CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH RESULTS

4.0 Chapter Overview

This chapter presents the result of the survey conducted among multilevel employees in Malaysia. The analyses begin by describing the general demographic characteristics of the respondents. Subsequently, factor analysis was conducted prior testing the entire variable in this study. This was followed by Normality Test for distribution, Cronbach's Alpha for reliability coefficient, Pearson Product Moment Correlation analyses and multiple regression analysis. The result of the study will be discussed in accordance to the research objective and the hypotheses of the study.

4.1 Response Rate

The survey questionnaires were sent out using various medium to the targeted respondents, namely a person whom are engaged under a contract of employment from both private and public sector in Malaysia.

A total of 300 hardcopies of the questionnaires were distributed and a useable responses received were only 176. Subsequently, a softcopy or online survey of the questionnaires developed under 'Google Doc' application (Online Survey: 2011) was distributed out to 300 targeted respondent's email, out of which only 65 responses were received back. As such, the total effective response rate is 40.1%. Table 6 shows the overall result of response rate for this research study.

Table 6: Research Response Rates

Method of Questionnaire	Number of questionnaires		
	Sent	**Return**	**Usable**
Hardcopy by hand	300	176	176
Softcopy by email	300	65	64
Total	600	241	241
Rate of usable response		40.1%	

4.2 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The summary statistics of respondent sample have a fair proportionate between men (41.5%) men and women (58.5%). As for the age groups, most of the respondents are between the age group of 21 to 30 years (48.13%) and 31 to 40 years old (37.76%). Majority of the respondents are Malay (58.09%), followed by Chinese (25.31%), Indian (12.45%) and others (4.15%). More than half of the respondents (52.70%) posses first or bachelor degree qualification with majority of them are single (46.89%) and married (51.04%). Approximately, 46 percent of them are executives or engineers. Almost half of the respondents earned between RM 2,000 to RM 3,999 (49.38%) and RM 4,000 to RM 5,999 (20.33%) respectively. Most of the respondents are from private sector (73.44%) with majority of them from Banking and Finance (18.3%), Oil and Gas (17.4%), IT and Telecommunication (14.5%) industries. The details are as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Variable	Frequency	Percentage of sample (%)
Gender		
Male	100	41.5
Female	141	58.5
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Age		
20 years or less	2	0.83
21 – 30 years	116	48.13
31 – 40 years	91	37.76
41 – 50 years	25	10.37
More than 50 years	6	2.49
Missing	1	0.41
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Ethnicity		
Malay	140	58.09
Chinese	61	25.31
Indian	30	12.45
Others	10	4.15
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Highest education level		
SPM/STPM or less	35	14.52
Certificate/Diploma	39	16.18
First Degree	127	52.70
Postgraduate Degree	34	14.11
Professional Qualification	6	2.49
Others	0	0
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Marital Status		
Single	113	46.89
Married	123	51.04
Divorced /Separated	5	2.07
Widowed	0	0
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Job Designation		
Top / Middle Management	13	5.39
First Line Management	62	25.73
Executive / Engineer	111	46.06
Support staff	55	22.82
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Monthly Income		
Below than RM2,000	27	11.20

RM 2,000 – RM 3,999	119	49.38
RM 4,000 – RM 5,999	49	20.33
RM 6,000 – RM 7,999	16	6.64
RM 8,000 – RM 9,999	13	5.39
RM 10, 000 and above	17	7.05
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Sector of Organization		
Private	177	73.44
Government	64	26.56
Total	**241**	**100.00**
Type of Industry		
IT / Telecommunication	35	14.5
Engineering / Construction	12	5.0
Banking / Finance	44	18.3
Retails / Distribution	12	5.0
Services	34	14.1
Oil and Gas	42	17.4
Manufacturing	32	13.3
Others	30	12.4
Total	**241**	**100.00**

4.3 Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed on the independent variables which are Recruitment and Selection (RS), Training and Development (TD), Fairness of Performance Management and Promotion (PMP) and Compensation and Incentives (CI); and dependent variable which are Employee Misconduct (EM). The factor analysis was performed on Independent Variables and Dependent Variable as to further examine the inter relationship among the items because those variables were adopted from several researches.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the purpose of factor analysis is to further examine the inter-relationship among selected variables that are studied in this research, which normally represents a common variation; however, in some cases, results of factor analysis will lead to having a fewer numbers of variables than the original set of variables. Moreover, this factorability is assumed and considered appropriate if the coefficient value of the correlation matrix is above 0.3, and if Bartlett's test of Sphericity is large and significant, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of Sampling Adequacy is greater than 0.6 (Coakes and Steed, 2007). Only factors that have eigenvalues more than 1.0 (in Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings) is considered significant (Hair et al, 2006).

