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Abstract

The aim of the present research is to investigate the relationship between organizational climate, meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees in the organization. The statistical population in this research is 215 individuals of employees of the Sarcheshmeh copper mine and copper of Meiduk. The sampling method of this research was simple random and by using the Cochran formula the sample size is equal to 138 individuals. Data required for the present study were collected by using a questionnaire whose validity was tested. To determine the validity and reliability of questionnaire we used the content validity and Cronbach's alpha coefficient. For meritocracy questionnaire, it was calculated 0.80 and for job deviant behavior questionnaire of employees in the organization, it was 0.86. The reliability coefficient is equal to 0.85 for organizational climate questionnaire. In this research the structural relations model was used to analyze the data. For data analysis and hypothesis testing this research used the statistical software of LISREL. The results showed that there is a significant relationship between the organizational climate and meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees.
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Introduction

Human resources are the most valuable resource of organization which uses effort, diligence and coordination and implementation of other parts of the organization to fulfill the organizational goals. These sources have the potential capacities and capabilities that become active in the organizational environment (Abeli, 2006). Achieving this requires the full understanding of the human resources and provides the appropriate conditions for work and effort. One of the issues in this field is to locate individuals in positions commensurate with their ability, experience as well as the important role of managers (Horton, 2002). The concept of merit or ability is one of the crucial approaches in recent decades to the world of managers. The concept of meritocracy involves the characteristic manifestation of selection, appointment and maintenance managers; specifically it includes a range of key factors that has not been reached by the general opinion consensus in the establishment of meritocracy. On this basis any analysis about the meritocracy requires extensive and comprehensive study. In today's competitive environment, human resource is the most valuable factor of production and service provision as well the most important asset of any organization so that their effective management, provides context for organizational excellence. In some cases employees may have a tendency to behaviors that do not conform to the organizational norms which threatened their safety and other employees. Occurrence of such behaviors of is called "deviant workplace behaviors" and affected the amount of development of the organization’s employees (Soltani, 2007 and Soltani, 2002). Deviant workplace behaviors are the behaviors that violate the rules of work and threatened the organization stability. Thus many researchers around the world researched about these behaviors and identified backgrounds, relevant factors and ways to combat them. Deviant behavior can be either constructive as well as destructive.

Despite the importance of deviations with constructive (Administrative behavior in violation of the norms that are important resources for innovation and entrepreneurship and to help create competitive advantage), little research has been done in this field (Galperin Bella and Burke Ronald, 2006). Theories related to organizational misbehavior were partly responsible for the field of sociology of the 1980s and especially the effect of Hollinger and Clark (1982). Their deviant behaviors of employees are divided into two categories: Diversion of assets and production diversion. Diversion assets are the behavior of attack in which an employee attacks of the employer's property or harm. Production diversion refers to behavior that organizational norms related to the quantity and quality of work during which an employee can be violated. According to the Varedi and Wiener (1996) the organizational misbehavior "For every action organization members is said to violate the norms of orientation of organizational and social." This definition stresses the importance the value system of internal organizational external organization and confirmed the diagnosis of misconduct. Hence organizational misbehavior are included such as: low working, a waste of time, out of work, refusal to work, improper actions in the workplace, sabotage, poor resistance, sabotage and misuse of the organization's facilities.

Akroid and Thompson (1999), experts in industrial sociology, have commented on the organizational misbehavior as "Whatever you do in the workplace and had not to do". In their opinion, organizational misbehavior has related to the difference between employers and
employees on topics such as time, type of work, services and identity. Watson (2003) offered a more detailed definition of this phenomenon that included: activities that occur in the workplace in accordance with cultural and administrative structures and organizational rules that should not happen and operational procedures in an organization to challenge the dominant tendencies.

Therefore the behavior located beyond the range of acceptable professional behavior is considered as organizational misbehavior. These behaviors are often unconventional and illegitimate and include the violent behavior that can be physical and psychological damage to employees or, in the long-term, causes of irreparable damage to organizations (Blonder, 2006). Therefore, it is vital to investigate the role of the organization and management incidence of the deviant work behaviors in which organizational norms are put in the fluctuations. This causes threat the safety of the organization and its employees. On the other hand organizational climate is a set of attributes and organizational characteristics that employees feel and understand. Its emergence is described through the actions, processes, and relationships of the members with the environment (Saatchi, 2003). The major consequence of the organizational climate is that it has influences on the perception and the sense of membership of employees in the organization and determines whether their organization are experienced in the psychologically rewarding and satisfactory. This entry in turn has a significant effect on the level of moral, motivation, satisfaction and desire of employees to remain in the organization (Mathiue & Farr, 1991). Therefore, the purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between meritocracy, organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.

