

WORKPLACE HARASSMENT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: A STUDY OF THE HIDDEN FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE ORGANIZATION INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT AND PERFORMANCE

Rana AlBahsh *

* School of Management and Logistic Sciences, German Jordanian University, Amman, Jordan
Contact details: German Jordanian University, Amman Madaba Street, P. O. Box 35247, Amman 11180, Jordan



Abstract

How to cite this paper: AlBahsh, R. (2023). Workplace harassment and domestic violence: A study of the hidden factors that affect the organization internal environment and performance. *Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review*, 7(3), 144–164.

<https://doi.org/10.22495/cgobrv7i3p12>

Copyright © 2023 The Author

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN Online: 2521-1889

ISSN Print: 2521-1870

Received: 12.06.2022

Accepted: 21.06.2023

JEL Classification: A120, J710, M140, Z130

DOI: 10.22495/cgobrv7i3p12

There is a gap in applying interdisciplinary literature on management research, which relates socioeconomic factors and organizations' work environment to organization outcomes. This study examines the effect of workplace harassment and domestic violence on organization outcomes in Jordan within poor communities working in the informal economy. Results showed that workplace harassment (WH), domestic violence (DV), or both increase intentions to withdraw from work and absenteeism, decrease the perception of work quality, affect attitude towards work (job satisfaction and job engagement) and towards coworkers (antisocial behavior and attitude towards vengeance). Older workers showed stability at work and pacific behavior with coworkers, but increased absenteeism. Educated workers increased their withdrawal from work, had negative attitude towards work, but were friendly with coworkers. Females had limited choices, they had low work engagement and negative opinion about work quality but did not withdraw from work. Females did not show antisocial behavior towards coworkers but had tendencies towards revenge.

Keywords: Poverty, Informal Economy, Workplace Harassment, Domestic Violence, Work Outcomes, Developing Countries

Authors' individual contribution: The Author is responsible for all the contributions to the paper according to CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) standards.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite that working in the informal economy offers job opportunities to workers, especially the poor and marginalized ones, the informal economy often provides poor working conditions, both physical (long hours, low wages, social protection, work/life imbalance and poor occupational safety and health standards) and psychosocial (verbal, physical and sexual harassment of workers) (Adler et al., 2017). This practice often results in human and labor rights abuses, because it undermines employment

relationships and security that are otherwise offered within normal work contracts, let alone its reverse effect on the economy, tax payments, employment and turnover (Blanchard & Landier, 2002; Bone, 2006; Briscoe et al., 2000; Daunton, 2002; Trades Union Congress [TUC], 2008; Visagie et al., 2012).

Poverty has always been a concern to economies. Many researches tried to explore it from different dimensions in order to understand its dynamics and find solutions to minimize it, if not vanish it. One of the important outcomes of poverty is the creation of the informal economy where

people practice economic activities that are not regulated or protected by the government. This includes working in unregistered enterprises and wage employment in unprotected jobs (Williams, 2014). Working within the informal economy, is more or less, related to the inability of a person to have a good and decent job in the formal economy that meets her/his needs; the thing that makes her/him take the tough decision to work “off the books” (Gutmann, 1978).

Inside the company and in its aim to reduce costs and achieve inflated production targets, it applies hostile human resource management practices, which lead to mistreatment of its workforce (Adler et al., 2017). For example, a piece-rate scheme might result in the abuse of workers by their supervisors because the compensation of the supervisor is linked to performance and high production (Lazear, 2000b). Moreover, the purchasing practices of the other parts of the supply chain, which evolved because of the high competition, led to severe contracts with workers where price, contract length, and turnaround time are low (Barrientos, 2013; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014).

Many multinational organizations and global brands outsourced their manufacturing activities to lower-cost production locations as the developing countries. This increased the flow of investment into developing countries with obvious advantages like increasing the participation rates of labor force and opening opportunities to marginalized groups like women and migrant workers. Nevertheless, there was an important exploitation of workers, especially in small factories, through low-quality work conditions in order to keep production costs competitive in the global marketplace. In fact, the international market demand and competition stressed matters like short lead times, high flexibility, speed of production, low costs and high quality from their outsources in the developing countries who transferred that stress to their workers in many faces including working in insecure conditions of work, abuse, and mistreatment (Barrientos, 2013; Plank et al., 2012; Rossi et al., 2014). Moreover, insecure conditions of work within the informal economy do not exist only in the developing and poor countries, it has proliferated in many developed countries. Companies like the ones that work on a seasonal basis and depend on the cyclical economic demand that peaks prefer flexible working practices that lead to reductions in all types of costs including wages, social securities, and health insurance as well as obligations towards the authorities like taxes. Accordingly, they adopt the types of job relations, which present these preferences such as fixed-term contracts, temporary working and employment via agencies (Briscoe et al., 2000; Hudson-Sharp & Runge, 2017) even if the adoption of these practices is at the expense of productivity (Behling & Harvey, 2015).

When management continues to offer poor working conditions in organizations with the justification to enhance economic efficiency, reduce costs and satisfy inflated production targets, and consequently sign contracts with the institutional customers (Lazear, 2000a; Shearer, 2004), workers will reduce their perception of well-being in general,

and accept the current poor conditions. This may explain the continuous relatively poor working conditions in these organizations, especially in developing economies (Adler et al., 2017; Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014).