As a result, for this study, the KMO and Bartlett's Test for the independent variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI) was 0.875 and significant (Chi-Square = 3.250E3, $p < 0.01$ at 0.000). The entire items were rotated and a factor that loads in Rotated Component Matrix was adopted as it is widely practiced in much research. There were four factors load for the entire Independent Variables items, and most components represent one independent variable each. However, some items loaded in different component such four of Compensation and Incentives items (CI14, CI15, CI16 and CI17) and one of Recruitment and Selection item (RS4) loaded in Training and Development column, but the rest of Performance Management and Promotion, Recruitment and Selection and Compensation and Incentives items loaded in a unique component respectively. Thus, items that did not load in its component were removed. Reliability test was performed for RS

and CI (as some of its items were removed) on the remaining items. The factor loading and reliability for each independent variable is as Table 8.

Items that have no factor loading, single factor loading and cross factor loading may be dropped for further analysis in this study. As according to Coakes, Steed and Ong, (2010) the purpose doing factor analysis is to shrink number of variables to a smaller group that underlying the factor that better summarized the essential information contained in the variables.

The KMO and Bartlett's Test results for the dependent variables, Employee Misconduct was 0.902 and significant (Chi-Square = 1.497E3, $p < 0.01$ at 0.000). Five items were loaded on the first component and the remaining five items loads in the second component. However, all the items were used for further analysis in this study because the value of factor loading of each item was high and above the cutoff point of 0.3. Moreover, the reliability of all items is 0.915 which is far greater than if it were divided into Component 1 at a reliability of 0.895 and Component 2 at a reliability of 0.872 respectively. Thus, the entire item for Employee Misconduct (DV) was maintained in the analysis. The factor loading and reliability for each dependent variable is as Table 9.

Table 8: Factor Analysis of Independent Variables

Items		RS	TD	PMP	CI
RS1	The organization hires people with specialized skills.	0.813			
RS2	The organization hires people with creative thinking skills.	0.817			
RS3	Recruiting and selecting process of the organization is appropriate with the jobs.	0.762			
RS4	The organization prefers internal promotion when filling vacant position.	*0.573			
PMP5	There is favoritism in performance evaluation in this organization.			0.824	
PMP6	The management follows a 'pick and choose' policy for promotion.			0.828	
PMP7	Only certain individuals are entertained for promotional opportunities.			0.881	
PMP8	Yearly assessment depends upon the kind of relationship employees have with their supervisors, not the work they perform.			0.886	
PMP9	Promotions in this organization largely depend upon what kind of relationship one has with the top management.			0.905	
TD10	The organization exposed extensive orientation programmes for all new employees to familiarize themselves with the norms and values.		0.610		
TD11	The organization provides continuous training programmes to update existing employee skills and knowledge.		0.744		
TD12	Training programmes are constantly revised or updated to fit with the changing environment.		0.777		
TD13	All the training programmes run by the organization are of high quality.		.743		
CI14	The organization incentive system encourages us (employee) to vigorously pursue organization objectives.				*0.829
CI15	The organization incentive system is fair at rewarding individual who accomplish organization objectives.				*0.805
CI16	The organization reward system really recognizes individual who contribute the most to our organization.				*0.800
CI17	The organization incentive system at this plant encourages us (employee) to reach organization goals.				*0.814
CI18	The organization incentive system is at odds with our organization goals				0.789
CI19	Individual that achieve organizational goals are rewarded the same as those who do not achieve organizational goals.				0.861
Cronbach's Alpha Reliability		0.851	0.891	0.921	0.690
KMO and Bartlett's Test Result = 0.875 (p < 0.01)					

**Note: Items that was removed, do not load in its component*

Table 9: Factor Analysis of Dependent Variable (Employee Misconduct)

