. (2006). *Encyclopedia of philosophy*. Detroit, Mich.: Thomson Gale/Macmillan Reference USA. Retrieved from <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/eBooks?ste=22&docNum=CX3446899999>
- Brassey, A., & Barber, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Greed*. Basingstoke [England] ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cable, D. M., & Edwards, J. R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: a theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 822.
- Caplan, R. D. (1971). Organizational stress and individual strain: A social-psychological study of risk factors in coronary heart disease among administrators, engineers, and scientists.
- Caplan, R. D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions, time perspectives, and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *31*(3), 248–267.
- Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. van. (1993). Person-Environment Fit Theory: Some History, Recent Developments, and Future Directions. *Journal of Social Issues*, *49*(4), 253–275.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business research methods* (Twelfth edition). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Dogan, K., & Vecchio, R. P. (2001). Managing envy and jealousy in the workplace. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, *33*(2), 57–64.
- Dommen, E. (2011). Calvin's Views on Greed: Calvin's Views on Greed. *The Ecumenical Review*, *63*(3), 306–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-6623.2011.00123.x>

- Durant, W. (2011). *Our Oriental Heritage: The Story of Civilization* (Vol. 1). Simon and Schuster.
- Edwards, J. R. (1991). *Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Edwards, J. R. (1996). An examination of competing versions of the person-environment fit approach to stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 292–339.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cable, D. M. (2009). The value of value congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 654–677. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014891>
- Edwards, J. R., Cable, D. M., Williamson, I. O., Lambert, L. S., & Shipp, A. J. (2006). The phenomenology of fit: Linking the person and environment to the subjective experience of person-environment fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 802–827. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.802>
- Edwards, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Van Harrison, R. (1998). Person-environment fit theory. *Theories of Organizational Stress*, 28, 67.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77(2), 85–129.
- Edwards, J. R., & Van Harrison, R. (1993). Job demands and worker health: Three-dimensional reexamination of the relationship between person-environment fit and strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 628.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics: and sex and drugs and rock “n” roll* (4th edition). Los Angeles London New Delhi: Sage.
- French, J. R., & Caplan, R. D. (1972). Organizational stress and individual strain. *The Failure of Success*, 30, 66.
- Ghanizadeh, A. (2017). The interplay between reflective thinking, critical thinking, self-monitoring, and academic achievement in higher education. *Higher Education*, 74(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0031-y>
- Gupta, N., & Beehr, T. A. (1979). Job stress and employee behaviors. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23(3), 373–387.
- Hair, J. F. (Ed.). (2014). *Multivariate data analysis* (7. ed., Pearson new internat. ed). Harlow: Pearson.

- Hamman, J. J. (2013). The Memory of Feeling: Envy and Happiness. *Pastoral Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-013-0555-3>
- Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical Mediation Analysis in the New Millennium. *Communication Monographs*, 76(4), 408–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750903310360>
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: a regression-based approach*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Haynes, K. T., Campbell, J. T., & Hitt, M. A. (2014). When More Is Not Enough: Executive Greed and Its Influence on Shareholder Wealth. *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314535444>
- Hoeffler, A. (2011). ‘Greed’ versus ‘Grievance’: A Useful Conceptual Distinction in the Study of Civil War? *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 11(2), 274–284.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 203–224.
- Imenda, S. (2014). Is There a Conceptual Difference between Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks? *Journal of Social Science*, 38(2), 185–195.
- ISO 10075:1991(en), Ergonomic principles related to mental workload — General terms and definitions. (2016). Retrieved January 8, 2016, from <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:10075:ed-1:v1:en:fn:2>
- Krekels, G., & Pandelaere, M. (2015). Dispositional greed. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 74, 225–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.036>
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of Individuals’ fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person–Job, Person–Organization, Person–Group, and Person–Supervisor Fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342.
- Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees’ perceptions of person–job and person–organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 454–470.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: an evidence-based approach* (12th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