Improvements in workers' well-being are often considered costs rather than investments that lead to potential improvement in the organization's economic performance. Managers and workers deviate in their perception of the importance of working conditions, especially in developing countries (Adler et al., 2017). On one hand, the empirical evidence finds that increasing minimum wages lead to reduced investments, decreased profits, lower manufacturing employment and higher bankruptcy risks for smaller producers (Harrison & Scorse, 2010). On the other hand, there is evidence that investing in workplace conditions like communication improvements, amenities, and increase wages develop global life assessments and reduce measures of depression and traumatic stress which leads to increase productivity (Adler et al., 2017; Leblebici, 2012). Hackman and Oldham (1976) find that job characteristics can put workers in a psychological state that motivates them to focus on work quality. Lazear (2000a) and Shearer (2004) find that a good application of the right compensation system like the piece-rate scheme will increase the productivity of workers and profits of the organization, but this scheme may be subject to abuse of power by supervisors because compensations are linked to worker performance and quality of outputs (Lazear, 2000b).

Domestic violence is another important worldwide matter where its effect on organization's performance is underestimated in the research (Agarwal & Panda, 2007; Azam Ali & Naylor, 2013; Showalter, 2016). The prevalence of domestic violence is usually acknowledged from a human rights perspective. However, violence at work as well as at home does have an impact on the pursuit of productivity targets in organizations that some companies at the top of the supply chain and international organizations sometimes monitor the prevalence of domestic violence. Nonetheless, research on domestic violence's impact on work performance remains under-investigated, especially in developing and poor countries (LeBlanc et al., 2014).

It is important to note that domestic violence is a sophisticated issue in developing countries because it incorporates many reasons for it like cultures, habits, traditions, and gender attitudes, which complicates the analysis. Moreover, most cases of domestic violence are directed particularly against women (Cools & Kotsadam, 2017; Heath, 2014; LeBlanc et al., 2014; Schuler & Nazneen, 2018). Working women too face domestic abuse, and that leads to a reduction in their achievements, well-being, productivity and performance (Agarwal & Panda, 2007; LeBlanc et al., 2014; Showalter, 2016).

Therefore, this paper aims to provide evidence of 1) the prevalence of workplace harassment (WH) and domestic violence (DV) in poor communities working in the informal economy in a developing country; 2) the impacts of WH and DV on the three important outcomes related to withdrawal from work (intentions to leave, and a limited ability to perform typical tasks), work attitudes towards the work (work engagement and job satisfaction),

work attitude toward coworkers (antisocial behavior and attitude towards revenge) and self-reported work quality. The study focused on both violence and nonphysical aggression. The definition of violence included physical assaults, while nonphysical aggression was defined as verbal assaults (yelling, cursing, and threatening, etc.). Sexual harassment was not applied because it was considered as sensitive issue to reveal by the respondents and the questions were not answered even with the anonymous nature of the questionnaire. Future research may take into account a conversation between females and males while applying the tips for managing a conversation suggested by the World Health Organization (WHO) towards facing the increase of gender-based violence during COVID-19 (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies [IFRC], 2020).

The study offers four novelties. First, the scope of this study concentrates on the socioeconomic dimension of the financially poor society where living on welfare and government assistant is often not enough to cover the essential needs of big families. Consequently, people will be working in a low-wage formal economy — like cashiers, janitors, and salespeople — and if they cannot enter the formal economy, they will head toward the informal economy. This study concentrated on the part of the society (poor society) that is working within the informal economy under low-work conditions and rights and detected if these conditions affected their behavior, and personality traits negatively towards coworkers.

Second, the study is drawn into the interdisciplinary conversation by economists who hoped that psychology could be a useful source of assumptions and hypotheses for economic research (Kahneman, 2003). This research ties relations between economic factors like poverty and the informal economy on one side and the personality traits and attitudes in the society through harassment and its effect on the attitude of people at work.

Third, the paper presents information on the prevalence of both WH and DV in small Jordanian organizations working in the informal economy. In Jordan, despite the many amendments to the work law, it still has many flaws regarding workers' rights. It does not require many basic rights for the workers like health insurance and social security, or restrict certain actions like forced labor and minimum wages, which left the workers under the total mercy of the work owners (“Taedilat altedylat ealaa” [Amendments to the “Labor Law”], 2021). On the other side, domestic violence in Jordan is high, in particular, against females, many social norms as well as laws enforcement that prevents aggression at home are not effective and consequently push a person to endure taugt conditions at home and at work which is in total not healthy for the organizations (Clark et al., 2009).

Fourth, the development of a quick, reliable, and brief screening instrument would benefit various organizations by providing a more concrete basis for their work. It would also be useful for researchers interested in organizations performance and the importance of the attitude and some conditions of workers. The paper also responds to the calls of (LeBlanc et al., 2014) to provide more

evidence on the influence of types of aggression on work outcomes. Many workplace innovations are perceived by workers to have a significantly higher impact on measures of worker well-being and productivity-improving measures than innovations reported by managers (Adler et al., 2017; Bloom et al., 2013; Kuvaas et al., 2014).

The literature on the determinants of children's attainments has focused on the effects of families' circumstances and choices (for example, parental education, family income, or family structure) and neighborhood characteristics (for example, the percentage of high school dropouts in the neighborhood or of professional workers). The viewpoint of this research, consistent with a variety of models in all of the social sciences, is that children are products of their home, their family and its circumstances, their peers, and their environments, and the effort is to reliably identify the elements or timing of each with the most important effects (Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1999).

Corporate code of conduct and ethical initiatives of organizations have dramatic social and environmental effects that are considered worldwide. These codes, generated usually by organizations, may posit tensions between a corporate approach focusing on compliance with outcome standards and a civil society approach focusing on process rights. While applying the codes has led in many cases to improvements in outcome standards, they have changed little in process rights for workers. It is though crucial for decision and policy makers that corporations generate and enforce codes that improve labor standards, and not limit the application of codes on outcome standards and practices while underpinning poor labor standards in global production systems (Barrientos & Smith, 2007; Kitson & Campbell, 1996). The same importance is for corporate social responsibility (CSR) in developing countries. The claims about the contribution of CSR towards achieving development and alleviating poverty in developed countries cannot be warranted in developing countries. Therefore, decision-makers should pay attention to a suitable CSR agenda taking into account the unique characteristics of developing countries and invent suitable solutions towards increased productivity and sustainability (Blowfield & Goerge Frynas, 2005).