Research literature
Job deviant behaviors of employees

In general, job deviant behaviors referred to the behaviors that have violated the organizational norms or threatened the organization safety, its employees working or both (Harter et al, 2004). Recently, the organizational experts frequently confirm that various types of the organizational misbehavior have become the prevalence of abuse among employees and managers. They focus on its important and costly consequences (Greenberg, 1996). Robinson and Bennett (1995), focusing on the deviant behaviors in the workplace and the role of members of the organization classified two dimensions of behaviors as follows: intensity and purpose of the behavior: Product categories include: Product deviation, deviation of financial, political deviation and aggression. Job deviant behavior includes: the violent behavior that has violated the organizational norms and threatened the organizations safety or that of its employees or both (Colbert et al, 2004). Job deviation is voluntary because the employees are not motivated to conform to the normative expectations or to violate these expectations. The purposes of the organizational norms are to raise job standards. Also not every behavior that violated the norm is diversion from the criteria, or a threat to the organization (Robinson Sandra and Bennett Rebecca, 1995). According reseach about the background of job deviation, issues such as the individual factors, cognitive, organizational… have been detected as effective in the job diversion (Salmani, 2010). Researchers divided the consequences arising from such deviations and violations in the organization such as services, production and industry into two main groups:
A) The personal consequences such as marring the job security of offender person and resultant mental and emotional abnormalities,

B) Organizational consequences such as reducing organizational productivity. Other researches stated other kinds of the consequences of job deviant behaviors and administrative violations. Some can be noted such as mistrust people toward the government, the waste of limited and economic valuable resources, failure to achieve the targets set by the government in the development various sectors, negative impact of labor on the GDP growth (Soltani, 2007).

Identification the types of job deviations: Typology of job deviant behavior of the employees, in this regard, is useful to develop systematic studies and enable us to achieve a comprehensive theory about them (Robinson Sandra and Bennett Rebecca, 1995). A lot of classifications have been done of the job deviant behavior. The most famous are the below-sated divisions of behaviors into four groups:

- The perversion of production: it occurs when employees violate the standards of quality and quantity in product the production or service which increase the production costs and reduce in the inventory control.

- Political perversion: it occurs when the employees support a particular shareholder in which case the others are exposed to contaminants. Such support may cause the costs increase and provide unstable quality of service, dissatisfaction and feelings of injustice.

- Financial perversion: it contains the acquisition or loss of company assets without company confirmation such as theft and embezzlement.

- Personal invasion: it contains the hostility and aggressive behavior toward others that could endanger the company's credit and have the negative serious consequences for selected persons (Litzky Barrie et al, 2006).

Researchers knew that the job deviant behaviors abuse the public or government power or possession of government property for personal purposes which is to detriment of the public interest (Henle et al, 2005).

Organizational climate:

The organizational climate was raised for the first time in 1951 by Kurt Lewin. He thought that behavior of individual depend on their surrounding environment. This concept was prevalent in 1960 in the literature on organizational atmosphere. Two important factors in were prevalent the literature of organizational climate that were the studies of Forehand and Gilmer and James and Jones (Thomas, 2006). The essence of organizational climate is revealing how the employees understand their work environment and their interpretation of the organization. A better understanding of the organizational climate can be effectively fundamental in the improvement of the production levels, motivation and degree of employee satisfaction (Ibid, 2-10). Organizational climate in a way is heavily dependent on the
construction of employees in terms of hierarchy management so that the higher levels managers in an organization cannot be very strong in the organizational climate but the lower-level employees can change the organizational atmosphere and be able to either weaken or strengthen it. (Ibid, 48-54).

In today's competitive world that the organizations are constantly in looking for new ways to maximize the performance of their employees. The necessary suitable organizational atmosphere and employee motivation for the survival and success of organizations is an important variable. The innovative organization cannot be achieved without the creative staff and supporting working environment (Paramitha and Indarti, 2014). Appropriate organizational atmosphere and mutual relations of groups within the organization between managers and employees can affect the behavior employees. This is effective in the amount of employees satisfaction can lead to increased levels of employee's performance. Therefore the organizations should provide the comfortable atmosphere in a way that employees and managers of all experiences, abilities and capacities can promote the organization's objectives. Brown and Mobergh believe that the organizational atmosphere is a set of culture, customs and special practical methods that have been observed by the members of the organization. They include: (1) identifying the organization, (2) distinguishing the organization from other organizations and institutions, (3) relatively durable over time and (4) influencing and guiding people. On the other hand organizational climate has been effective on the willingness of employees to do things beyond their role in the organization so that individuals and the organizations will benefit from this performance.