Items		Component	
		1	2
EM1	Made personal local calls on the organizational telephone.		0.836
EM2	Taking extra personal time (i.e longer breaks, longer lunch hours, late arrival and/or early departure).		0.839
EM3	Using office supplies and materials for personal use (i.e use of copy machine and/or printer; took pens, paper clips or other inexpensive items).		0.849
EM4	Calling in sick to take a day off even though other employees will have to make up for the slack.		0.536
EM5	Misreporting of actual time worked (i.e inflate overtime hours).	0.688	
EM6	Gave certain customers or clients a better deal than that given to others who should get the same deal.	0.808	
EM7	Exaggerated to prospective clients, buyers, or others the benefits of your product or service.	0.853	
EM8	Inflate an expense account (i.e raise cost of goods/services purchased and/or raise claims of the original bills).	0.788	
EM9	Giving or accepting bribes, kickbacks, or inappropriate gifts in exchange for preferential treatment.	0.794	
EM10	Doing personal business during working hours.		0.658
Cronbach's Alpha Reliability		0.895	0.872
KMO and Bartlett's Test Result = 0.902 (p < 0.01)			

4.4 Normality Test

According to Coaked, Steed and Ong (2010), "…the assumption of normality is a prerequisite for many inferential statistical techniques…" and Chua (2008) highlighted that data distribution for the sample is considered normal if the skewness and kurtosis values for all variables are within the range (±2 standard error of skewness). Thus, the study meets this criterion as all variables, Recruitment and Selection (RS), Training and Development (TD), Performance Management and Promotion (PMP), Compensation and Incentives (CI), Procedural Justice (PJ), Unethical Behavior of Self (ES), Unethical Behavior of

Co- Workers (ECW) and Employee Misconduct (EM) are within the predetermined range (Table 10).

Table 10: Assessing Normality for the Main Variables

Details	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Recruitment and Selection	3.567	0.730	-0.601	0.157	0.777	0.312
Training and Development	3.522	0.930	-0.698	0.157	0.213	0.312
Performance Management	2.777	1.006	0.097	0.157	-0.589	0.312
Compensation and Incentives	3.203	0.631	-0.130	0.157	0.488	0.312
Procedural Justice	3.225	0.846	-0.447	0.157	-0.103	0.312
Unethical Behavior of Self	3.446	0.984	0.007	0.157	-0.708	0.312
Unethical Behavior of Co-Workers	3.073	1.012	-0.000	0.157	-0.272	0.313
Employee Misconduct	3.752	8.622	-0.468	0.157	-0.369	0.312

4.5 Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test

Once the final data were obtained, every negative-item was recoded. The data were further analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha reliability test. The analysis was conducted on all 52 items for internal consistency purposes. Most variables in this study achieved a cut-off point of 0.7, indicating that they are reliable

(Nunnaly, 1978; Hair et al, 2006). The results of the reliability test are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Results of the Reliability Test for Main Variables.

Variables	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Recruitment and Selection	4	0.851
Training and Development	4	0.891
Performance Management and Promotion	5	0.921
Compensation and Incentives	6	0.690
Procedural Justice	15	0.968
Unethical Behavior of Self	4	0.821
Unethical Behavior of Co Workers	4	0.886
Employee Misconduct	10	0.915

4.6 Testing Hypotheses

Pearson's Correlation Analysis

According to Coakes and Steed (2007), the correlation analysis was used to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. Thus for the purpose of this study, correlation test was performed to examined the entire variables. Table 12 shows the complete overview of the Bivariate Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient of the variables.

Table 12: Bivariate Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients

Variables	EM	RS	TD	PMP	CI	PJ	ES	ECW
EM – Employee misconduct								
RS – Recruitment and Selection	-.003							
TD – Training and Development	.135’	.609”						
PMP – Performance Management and Promotion	.186”	.110’	.119’					
CI – Compensation and Incentives	.159’’	-.193”	-.225”	.140’				
PJ – Procedural Justice	-.121’	.399”	.427’’	.316’’	-.195’’			
ES – Unethical Behavior of Self	.545’’	.085	.225”	.261”	.100	.019		
ECW – Unethical Behavior of Co Workers	.252”	.041	.013	.432’’	.070	.178’’	.536”	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

The result shows most of HRM Practices correlates positively with Procedural Justice, specifically Recruitment and Selection (r=0.399, p<0.01); Training and Development (r=0.427, p<0.01), Performance Management and Promotion (r=0.316, p<0.01) at the significant level of p<0.01. But, Compensation and Incentives correlates negatively with Procedural Justice (r=-0.195, p<0.01). From this analysis, H1a H1b and H1c were supported, and H1d was not supported.