This study addressed the importance of WH and DV in the small organizations working in the informal industry in Jordan, and their impact on the organizations performance and outcomes related to withdrawal from work, work attitudes, self-reported work quality, and aggressive attitudes towards coworkers. The results were discriminated by the demographic factors and living standard beliefs of the worker. The questionnaire was prepared to reflect the particularity of the society of the study, as well as the dimensions covered by previous instruments. Data comes from 490 workers in small organizations or work in small organizations informally.

The results showed that WH and DV had negative effects on the behavior of workers toward work and towards other coworkers. Withdrawal from work increased when WH, DV, or both existed in the worker's life. It reduced the approbation of the work quality of the products and services of

the business. It increased tension between coworkers and decreased enthusiasm to do the jobs. Furthermore, age, education, living standards, and gender proved to affect the results. For example, age showed that older workers have more stability and satisfaction and less antisocial behavior towards other coworkers, they do not intent to leave work but instead increased their absence from work. Educated workers had a different strategy; they were not totally engaged and satisfied at work and generally did not like the quality of the work, but they were more realistic and did not have aggressive behavior towards other coworkers. In the meantime, they searched for other work and increased their absence. Females seem to have a different point of view, while their engagement was low and their opinion about the quality of work was negative, they did not withdraw from work. Contrary to that, they did not search for other jobs and their absence was low. On the other hand, while females tended to show higher peaceful behavior with low antisocial behavior, they on the other side had a high tendency towards revenge. These results reflect the circumstances the females have to endure while living in poor communities. They do not have the space that enables them to change in their lives and they have to accept what they already have. Living standards also and worrying about life obligations increase the instability at work as well as the behavior towards the work and coworkers. The results of this study convey a message to factory managers to foster worker well-being, which may improve work performance.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature and presents the theoretical framework. Section 3 analyses the methodology that has been used to conduct empirical research on factors affecting the performance and internal environment in organizations, it includes the description of participants and the design of the questionnaire. Section 4 shows the results, and Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

In less developed countries, human resource management practices often consider work force as costs of production that they should reduce to the minimum and that improving the worker's well-being is an extra cost rather than an improvement of the whole organization work environment. Moreover, in many cases, workers face abuse and inhumane treatment and labor violation from the management as the later aims to achieve inflated production targets while reducing labor costs. On the other hand, the quality and stability of the workers' private lives are of equal importance to the organization performance as domestic aggression and shakiness would affect the workplace environment, yet, many companies keep this factor completely beyond their scope of interest.

2.1. Workplace harassment

The workplace can have both positive and negative effects on employees. Theories have emphasized that employees increase their efforts and

productivity, as they perceive that their managers and supervisors are willing to reciprocate with desirable socioemotional and impersonal responses. For example, the organizational support theory emphasizes that when an organization supports its employees, they in return, strive to repay the organization by enhancing their efforts to achieve its targets (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003). The psychological contract theory argues that employees form a psychological contract with the organization when they believe that the organization maintains its promises toward them (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003). As a result, coworkers' and supervisor's support will have a positive influence on health, job satisfaction and other work performance outcomes and targets (Spell et al., 2014). Carvajal et al. (2018), Grönlund and Öun (2018), and Tenney et al. (2016) find that workers' well-being, including life satisfaction, job satisfaction, leads to higher performance of workers and organizations, lower absenteeism, stronger motivation, positive relationships, and lower turnover.

The evidence shows that creating a developmental climate between workers and supervisors where the relation in the organization is perceived as mutual support between both parties (Spell et al., 2014), and when the organization maintains a high-performance work system where participation, compensation, appraisal and communication are adopted (Razouk, 2011), and when the organization adopts policies and practices of human resource management, which aim to ensure a positive group culture and healthy employee-manager communication (Croucher et al., 2013), all would have a positive effect on workers attitude towards turnover, work performance and engagement. This will then lead to a favorable impact on the organization's current and future performance and its success to reach its target production (Croucher et al., 2013; Olsen et al., 2010; O'Regan et al., 2010; Patel & Cardon, 2010; Razouk, 2011; Spell et al., 2014).

Workplace harassment is the behavior that aims to harm and hurt another person in the workplace (Bowling & Beehr, 2006). It takes several forms like verbal abuse (Johnson & Indvik, 2006), violence (Barling et al., 2001), and sexual harassment (Barling et al., 2001; Ferri et al., 2016; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Kath et al., 2009; Shi et al., 2017). In the fashion industry, growing pressure from big brands on suppliers to deliver clothes quickly and cheaply as well as poor implementation of laws to combat sexual harassment at work with the power to fine or fire those found guilty of harassment fueled the exploitation of workers like lack of bathroom breaks to verbal and sexual abuse ("H&M probes abuse", 2021).

Aggression at work has a detrimental effect on workers' physical and mental health, which in turn affects the organization's work performance (Adler et al., 2017; Dehue et al., 2012; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Verkuil et al., 2015). Duan et al. (2019) find that workplace violence increases workers' turnover intention and job burnout¹ while it decreases job satisfaction. Barling et al. (2001) also find that

¹ Work-related stress, i.e., a state of physical or emotional exhaustion.

harassment in the workplace increases anxiety, anger and perception of injustice, which leads to lower commitment, higher withdrawal intentions, and poor interpersonal job performance. Ironically, many managers and supervisors apply verbal harassment at work intentionally as they consider it as a motivator to workers in the short-term (Pike & Godfrey, 2014); more than 90% of American adults experience aggression from their supervisors and managers during the span of their work career, especially in larger organizations (Johnson & Indvik, 2006).