Litwin and Stringer (1974) defined the organizational climate as a set of measurable characteristics in the work environment that are directly or indirectly understood by those who work in this environment and effect on their motivation and behavior (litwin and Stringer, 1974).

In defining the organizational climate many different definitions in the areas of management have been offered. Some have equated it with the environment (Farmahini Farahani, 1999). Organizational climate refers to the set of elements and factors that are outside an organization but on the whole these elements and factors have an impact on the activities of an organization (Kadivar, 1997).

Alageband (2006) identifies the organizational climate as all internal and external factors and conditions that surround it and are located in them.

**Types of organizational climate**

The excellent organizational atmosphere has been proposed in recent decades as a major challenge in management studies. Every organization has a culture, traditions and customs, values, norms and operation specific procedures. Based on these characteristics, their behavior can be predicted. These characteristics allow us to recognize that an organization is different from other organizations (Alawi, 2003). In the 60s, Craft and Halpin did a study on organizational climate and identified six types of organizational climate:
Open climate: in this atmosphere the teachers (employees) have the high spirit and work together well and without aggression or fighting the management policies. The management facilitates the performance of tasks and affairs. Individuals do not have trouble and they enjoy friendly relations with each other.

Autonomous climate: Teachers in this climate have relatively complete; they can find a way among the group to satisfy the social needs. Teachers (employees) are working on their own and can to achieve their goals easily or quickly.

Controlled climate: controlled climate is concerned with pressure to achieve the objectives of the organization at the expense of satisfying the social needs. All hard working employees have little time for friendly relationship with each other and this climate has more emphasis on performing tasks.

Friendly climate: in this climate the manager believes that all members are a family. He avoids doing things that hurt the feelings of its members.

Paternal climate: teachers do not work together which causes a lack of coordination. Teachers do not have friendly relations and their Morales are significantly lower. Managers try to monitor and control their teachers.

Climate Pack: in this climate teachers are not involved in the organization affairs. Job satisfaction of teacher (employees) is at a low level. Teachers try to connect and communicate with each other to satisfy their private relations. Most teachers want to leave their jobs (Mirkamali, 2002).

Meritocracy:

In discussing the broad concepts of competence and meritocracy interpretations and definitions have been stated. These two concepts have been investigated from the perspective of experts who refer to the important and summarize definitions.

Katav, Newsom and Di defined competency as any kind of knowledge, skills, abilities or the personal qualities shown through the behaviors and lead to excellence (Bandr, 2003). Competence means a written description of the personal skills and measurable work habits that are used in order to achieve business objectives (Green, 1999). Skills and habits that are necessary for employees to be effective in a job are considered as the concept of competence (Monsefid, 1996). Mirabal said that competency includes knowledge, skills and abilities or characteristics associated with high performance in a job (Mirabal, 1996). Meritocracy is formed of two words the Merit that means competence, capability, suitableness and cracy which means administration or method of affairs manage (Aryanpour Kashani, 1992).

Meritocracy refers to the social system in which the highest power and social level are deposited to individuals with the greatest ability. Meritocratic people have this kind of power in such a system. As a definition of meritocracy, it is appropriate to investigate the concept of merit. Thomas Conrad in his definition of meritocracy states the set of principles that compose meritocracy:

1. The merit test should measure the individual talent.
2. Everyone shall have an equal opportunity to express their talents (equality of opportunity).
3. People with more talent should be receiving the greater share of the social rewards.
4. Social inequality in (income, social class, and power) is fair, of course when the result of the principles and criteria has already been set up (Liu, 2007).

Rob Moore states that meritocracy is the system that allows people to get their social position according to ability rather than referring to an incident and happening (Liu, 2007).

Eight step process of meritocracy:

Meritocracy draws on the combination process from sub process of process of merit polls, merit selection, merit equipment, merit impressments, merit clothes and merit breeding. Relationships between these factors can be seen in the following diagram:

![Figure 1: eight step process of meritocracy](image)

1. Merit want

In the merit wants to take advantage of the competence and valuing them as a national commitment and organizational inviolable, value is emphasized. In the such a culture disadvantaging of the merit people in jobs is deemed to be sin and offense and the behavior of managers who are influenced by variables family relations, ethnic or political considerations, will be considered (Abel, 2005).
2. Merit recognition

This step is a centerpiece in the process of absorbing the required force of the organizations. At this stage organizations should apply the most effective methods of notification and the efficient search methods and motivates the merit individuals (Abel, 2005).