- Microsoft Encarta World English Dictionary. (1987, 1999). *Microsoft Encarta World English Dictionary*. Developed for Microsoft by Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Mitchell, D., & Project Muse. (2011). *Greed, lust and power Franciscan strategies for building a more just world: Washington Theological Union Symposium papers 2010*. St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure University. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.viu.ca/login?url=http://muse.jhu.edu/books/9781576592410/>
- Mohr, G., Müller, A., Rigotti, T., Aycan, Z., & Tschan, F. (2006). The Assessment of Psychological Strain in Work Contexts. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 22(3), 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.22.3.198>
- Mugellini, G., Isenring, G. L., & Killias, M. (2017). Employee offences: What strategy of prevention for what business? *Security Journal*, 30(3), 825–843.
- Newhauser, R. (2000). *The early history of greed: the sin of avarice in early medieval thought and literature*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Newhauser, R. (Ed.). (2007). *The seven deadly sins: from communities to individuals*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (n.d.). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (8th ed.). Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP, UK.: Oxford University Press.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42(1), 185–227.
- Richards, J. W. (2009). *Money, greed, and God why capitalism is the solution and not the problem*. Pymble, NSW; New York, NY: HarperCollins e-books. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=275270>
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. K. (2012). *Management* (11th ed). Boston: Prentice Hall.

- Robertson, A. F. (2001). *Greed: gut feelings, growth, and history*. Cambridge, UK : Oxford, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity Press ; Blackwell Publishers.
- Sahu, P. K. (2013). *Research Methodology: A Guide for Researchers In Agricultural Science, Social Science and Other Related Fields*. India: Springer India. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-81-322-1020-7>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students* (5th ed). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students* (6th ed). Harlow, England ; New York: Pearson.
- Seuntjens, T. G., Zeelenberg, M., Breugelmans, S. M., & van de Ven, N. (2014). Defining greed. *British Journal of Psychology*, n/a-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12100>
- Seuntjens, T. G., Zeelenberg, M., van de Ven, N., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2015). Dispositional Greed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000031>
- Smith, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (2007). Comprehending envy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 46–64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.46>
- Smith, R. H., Parrott, W. G., Diener, E. F., Hoyle, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (1999). Dispositional envy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(8), 1007–1020.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 125.
- Snyder, M., & Simpson, J. A. (1984). Self-monitoring and dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1281.
- Takacs Haynes, K., Campbell, J. T., & Hitt, M. A. (2017). When more is not enough: Executive greed and its influence on shareholder wealth. *Journal of Management*, 43(2), 555–584.
- Taylor, M. H. (2011). On Greed: Toward “Concrete and Contemporary Guidance for Christians”: On Greed. *The Ecumenical Review*, 63(3), 295–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-6623.2011.00122.x>
- Tickle, P. (2004). *Greed: the seven deadly sins*. New York: New York Public Library : Oxford University Press.

- van de Ven, N., & Zeelenberg, M. (2014). On the counterfactual nature of envy: "It could have been me." *Cognition and Emotion*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.957657>
- Vecchio, R. (2005). Explorations in employee envy: Feeling envious and feeling envied. *Cognition & Emotion*, 19(1), 69–81.
- Vecchio, R. P. (1997). Categorizing coping responses for envy: A multidimensional analysis of workplace perceptions. *Psychological Reports*, 81(1), 137–138.
- Vecchio, R. P. (2000). Negative emotion in the workplace: Employee jealousy and envy. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(3), 161–179.
- Veselka, L., Giammarco, E. A., & Vernon, P. A. (2014). The Dark Triad and the seven deadly sins. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 75–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.055>
- Volkswagen says 800,000 cars may have false CO2 levels - BBC News. (2015). Retrieved January 3, 2016, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-34712435>
- Wang, L., Malhotra, D., Murnighan, J. K., & (first). (2011). Economics Education and Greed. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(4), 643–660. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2009.0185>
- Wang, L., & Murnighan, J. K. (2011). On Greed. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 279–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.588822>
- Widmer, P. S., Semmer, N. K., Kälin, W., Jacobshagen, N., & Meier, L. (2012). The ambivalence of challenge stressors: Time pressure associated with both negative and positive well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 422–433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.006>