The harassment often takes several forms like profanity, openly hostile remarks about performance and competency, gossip, and rumors. It leads then to distress, establishes poor well-being for the bullied employee, and decreases the morale among staff, which in turn leads to high turnover and high frequency of absence from work, which then lowers the performance of the whole organization (Dehue et al., 2012). The WHO divides workplace harassment into two types of violent behaviors: 1) physical violence (beating, kicking, slapping, stabbing, shooting, pushing, biting, and pinching) and 2) psychological violence (including verbal abuse, threats, etc.) (Duan et al., 2019). Björkqvist et al. (1992) order the use of aggressive behavior starting with direct physical aggression when a person has the ability to approach the other physically. If she/he cannot, then she/he will use direct verbal, and if cannot, then she/he will use indirect aggression where the target is attacked indirectly and the aggressor remains unidentified and avoid counterattack.

2.2. Domestic violence

Domestic violence has its negative effect on the physical and mental health of the victim (Lalley-Chareczko et al., 2017). While it can occur from any member of the family like parents, spouse or intimate partner, and siblings (Adams et al., 2012; Douglas, 2018; LeBlanc et al., 2014), females are more often victims of male partner violence (Carmo et al., 2011; Peate, 2017). Moreover, the level to which it is perceived as acceptable substantially varies between countries and cultures (Cools & Kotsadam, 2017; Schuler & Nazneen, 2018). In some societies, like in South and East Asia, which have high levels of interdependence and tight intergenerational ties, abusers in the household extend the male partner to other members of the multigenerational families (Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020).

Research proves that domestic violence transfers disruptions to the workplace. It is associated with a decline in productivity and performance, workplace time reductions, loss of paid work time, job loss, unemployment (Showalter, 2016), higher levels of cognitive distraction and higher work neglect while at work, and increase absenteeism and intentions to quit (LeBlanc et al., 2014; Schuler & Nazneen, 2018). While psychological aggression predicts additional variance in partial absenteeism above the effects of physical aggression, both physical and psychological aggression are related to unfavorable effects on the performance of an organization (LeBlanc et al., 2014).

In developing countries, despite the evidence of a declining acceptance of domestic violence because of socioeconomic and cultural changes (Bertrand et al., 2015; Pierotti, 2013), it remains nonetheless considerable and has a significant negative effect on victims' labor force participation (Cools & Kotsadam, 2017), especially females who have low education or married when they were young (Schuler & Nazneen, 2018). An intimate partner seeks to counteract her increased bargaining power through violence, which seems to have a significant negative effect on women's job stability and economic well-being (Heath, 2014). In communities with relatively higher acceptance of wife-beating, employed women still face a great risk of abuse (Cools & Kotsadam, 2017). In some cases, owning a real asset like a house or land significantly reduces a woman's risk of domestic violence while employment makes no difference (Agarwal & Panda, 2007). In other cases, decreases in the wage gap reduce violence against women (Aizer, 2010).

2.3. Informal economy and poverty

The informal economy² or undeclared work is a concept that contains several economic transactions. It is defined as paid activities that are unregistered by, or hidden from, the state for reasons like tax, social security and/or labor law, but these activities are considered to be legal in all other respects (Ahmad, 2008; European Commission, 2008; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2012; Pfau-Effinger, 2009; Williams, 2014). Poverty knocks on the door of an individual when she/he finds that her/his resources are not sufficient to meet the minimum needs like food, shelter, clothing, education, health and transport (Department of Statistics, 2010). Combined with the limited ability to access the formal labor force for reasons like very limited competencies, low level of education, and societal and cultural conditions, a person finds her/himself forced to enter informal work.

Entering the informal labor market introduces the worker to a harsh reality where most of the time the work endures long hours, hard working conditions, inflexibility, and low pay, let alone the many kinds of disrespectful attitudes and harassment from both supervisors and coworkers (Ahmad, 2008; Johnson et al., 2010; Williams, 2014). When the returns of formal employment do not meet a person's minimum needs as supposed to, she/he finds her/himself forced to join the informal economy as an alternative means to accumulate resources to meet the needs (European Commission, 2013). In fact, there is a significant correlation between poverty and the attempts of people to meet their personal financial needs through participation in the informal economy (Dellot, 2012). Williams (2014) finds that the greater the percentage of the population at risk of poverty and the level of severe material deprivation in a country, the larger the informal economy. Therefore, one can expect that a significant part of the officially unemployed people may be in reality working "off the books"

² DYMIMIC (dynamic multiple-indicators multiple-causes) method is an indicator for the informal sector. It depends on multiple monetary and non-monetary indicators, related to the money in circulation, level of tax morality and labor supply to calculate the informal sector in an economy.

the thing that promises increases in the informal sector (Gutmann, 1978).

The *Marginalization thesis* view that participation in the informal economy occurs amongst marginalized populations, such as the low-income and unemployed groups, who choose to work in the unobserved sector (Ahmad, 2008; Gutmann, 1978; Katungi et al., 2006), a situation where working in the informal sector either buffers against unemployment or supports unemployed workers who choose to receive public assistance while working “off the books” (Williams, 2014). The *Reinforcement thesis*, argues that despite that working within the informal economy offers the advantage to possess free time for marginalized populations, it entitles many risks, inconveniences and omissions from benefiting from certain rights like social security, having a verbal agreement with the employer rather than a contract, the fear of detection, the fear of being fired, and the lack of resources and opportunities. Conversely, those in formal jobs and high-income groups have fewer fears from the authorities; they also have more resources and skills that will enable them to compete and undertake other opportunities including those in the informal economy whenever they want, resulting in the informal economy reinforcing inequalities that are produced by the formal economy rather than reduce it.