The result indicates that Recruitment and Selection do not have any relationship with Employee Misconduct, but Training and Development (r= 0.135, p<0.05), Performance Management and Promotion (r=0.186, p<0.01), and Compensation

and Incentives (r=0.159, p<0.01) correlates positively with Employee Misconduct. From this analysis, only H2a was not supported, but the rest H2b, H2c and H2d was supported. Interestingly, Procedural Justice correlates negatively with Employee Misconduct (r=-0.121, p<0.05). Finally, Unethical Behavior of Self correlates positively with Employee Misconduct (r=0.545, p<0.01); and the Unethical Behavior of Co Workers correlates positively with Employee Misconduct (r=0.252, p<0.01).

Regression Analysis (Mediating Variable)

Regression analysis was conducted to test for the significance of Procedural Justice as mediating variable between the relationship of the HRM Practices (Independent Variables) and Employee Misconduct (Dependent Variable) using the four step method as proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). The first step is to perform multiple regression analysis on Independent Variables and Dependent Variable. Results are as per Table 13.

The results shows that Recruitment and Selection (RS) do not correlates with Employee Misconduct (EM) as it was not significant as β, -0.130 (p>0.05, at 0.102). Training and Development was significant at β, 0.231 (p<0.05, at 0.004); Performance Management and Promotion was significant at β, 0.151 (p<0.05, at 0.019); and Compensation and Incentives was significant at β, 0.153 (p<0.05, at 0.020). The Independent Variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI) explains 8.2% of the

variance of Employee Misconduct (EM). Overall, the result indicates significant relationship (F4, 235 = 5.261, p < 0.05).

Table 13: Multiple Regressions (IV regress DV)

Correlations					
Model	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
(Constant)	-1.186	.414		-2.862	.005
Recruitment & Selection (RS)	-.054	.033	-.130	-1.643	.102
Training & Development (TD)	.062	.021	.231	2.890	.004
Performance Management (PMP)	.030	.013	.151	2.358	.019
Compensation & Incentives (CI)	.081	.035	.153	2.349	.020
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Misconduct (EM) R:0.287 ; R Square: 0.082					

Step 2, the independent variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI) was regressed against the mediating variable, Procedural Justice (PJ). The results as Table 14, shows that Recruitment and Selection (RS) correlates with Procedural Justice (PJ) as it was significant at β, 0.192 (p<0.05, at 0.006); Training and Development was significant at β, 0.244 (p<0.05, at 0.001); and Performance Management and Promotion was significant at β, 0.286 (p<0.05, at 0.000) and Compensation and Incentives was significant at β, -0.143 (p<0.05, at 0.013). The Independent Variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI) explains 30% of the variance of Employee Misconduct (EM). Overall, the result indicates significant relationship (F4, 235 = 25.03, p < 0.05).

Table 14: Multiple Regressions (IV regress MV)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	21.544	4.632		4.652	.000
Recruitment & Selection (RS)	1.018	.367	.192	2.772	.006
Training and Development (TD)	.832	.238	.244	3.493	.001
Performance Management (PMP)	.721	.141	.286	5.114	.000
Compensation & Incentives (CI)	-.967	.387	-.143	-2.496	.013
a. Dependent Variable: Procedural Justice R: 0.547; R Square: 0.299					

Step 3, the mediating variable (PJ) was regressed against the dependent variable (EM). Table 15 shows that Procedural Justice do not correlates with Employee Misconduct as it was slightly not significant at β , -0.121 ($F1, 238 = 3.551$, $p>0.05$, at 0.061). The Procedural Justice (MV) only explains 1.5% of the variance of Employee Misconduct (DV). It was contradicted with earlier Pearson's correlation result, that Procedural Justice was significant and correlates negatively with Employee Misconduct ($r= -0.121$, $p<0.05$).

Table 15: Multiple Regressions (MV regressed on DV)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.467	.252		1.856	.065
Procedural Justice	-.009	.005	-.121	-1.884	.061
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Misconduct (EM) R: 0.121; R Square: 0.015					

Regression analysis was performed via controlling independent variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI) when regressing mediating variable (PJ) against dependent variable (EM). The results (Table 16) shows that PJ negatively and significantly predicts EM at β , -0.265 (F5, 234 = 7.080, p<0.05, at 0.000) when IVs is controlled. Moreover, only TD and PMP significantly predict EM at β , 0.295 (p<0.05, at 0.000) and β , 0.227 (p<0.05, at 0.001) respectively. The Procedural Justice (MV) explains 13.1% of the variance of Employee Misconduct (DV), when controlling Independent Variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI).