3. Merit rating

It is necessary to recognize those people who think they have to capabilities of merits, on the basis of general and specialized skills and tests and expert interviews. This step requires careful rereading of religious teachings, moral, cultural, social and managerial and executive issues to define criteria of comparison. Providing these principles is far from the truth and should be done gradually and on long-term planning.

4. Merit selection

This step has two parts. The first part is related to the assessment and analysis of the results of the previous stage and the second part is related to the allocation of merit positions to its deserving. At this stage of the meritocracy process, based on scientific research the ideal and anti-ideal situations are traced and based on that the merit of individuals.

5. Merit attract

Merit attract means the attraction of the competent managers and employees. Due to the competitive pace of activities in the coming years, government should attract the merit managers in a competitive environment absorb the requirements of merit managers in the government departments, NGOs and universities. For this reason, and given the huge impact of public managers, effective, transparent and fair measures must be created in order to attract merit managers (Gorban panah, 2008).

6. Merit appointing

Merit appointing means that with the preservation of the balance between jobs and employed individuals we can have the maximum performance. Although a correct choice is often done with this expected, but since choices are done collectively and at different levels of management, expertise and staff have considered mainly the general characteristics of the classes. The allocation and assignment of selected individuals require the precision and attention in the specific requirements of the job as defined in that category. Also in this stage, it is necessary to select according to personality characteristics of individuals (Abel, 2006).
7. Merit care

This step is very important because the absorbing and selection of merits is a simple work, but their maintenance is problematic. There is a need to design mechanisms of scientific, humane and reasonable structures to enable the merit people become the loyal to their organization (Soltani, 2005).

8. Merit educating

The meritocracy system should not rely on the current situation. This system provides the breeding grounds, the actual and potential staff through the short-term and long-term training. It pushes them to higher levels of the insight, knowledge and capabilities.

In parallel, this system has created the reception field of heavier responsibilities and takes effective tasks (anonymous author, 2006).

**Meritocracy principles**

The foundation of meritocracy is in the social justice in nurturing of talents. Meritocracy is a social situation that can be achieved by scientific excellence and not by assignment or nepotism. So identifying the qualified individuals must be based on effort and their ability (Golkar and Nasehifar, 2003). Based on this, the following principles for meritocracy can be expressed:

1. The principle of equality of opportunity

According to this principle, different individuals should have the equal chance to achieve the opportunities and be responsible for either success or failure (Golkar and Nasehifar, 2003).

According to this principle everyone should have an equal opportunity to reveal his/her talents because meritocracy emphasizes the equality of opportunity. This factor has caused the widespread acceptance of the meritocracy. An example that is often used in discussions about equality of opportunity is that when a race is competitive, all the runners in that race start from the same point. So to ensure the absence of discriminatory treatment, it was suggested that runners should be randomly determined to the race track lines. Some suggest that it is enough but others argued that, in addition to determining the accident of racetrack, the runners must have different starting points so that the integral obstacles in front of the runner’s outlines racetrack are compensated. In this mode, multiple barriers disappear and no one is deprived of the race and everyone has an equal opportunity to compete and win the race (Liu, 2007).
2. The principle of equality of individuals’ value

This principle is considered as the underlying principle of meritocracy. According to this principle, the individuals are innately the same, and the criteria such as origin cannot be as valid as meritocracy criteria (Golkar and Nasehifar, 2003).

3. Principle of capacity building

This principle suggests that we should provide the necessary conditions for the establishment of meritocracy. In this context, it is necessary to identify the employees’ abilities and then create the capacity of successfully.

4. Principle of optimization

In meritocracy, the organization is seeking to improve the work, goods and services. This means through attention to competences the optimization process can be facilitated. In simple terms, meritocracy should focus on the optimization through which organization can achieve sustainable development.

5. Principle of criteria- oriented

The basis of meritocracy is the creation of criteria for selecting and retaining competences. This principle has emphasized that there should be a minimum establishment of standards in the organization and development of the standards.

6. Principle of ability to update meritocracy

This principle emphasizes that in meritocracy selection criteria and excellence are not fixed and static but should be always in accordance with the environment condition of intra and inter organizational variables. Meritocracy criteria have to take into account the scientific revolutions updates.