Informal work can be performed in several forms like first, the *waged informal employment*, where the marginalized populations (the low-income and the unemployed groups) engage in wage rates way below the national minimum wages. This kind of work is usually conducted under sever conditions and for unscrupulous and exploitative employers (Geddes et al., 2013; Williams, 2014). Second, the *informal self-employment* where the informal sector is a ground for testing the viability of start-ups before the decision to create a formal enterprise, which usually entitles many difficulties, obstacles and costs (Community Links and Refugee Council, 2011; Dellot, 2012; Katungi et al., 2006). Third, the *paid favors* which is conducted by and for close social relations such as kin, connexion, friends, neighbors, acquaintances and colleagues in a way to help them do a work and avoid any connotation of charitable action which may be refused by them (European Commission, 2013; European Commission, 2008; Pfau-Effinger, 2009). For example, a person may employ her/his unemployed cousin to redecorate a home (Williams, 2014).

2.4. Informal sector in Jordan

It is a difficult task to measure the size and dimensions of the informal economy; however, economists have developed reliable methods to predict its impact in a given country. Surprisingly, results confirm that the informal economy is considerably large and sprawling in many countries (Ela, 2013).

The Jordanian market faces many obstacles. Amongst them is the “missing middle”³ with a scattered density of firms between micro and small enterprises on the one hand and well-

established large firms with limited contribution to net job creation on the other. Furthermore, even with promising sectors such as information and communication technologies, pharmaceuticals, and health tourism, but these sectors face challenges to scale up within the Jordanian market and are under continual competitive pressures especially from within the region. Another obstacle that faces sustainable development in Jordan is that the business climate is exposed to policy, regulatory, and administrative uncertainties due. Along with regional shocks since 2008, there has been an adverse effect on investor confidence (The World Bank, 2016).

These obstacles, and others, informality is widespread and has disproportionate impacts on the poor. Indeed, the influx of Syrian refugees is borne by the informal sector. It supplied the informal labor and enterprise with refugees, and this, in turn, deepened the wedge between formal and informal employment and shifted more economic activity outside the tax base and so undermined fiscal sustainability. From 2013 to 2020 the size of the informal economy in Jordan increased from 44% to 60% (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2013; The World Bank, 2020), which indicates that the whole situation had its shed on poverty, which has increased dramatically, along with increased expenditure for the household (The World Bank, 2016).

Poverty in Jordan is a critical problem. While the average monthly wage in 2013 is 269 Jordanian dinar (JD)⁴ (UNDP, 2013), it is way beyond the absolute poverty line (812 JD) in the same year, which indicates important financial needs that will contribute to converting a person towards the informal work (Department of Statistics, 2010). Moreover, Jolliffe and Sarajuddin (2015) suggest that while the poverty rate in Jordan in 2010 was declared as 14.4%, the prevalence of those who have been affected by poverty was more than twice as large as this official estimate. Inflation, unemployment and decline in economic activities have contributed to the increase in poverty in Jordan. In 2017, the unemployment rate rose a whole 3% to reach 19% (International Labor Organization, 2016; The World Bank, 2018). Moreover, the situation became harder on workers after COVID-19. The unemployment rate increased to 23% in the second quarter of 2020 as declared by the Department of Statistics in Jordan, whereas the International Labor Organization survey in 2020 revealed that 47% of the respondents were out of work by April 15, 2020, which added a critical stress on the household income⁵.

Adding to the stressful and tough economic factors, the fact that an important part of the society in Jordan lacks the suitable education level, competencies, and sophisticated skills, hardens the ability to join the formal work force, which produces stressful situations to co-op up with the household continuous financial needs, and though forces the individual to resort to the informal economy with all its disadvantages. Therefore, the informal economy in this paper is a proxy for poverty.

³ Missing middle: is when institutions that can connect small and informal enterprises more efficiently with the larger, formal institutions of the economy, are missing in the market.

⁴ Jordanian dinar equals USD1.4.

⁵ The median monthly income prior to the lockdown was 368 Jordanian dinars (approximately USD519). In March, it had fallen to 215 Jordanian dinars (approximately USD303) (International Labor Organization, 2020).

2.5. Hypotheses

According to the literature, the research explored the following hypotheses:

H1a: Work place harassment has a positive effect on workers' intention to leave work and absenteeism (limited ability days).

H1b: Domestic violence has a positive effect on workers' intention to leave work and absenteeism (limited ability days).

H2a: Work place harassment has a negative effect on approval of work quality.

H2b: Domestic violence has a negative effect on approval of work quality.

H3a: Work place harassment has a negative effect on workers' job satisfaction and work engagement.

H3b: Domestic violence has a negative effect on workers' job satisfaction and work engagement.

H4a: Work place harassment has a positive effect on antisocial behavior among workers and the attitude towards vengeance.

H4b: Domestic violence has a positive effect on antisocial behavior among workers and the attitude towards vengeance.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Participants

The sample comprised 490 persons (63% males and 37% females) living in areas that are described to be poor in the capital of Jordan, Amman. All the individuals in the sample work in the informal sector, the study adopted the World Bank's identification of the informal economy as a person who does not have a job contract with a company, does not pay taxes, and does not have social insurance (UNDP, 2013). The age range was 18-61 years old (with a mean of 35.27 years old; and a standard deviation of 11.25 years); 84.5% of the participants went to at least the primary school while 15.5% did not go to school at all. It is important to note that the questionnaire was distributed in the first quarter of 2020, which is before the lockdown and the other procedures related to COVID-19. Accordingly, this research reflects the situation in the Jordanian economy before the deterioration caused by the pandemic related to the big increase in the unemployment rate in both the formal and the informal economy.

3.2. Design of the questionnaire, variables, and coding

Following the literature on scales that measure workplace aggression, domestic violence, and outcomes related to withdrawal from work, work quality, and job attitude, items were regenerated to address each part and formulate a questionnaire that corresponds to the case. The questionnaire is designed in the following sections.