Table 16: Multiple Regressions (MV regress DV, control IV)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model	**B**	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	-1.186	.414		-2.862	.005
Recruitment & Selection (RS)	-.054	.033	-.130	-1.643	.102
Training and Development (TD)	.062	.021	.231	2.890	.004
Performance Management (PMP)	.030	.013	.151	2.358	.019
Compensation & Incentives (CI)	.081	.035	.153	2.349	.020
(Constant)	-.740	.422		-1.752	.081
Recruitment & Selection (RS)	-.033	.033	-.079	-1.010	.313
Training and Development (TD)	.079	.021	.295	3.699	.000
Performance Management (PMP)	.045	.013	.227	3.447	.001
Compensation & Incentives (CI)	.061	.034	.116	1.793	.074
Procedural Justice (PJ)	-.021	.006	-.265	-3.641	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Misconduct (EM)
R: 0.362; R Square: 0.131

Finally, Mediating Variable (PJ) was controlled when Independent Variable (RS, TD, PMP and CI) was regressed against Dependent Variable (ES). The results (Table 16) shows PJ (MV) still significant at β , -0.265 (F5, 234 = 7.080, p<0.05, at 0.000). Moreover, only TD and PMP significantly predicts EM (when PJ is controlled) at β , 0.295 (p<0.05, at 0.000) and β , 0.227 (p<0.05, at 0.001). The Independent Variables (RS, TD, PMP and CI) explains 13.1% of the variance of Employee Misconduct (DV), when controlling Procedural Justice (MV).

Table 17: Multiple Regressions (IV regress DV, control MV)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.467	.252		1.856	.065
Procedural Justice (PJ)	-.009	.005	-.121	-1.884	.061
(Constant)	-.740	.422		-1.752	.081
Procedural Justice (PJ)	-.021	.006	-.265	-3.641	.000
Recruitment & Selection (RS)	-.033	.033	-.079	-1.010	.313
Training and Development (TD)	.079	.021	.295	3.699	.000
Performance Management PMP)	.045	.013	.227	3.447	.001
Compensation & Incentives (CI)	.061	.034	.116	1.793	.074
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Misconduct R: 0.362; R Square: 0.131					

From the above analyses, only Training and Development (TD) and Performance Management and Promotion (PMP) fulfilled step 1, 2 and 4 of Baron and Kenny (1986) methods. In step 3, Procedural Justice (MV) was not significant with Employee Misconduct (DV), but, in Step 4 Procedural Justice (MV) was significant when IV was controlled (as MV predicts DV) and when PJ was

controlled (as IV predicts DV) respectively. Thus, the findings indicate that Procedural Justice is a partial mediator to the relationship between Training and Development and Performance Management and Promotion with Employee Misconduct. According to Baron and Kenny (1986) some form of mediation is supported if M (MV) remains significant after controlling X (IV). If X (IV) no longer significant when M (MV) is controlled, the finding supports full mediation. If X (IV) is still significant (i.e., both X (IV) and M (MV) significantly predict Y (DV)), the finding supports partial mediation. Thus, Procedural Justice is a partial mediator for the relationship between Training and Development (TD) and Performance Management and Promotion (PMP) with Employee Misconduct (EM). Therefore, H3b and H3c is supported, H3a and H3d was not supported.

Regression Analysis (Moderating Variable)

In examining the moderating effect of one's ethicality, regression analysis were conducted to test H4, Unethical Behavior of Self (ES) moderates the relationship between Procedural Justice (PJ) and Employee Misconduct (EM); and H5, Unethical Behavior of Co-Workers (ECW) moderates the relationship between Procedural Justice (PJ) and Employee Misconduct (EM) respectively. This moderators falls under qualitative measure as Baron and Kenny (1986) explained that a moderator is a qualitative (e.g., sex, race, class) or quantitative (e.g., level of reward) variable that affects the direction and/or strength of the relation between an independent and a dependent variable.