7. Principle of nativism

In meritocracy, conditions of local, culturally and humanitarian of every organization and region must be considered. This means that this principle emphasized the rules and conditions of culture and local criteria in meritocracy.

8. Principle of invalidity of personal tastes

Namely in the meritocracy, the individual opinion and the criteria of individual selection should not be stressed. Instead the scientific and technical criteria were selected.
9. The principle of comprehensiveness
Meritocracy is not a one-dimensional concept and must be based on a set of factors and conditions in the individual. When meritocracy pays attention just to one dimension such as literacy and expertise, we cannot expect the success and improvement in the organization (Soltani, 2006, p. 411).

10. Programme principle

This principle states that meritocracy set of factors are not created or generated randomly. But also they are based on a scheduled and scientific program. So we should have a program for meritocracy that is implemented through design of the relevant elements.

11. Cultural principle

In meritocracy, the component of attitudes, ways of thinking and working life of the employees and managers must be provided. The cultural context of the employees of the organization in the terms of the cultural traits must embrace the principles and rules of meritocracy (Soltani, 2005).

Figure 1. Conceptual Model
Research hypotheses

1. There is a significant relationship between the meritocracy and organizational climate.
2. There is a significant relationship between the organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.
3. There is a significant relationship between the job deviant behaviors of employees and meritocracy.
4. There is a significant relationship between the job deviant behaviors of employees and meritocracy due to the role of mediator of organizational climate.

Research method

The method of the present research is practical. The characteristics of the target population have been studied in a certain period of time and in the territory of the designated location. The researchers want to extend the results obtained by applications methods to similar units. Collecting information for testing hypotheses will be done through questionnaires. This research is a kind of the analysis of the correlation matrix or covariance in which we used the structural equation modeling. The statistical population in this research is the all employees of the Sarcheshmeh copper mine and copper of Meiduk. The sampling method of this research is simple random and by using the Cochran formula the sample size is equal to 138 individuals. Data were collected by using a questionnaire whose their validity was tested. To determine the validity and reliability of questionnaire we used the content validity and Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The reliability coefficient for questionnaire of organizational climate is equal to 0.85. For meritocracy questionnaire, it was calculated 0.80 and for job deviant behavior questionnaire of employees in the organization, it was 0.86. In this study, we used the structural equation model to analyze the data. For data analysis and hypothesis testing we used the statistical software of LISREL. Therefore, in present research the measurement model have been obtained after drawing the analytical model of research based on data by the Path diagram with execution the program of Perlis from LISREL software. In this model by using the B coefficients, t-test has tested the hypotheses. Meanwhile, the model fit indices were automatically calculated with executing the program Perlis for desired model.

Data analysis

At first, the chi-square index is calculated to test the null hypothesis. The goal model is faced in the population. Significant chi-square has implies on rejecting the null hypothesis that indicated that the model is not available in the population. GFI and AGFI (size LISREL) were formulated and affected by sample size.

NFI: it is the softened index of fit amount is between 0.90 and 0.95 which is acceptable. The higher amounts of 0.95 are excellent. NNFI: it is the non-softened index of fit if the amount is higher than 0.1 it is equal to 0.1. RMSE: it is the square root of the variance estimation of approximation error that is reported as a decimal. Among the mentioned indicators RMSEA and GFI are more important. The RMSEA indicators for good model are
equal or less than the 0.05. The models that their RMSEA are equal or more to 0.1 have a weak fit. GFI index close to 1.0 has shown the good fit of the model.

Table 1: fit indices of research model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>estimated value</th>
<th>Standard values</th>
<th>Fit index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3937.91</td>
<td>Due to the dependent on sample size is not relevant criterion</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NNFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>CFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>RMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>GFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Table 1, it can be seen that the amount indicators of compliance or goodness of fit all are in the relatively acceptable level. The following two figures show the general models of LISREL software's output that time are involve at the same the structural model and measurement.
Figure 2: The base model with path coefficients

Chi-Square=3537.51, df=857, p-value=0.00000, RMSR=0.141
Figure 3: The base model with T amounts
Testing hypotheses

The first hypothesis
Researchers claim:
1. There is a significant relationship between meritocracy and organizational climate.
H0: There is not a significant relationship between meritocracy and organizational climate.
H1: There is a significant relationship between meritocracy and organizational climate.