3.2.1. Exposure to workplace harassment (WH)

To represent harassment in the workplace the study used the Workplace Harassment Scale (Björkqvist et al., 1994) and the Buss-Durkee Inventory subscale

of indirect aggression (Björkqvist, 1994). Although there are other types of harassment, like sexual and physical harassment but they were too sensitive subjects that many respondents refused to answer, accordingly this study used indirect harassment.

The research contained several questions that measured a variation of harmful workplace behaviors by managers and supervisors toward their workers. The items that reflect emotional aggression that challenged, threatened, or diminished a worker's sense of competence and self-worth were selected.

The questions asked the worker about the number of occasions during the last 12 months when her/his manager or supervisor:

1. Made insulting comments about your private life.
2. Looked at you in a negative way.
3. Criticized you in a bad manner.
4. Shouted at you loudly.
5. Questioned your abilities or judgments.
6. Embarrassed or ridiculed you in front of your coworkers.
7. Unfairly accused you of a negative outcome.
8. Noted sensitive details of your private life to embarrass you.
9. Sneered or mocked at you.
10. Refused to speak to you or discuss you.
11. Gave you insulting tasks.
12. Did certain actions like slamming doors, banging on tables, throwing things, and breaking things when speaking about your work.

Aquino and Douglas (2003) adopted successfully the Workplace Harassment Scale to represent emotional aggression among employees. Węziak-Białowska et al. (2020) also used the items to indicate such aggressions. The measurement scale was 0 = never, 1 = not sure, 2 = once, 3 = 2-5 times, and 4 = 6 or more times.

The respondents were asked to indicate only the behaviors of her/his supervisor that caused them psychological or emotional discomfort in order to measure only the incidents that were likely to cause stress or discomfort to the workers (Aquino & Douglas, 2003).

3.2.2. Exposure to domestic violence (DV)

The analysis evaluated domestic violence two folds. Emotional aggression and physical aggression from the model of Węziak-Białowska et al. (2020) and a modified version of the Dimensions of Discipline Inventory (DDI) of (Straus & Fauchier, 2007). Then the questions were constructed that provided information on domestic behavior towards the worker physically and emotionally, after modifying the questions to reflect the general attitude of the household towards the worker in the last 12 months.

Accordingly, the question about emotional aggression asked the worker: '*How often a member or more in your household did the following to you in the last 12 months: yelled at you, shouted at you, or cursed at you?*' The questionnaire presented the physical aggression with the question '*Has someone or more in the household hurt you physically in the last 12 months?*'. The answer for the emotional and physical questions took a 5-point Likert scale (0 = never, 1 = every month, 2 = every

week, 3 = every day, and 4 = more than once every day). Again, respondents were asked to indicate only the household's behaviors that caused them psychological or emotional discomfort in order to measure only the incidents that were likely to cause stress or discomfort to the workers (Aquino & Douglas, 2003).

3.2.3. Outcomes — Withdrawal from work

The study applied two empirically proven indicators and scales for measuring work outcomes: 1) *intent to leave*, and 2) reported number of *limited ability days*.

As for the *intent to leave*, two questions were used: 'Do you plan to quit your job in the next 6 months?' (with yes/no answers) as in Jiang et al. (2009), Węziak-Białowolska et al. (2020), and 'Have you tried to change your main occupation for the past 12 months?' (with yes/no answers) as in Merkin (2008). A positive answer to one of the two questions indicates that the worker has intended to leave her/his work either in the past or in the future. Accordingly, a positive statistical result would prove the positive relation in *H1a* and *H1b*.

For the *limited ability days (absenteeism)*, respondents were asked the following two questions: 'During the past 30 days, for approximately how many days did poor physical health or poor mental health keep you from performing your typical activities, such as taking care of yourself, work, or leisure?' as in Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2000), and 'In the past 12 months, have you taken off from work for more than a week due to work-related stress, injury, or illness?' (Merkin, 2008), with a modification to represent 12 months rather than 24 months. For the first question, respondents indicated how many days during the last month their performance was affected by physical or mental issues on a 5-point Likert scale format where 0 = 0 days, 1 = 1-3 days, 2 = 4-7 days, 3 = 8-12 days, and 4 = 13 and more days. For the second question, the Likert scale was 0 = 0 times, 1 = 1-2 times, 2 = 3-4 times, 3 = 5-7 times, and 4 = more than 7 times. A positive statistical result would prove the positive relation in *H1a* and *H1b*.

3.2.4. Outcomes — Work quality

To measure *work quality*, a projective technic in the following question was used: 'What do you think about the quality of the work of your coworkers in jobs similar to yours?' (0 = very poor quality, 1 = poor, 2 = accepted, 3 = excellent, and 4 = very excellent). This question used the indirect technique to account for social desirability. It is based on asking respondents to make predictions about how a similar other would act or think about a particular issue and it proved valid and reliable estimation in the empirical researched (Tourangeau & Yan, 2007; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020).

3.2.5. Outcomes — Job attitudes

Job satisfaction variable was measured using the following yes/no phrases from Jiang et al. (2009), Merkin (2008), and Price (2001):

1. I am satisfied (content) with my wage (payment) at my work.

2. I am satisfied (content) that I have an opportunity for improving skills at my work.

3. I am satisfied (content) with the general work environment at my work.

4. My manager (supervisor) lets me know when I do a good job.

A not satisfied answer to any of the phrases would reflect some kind of discontent of the worker in her/his work. The answers were recoded to represent the job satisfaction binary variable where 0 = not satisfied, and 1 = satisfied. Here too, one should be cautious in interpreting the results because the coding denotes 0 to a satisfied (content) worker, and denotes 1 to unsatisfied (discontent) worker. A positive statistical result will indicate that the worker is unsatisfied (discontent) in her/his work and that would prove the negative relation in *H3a* and *H3b*. For that purpose, the variable was renamed to *job dissatisfaction*.