According them, the typical way to measure this type of moderator effect is to correlate separately a dependent variable with independent variables for each category and then test the difference. On the other hand, they highlighted that regression analysis is more appropriate because regression coefficients are not affected by differences in the variances of the independent variable or differences in measurement error in the dependent variable. It is almost always preferable to measure the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable not by correlation coefficients but by unstandardized (not betas) regression coefficients (Baron and Kenny, 1986).

Hierarchical regression method was performed to analyze whether ES and ECW moderate the relationship between Procedural Justice (PJ) and Employee Misconduct (EM). Table 18 shows that ES does moderate the relationship between PJ and EM. ES was statistically significant at β , 0.546 ($F_{2, 237} = 54.03$, $p<0.05$, at 0.000). PJ is significant at β , -0.132 ($p<0.05$, at 0.015). The Unethical Behavior of Self (Moderating Variables) explains 31.3% of the variance of Employee Misconduct (DV). Thus, H4 was supported.

Table 18: Regressions Analysis on Moderating Variable (ES)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-1.884	.197		-9.574	.000
Unethical Behavior of Self	.137	.014	.544	9.999	.000
(Constant)	-1.395	.279		-4.995	.000
Unethical Behavior of Self	.138	.014	.546	10.148	.000
Procedural Justice	-.010	.004	-.132	-2.447	.015

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Misconduct
R:0.560; R Square: 0.313

Table 19 shows the result that ECW also moderates the relationship between PJ and EM. The ECW was statistically significant at β , 0.286 (F2, 234 = 12.26, p<0.05, at 0.000). PJ is significant at β , -0.175 (p<0.05, at 0.006). The Unethical Behavior of Co Workers (Moderating Variables) explains 9.5% of the variance of Employee Misconduct (DV). Thus, H5 was supported.

Table 19: Regressions Analysis on Moderating Variable (ECW)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.769	.201		-3.830	.000
Unethical Behavior of Co-Workers	.063	.016	.255	4.046	.000
(Constant)	-.200	.285		-.701	.484
Unethical Behavior of Co-Workers	.071	.016	.286	4.531	.000
Procedural Justice	-.014	.005	-.175	-2.772	.006

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Misconduct
R:0.308; R Square: 0.095

4.7 Summary of Hypotheses Result

Summary of the hypothesis as been explained previously are as Table 20.

Table 20: Summarization of Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses		Result
H1a	There is a positive relationship between Recruitment and Selection and Procedural Justice.	Supported
H1b	There is a positive relationship between Training and Development and Procedural Justice.	Supported
H1c	There is a positive relationship between Performance Management and Promotion and Procedural Justice.	Supported
H1d	There is a positive relationship between Compensation and Incentives and Procedural Justice.	Not Supported
H2a	There is a positive relationship between Recruitment and Selection and Employee Misconduct.	Not Supported
H2b	There is a positive relationship between Training and Development and Employee Misconduct.	Supported
H2c	There is a positive relationship between Performance Management and Promotion and Employee Misconduct.	Supported
H2d	There is a positive relationship between Compensation and Incentives and Employee Misconduct.	Supported
H3a	Procedural Justice mediates the relationship between Recruitment and Selection and Employee Misconduct.	Not Supported
H3b	Procedural Justice mediates the relationship between Training and Development and Employee Misconduct.	Supported

Hypotheses		Result
H3c	Procedural Justice mediates the relationship between Performance Management and Promotion and Employee Misconduct.	Supported
H3d	Procedural Justice mediates the relationship between Compensation and Incentives and Employee Misconduct.	Not Supported
H4	Unethical Behavior of Self moderates the relationship between Procedural Justice and Employee Misconduct.	Supported
H45	Unethical Behavior of Co Workers moderates the relationship between Procedural Justice and Employee Misconduct.	Supported

This study establishes that there is a relationship between three of HRM Practices which are Recruitment and Selection, Training and Development and Performance Management and Promotion with Procedural Justice. Interestingly, most of the discussed HRM Practices (except Recruitment and Selection) do have positive relationship with Employee Misconduct. Procedural Justice has a negative relationship with Employee Misconduct and it does mediate the relationship between Training and Development, and Performance Management and Promotion towards Employee Misconduct. Last but not least, the Unethical Behavior of Self and Unethical Behavior of Co Workers moderate the relationship between Procedural Justice and Employee Misconduct respectively in Malaysia context.