Table 2: Results of standardized coefficients and t-statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Predicting variable</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
<th>Estimated coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meritocracy</td>
<td>organizational climate</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, the amount of path coefficient between meritocracy and organizational climate is equal 1.18 and the amount of corresponding T is equal 5.72 > 1.96. According to t-test with critical value of 0.05 at the 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis can be rejected. As a result, the researchers claim is confirmed and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a positive relationship between the meritocracy and organizational climate.

The second hypothesis
1. There is a significant relationship between organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.
H0: There is not a significant relationship between the organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.
H1: There is a significant relationship between the organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.

Table 3: Results of standardized coefficients and t-statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Predicting variable</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
<th>Estimated coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organizational climate</td>
<td>job deviant behaviors of employees</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, the amount of correlation between organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees is equal to 1.31 and the corresponding T is equal to 5.85 > 1.96 that according to t-test with critical value of 0.05 at the 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis can be rejected. As a result, the second researchers claim is confirmed and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a positive relationship between the organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.

The third hypothesis
1. There is a significant relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees.
H0: There is not a significant relationship between the meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees.
H1: There is a significant relationship between the meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees.

Table 4: Results of standardized coefficients and t-statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Predicting variable</th>
<th>Estimated coefficient</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meritocracy</td>
<td>job deviant behaviors of employees</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4, the amount of path correlation between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees is equal to 1.76 and the corresponding T is equal to $5.46 > 1.96$. According to t-test with critical value of 0.05 at the 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis can be rejected. As a result the third researchers’ claim is confirmed and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a positive relationship between the meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees.

The fourth hypothesis

4. There is a significant relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees due to the role of mediator of organizational climate.

H0: there is not a significant relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees due to the role of mediator of organizational climate.

H1: There is a significant relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees due to the role of mediator of organizational climate.

Table 7: Results of standardized coefficients and t-statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated coefficient</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
<th>Direct connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>meritocracy $\rightarrow$ organizational climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>organizational climate $\rightarrow$ job deviant behaviors employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18 $\times$ 1.31</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>meritocracy $\rightarrow$ job deviant behaviors employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In direct connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table (7), the indirect relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees can be confirmed due to the role of mediator of organizational climate by direct effect of meritocracy. Such role can investigate the organizational climate and then the direct effect of organizational climate on the job deviant behaviors of employees. According to the table (7) the indirect effect of meritocracy on the job deviant behaviors employees due to the role of mediator of organizational climate is equal to 1.54.

The research findings and analysis of results

The results of the first hypothesis showed that the amount of path coefficient between meritocracy and organizational climate is equal 1.18 and the amount of corresponding T is equal $5.72 > 1.96$. According to t-test with critical value of 0.05 at the 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis can be rejected. As a result, the researchers’ claim is confirmed and it can
be said with 95% confidence that there is a positive relationship between the meritocracy and organizational climate. The meritocracy can improve the organizational climate and morale and participation of individuals in decision-making. It can increase their creativity and innovation which are effective in the provision of mental health of employees.

The second hypothesis results showed that the amount of correlation between organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees is equal to 1.31 and the corresponding T is equal to 5.85> 1.96. According to t-test with critical value of 0.05 at the 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis can be rejected. As a result, the second researchers claim is confirmed and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a positive relationship between the organizational climate and job deviant behaviors of employees.

The third hypothesis results showed that the amount of path correlation between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees is equal to 1.76 and the corresponding T is equal to 5.46> 1.96. According to t-test with critical value of 0.05 at the 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis can be rejected. As a result, the third researchers’ claim is confirmed and it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a positive relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees.

The fourth hypothesis test result is investigated according to the information of table 7. The indirect relationship between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees can be confirmed due to the role of mediator of organizational climate by direct effect of meritocracy. Such role can investigate the organizational climate and then the direct effect of organizational climate on the job deviant behaviors of employees. According to the table (7) the indirect effect of meritocracy on the job deviant behaviors employees due to the role of mediator of organizational climate is equal to 1.54.

The path coefficient of meritocracy variable on the organizational climate is 1.18 with T value equal is 5.72. The error level of 0.05 with a confidence 0.95 of the statistic target is significant. The path coefficient of organizational climate variable on the job deviant behaviors of employees is 1.31 with T value equal with 5.85. The error level is of 0.05 with a confidence 0.95, the statistic target is significant. As a result the influence of the mediating role of organizational climate between meritocracy and job deviant behaviors of employees is equal to 1.18× 1.31 =1.54 and the researchers’ claim is confirmed.
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