To measure *work engagement*, the study used the shortened version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). The shortened version of the scale (UWES-9) had acceptable psychometric properties so that the instrument can be used to measure positive organizational behavior (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2006; Węziak-Białowolska et al., 2020). The scale includes three subscales to measure three dimensions of engagement: *vigor*, *dedication*, and *absorption*. In this research, six questions were asked; two questions for each subscale with a yes/no answer. In the vigor dimension, the questions were:

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.

2. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.

For the dedication scale, the questions were:

3. I am enthusiastic about my job.

4. I am proud of the work that I do.

The questions that reflected the third dimension, absorption, were:

5. I am carried away when I am working.

6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.

The yes/no answers were recoded to represent the work engagement binary variable where 0 = no, and 1 = yes. Again, one should be cautious in interpreting the results because the coding denotes 0 to a worker who is engaged and involvement in the job, and denotes 1 to a worker who is not engaged in the work. Accordingly, a positive statistical result will indicate that the worker is not engaged in her/his work and that would prove the negative relation in *H4a* and *H4b*.

Antisocial behavior. Questions addressed the behavior of the workers towards others during the last 12 months. The modified questions were as follows. During the last 12 months, have you:

1) said or did unkind thing to purposely hurt other coworkers while at work?

2) negatively criticized other coworkers to embarrass them while at work?

3) started intentionally negative arguments with other coworkers while at work?

The three questions were derived from the 13-item individual antisocial behavior scale of Douglas and Martinko (2001) which was a development of the 9-item individual antisocial

behavior of Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998), which describes aggressive actions directed towards coworkers and was successfully used by Aquino and Douglas (2003). Respondents indicated how often a worker performed these behaviors on a 5-point Likert scale format (0 = never, 1 = 1-3 times, 2 = 4-6 times, 3 = 7-9 times, and 4 = 10 times and more). A positive statistical result would prove the relation in *H5a* and *H5b*.

Attitude towards revenge. Three questions reflected if the respondent possessed a positive attitude toward revenge from the vengeance scale of Stuckless and Goranson (1992). The questions were:

1. I try to even the score with anyone who hurts me.

2. I believe in the motto an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

3. If someone causes me trouble, I will find a way to make her or him regret it.

Respondents answered on a 5-point Likert scale (0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = not sure, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree). High scores will indicate a more positive attitude towards revenge (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Douglas & Martinko, 2001). A positive statistical result would prove the positive relation as in *H5a* and *H5b*.

3.2.6. Control variables

According to the literature, results may differ depending on individual characteristics like gender, age, and education (Batz-Barbarich et al., 2018; Carvajal et al., 2018; Chow et al., 2015; Grönlund & Öun, 2018; Tenney et al., 2016; Uzun, 2018). Another important discriminatory factor is living standards where workers concern about their financial shortages and material deprivation (Johnson, 2011). Consequently, the analysis included the following control variables: 1) Demographic variables: *gender*, *age*, and *education*; and 2) *Living standards*. For the demographic variable, the paper denoted the value 0 for males and the value 1 for females. The level of *education* was scaled as follows: 1 = no school at all, 2 = primary school, 3 = secondary school, 4 = college level, and 5 = university education. *Living standards* were measured through a question: 'How often do you worry about being able to meet your normal monthly expenses?'. A 5-point Likert scale represented the answers as 4 = extremely worry all the time and represented a high financial and material lack and 0 = do not

worry at all which represent a steady and solid life standard (Aquino & Douglas, 2003; VanderWeele, 2017).

3.3. Procedure of administering the questionnaire

To ensure meaningful results, a pilot questionnaire was administered to a small sample. The questions were written in simple Arabic language so that every participant will comprehend them easily.

The Author contacted the social institutions in the poor areas and explained the criteria of the participants needed for the research respecting some equal distribution of gender, and a wide age-range. Then the participants were approached directly in several groups in a personally administered questionnaire. All the questions were explained to them to ensure a good understanding of the meaning of each question. The first sample comprised 583 persons, of them, 527 were collected. 37 were not fully answered or had other flaws like contradicted answers, so they were omitted from the sample. The final sample comprised 490 persons who live in a poor area and work in the informal economy (do not have social insurance).

3.4. Ethical issues

Because the questions asked about unkind and unethical behavior at work and at home, the study was ethically sensitive. Hence, an introduction to the type of questions was delivered to the participants so one could decide if she/he wanted to participate, also, participants were asked not to provide any indication about themselves like their names or phone numbers, etc.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides detailed results of the study. The first part shows descriptive statistics, and the second part provides the results of the regressions with discussion.

4.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics and the reliability of the questionnaire results for the dependent and the independent variables.

Table 1. Summary descriptive statistics and Cronbach's alpha reliability test for the scaled variables

Variables	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N	Cronbach's alpha
(1) WH	28.49	3.98	17	34	490	0.816
(2) DV	4.33	2.16	1	8	490	0.802
(3) Intention to leave	1.52	0.68	0	2	490	-
(4) Limited ability days	1.95	1.20	0	4	490	0.824
(5) Work quality	2.94	1.00	1	5	490	-
(6) Job satisfaction	2.78	1.11	0	4	490	-
(7) Work engagement	3.31	1.49	0	6	490	-
(8) Antisocial behavior	6.14	3.56	0	12	490	0.837
(9) Revenge	7.18	3.65	0	12	490	0.906
(10) Age	35.27	11.25	18	61	490	-
(11) Education	3.15	1.18	1	5	490	-
(12) Living standards	2.67	1.38	0	4	490	-
(13) Gender	0.37	0.48	0	1	490	-

To test for the reliability and internal consistency of each scaled category, Cronbach's alpha was applied. The study included items for each category from several references and inventories while respecting high consistency and relatedness to reach high values of Cronbach's test. Accordingly, internal consistency was between 0.80 and 0.84 for all the variables, indicating that

the items for each category were well-related and consistent in measuring the same underlying concept.

Table 2 shows the results of Pearson's correlations between the variables. The correlations between the different variables seem to be high and significant which indicates a strong relation between the variables.

Table 2. Matrix of correlations

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
(1) <i>WH</i>	1												
(2) <i>DV</i>	0.340***	1											
(3) <i>Intent to leave</i>	0.676***	0.469**	1										
(4) <i>Limited ability days</i>	0.576***	0.523***	0.623***	1									
(5) <i>Work quality</i>	-0.694***	-0.437***	-0.506***	-0.400***	1								
(6) <i>Job satisfaction</i>	-0.791***	-0.500	-0.780***	-0.677***	0.704***	1							
(7) <i>Work engagement</i>	-0.536**	-0.570***	-0.674***	-0.515***	0.506***	0.587***	1						
(8) <i>Antisocial behavior</i>	0.726**	0.766***	0.620***	0.439**	-0.711***	-0.704***	-0.756***	1					
(9) <i>Revenge</i>	0.788***	0.684***	0.720***	0.599***	-0.811***	-0.847***	-0.640***	0.849***	1				
(10) <i>Age</i>	-0.110*	-0.106**	-0.092	0.195***	-0.049	0.083*	-0.073	-0.257***	-0.179***	1			
(11) <i>Education</i>	-0.098**	-0.142**	0.287**	-0.068**	-0.273***	-0.442***	-0.126	-0.644***	-0.493***	0.348***	1		
(12) <i>Living standards</i>	0.825***	0.592***	0.796***	0.871***	-0.775***	-0.855***	0.869***	0.880***	0.912***	0.188***	0.285*	1	
(13) <i>Gender</i>	0.656***	0.848***	-0.512***	-0.317***	-0.353***	0.246**	-0.635***	-0.696***	0.635***	0.030	-0.169**	0.414***	1

Note: *, **, *** indicate significance at 10%, 5%, 1%.

4.2. Regression results and discussion

This section displays the results of the regressions, which were applied in three steps. First, applying multiple regressions of the *WH* and the control variables on each of the seven dependent variables. Second, apply the regressions of the *DV* and the control variables on each of the dependent variables. In the last step, both *WH* and *DV* were

present with the control variables and regressed on each of the seven dependent variables.

Table 3 shows the results of the regressions of *WH* and the other predictor variables of the outcomes concerning withdrawal from work, disapproval of work quality, as well as job attitude. All the relations seemed to be significant and according to the hypotheses.

Table 3. Regressions of *WH* and control variables on withdrawal from work, work quality, and job attitude

Predictor variables	Outcomes						
	Withdrawal from work		Work quality	Job attitude			
	1. Intention to leave	2. Limited ability days	3. Approval of work quality	4. Job satisfaction	5. Work engagement	6. Antisocial behavior	7. Revenge
<i>WH</i>	0.093** (17.132)	0.133*** (9.596)	-0.118*** (-18.265)	-0.158*** (-26.153)	-0.101** (-12.251)	0.626** (22.783)	0.641*** (27.675)
<i>Age</i>	-0.002 (-1.247)	0.019*** (4.937)	-0.001 (-0.369)	0.002 (0.932)	-0.007 (-1.439)	-0.059*** (-8.664)	-0.021*** (-3.469)
<i>Education</i>	0.055** (4.183)	0.278*** (9.977)	-0.142*** (-4.871)	-0.075*** (-3.224)	-0.081 (-1.733)	-0.658*** (-7.106)	-0.236*** (-3.804)
<i>Living standards</i>	0.390*** (14.656)	0.885*** (15.212)	-0.209*** (-4.671)	-0.595*** (-16.708)	0.955*** (13.345)	2.477*** (23.810)	1.971*** (20.714)
<i>Gender</i>	-0.204*** (-4.877)	-0.087*** (-0.952)	-0.238*** (-3.367)	0.233*** (4.152)	-0.568*** (-5.040)	-0.641*** (-3.915)	0.583*** (3.895)
Constant	-1.008 (-8.001)	-0.900*** (-0.528)	-1.292*** (-5.666)	-3.222 (-15.392)	-2.916*** (-5.993)	-10.054** (-15.002)	-12.305** (-19.083)
Adjusted R ²	0.728	0.471	0.677	0.825	0.478	0.807	0.847
Observations	490	490	490	490	490	490	490

Note: ***, **, * indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels. Values for each of the variables represent β coefficients and *t*-values (in parentheses).

The first regression shows the effect of *WH* and other predictor variables on the worker's *intention to leave*. *WH* had an important and significant effect on the worker's intention to leave work, as expected by *H1a*, with $\beta = 0.093$ and a significance level of 5%. Education had a positive effect with $\beta = 0.055$ and

a level of significant of 5%. Living standards had a positive and important effect at a level of 1%. Gender relation was negative and significant at 1%. The model shows that increased *WH* and increased worries about living obligations (living standards) would raise the intent of the worker to leave her/his

current work and find another one. Education seemed to encourage a worker to search for another job while the less educated workers continued in their current work as she/he may not easily find another work. Females also seem to carry on in their current work more than males. The model explains 72.8% of the variance of the intention to leave variable.

The second regression shows the relation of the predictor variables with the *limited ability days* or *absenteeism*. WH had a positive and significant effect on limited ability days with $\beta = 0.133$ and p-level at 1% which is in accordance with *H1a*. Age had a positive effect with $\beta = 0.019$ and a significance level of 1%. Education had a significant positive effect on limited ability days with $\beta = 0.278$ and p-level at level 1%. Living standards had a positive relation at the level of 1%. Gender had a significant negative effect with $\beta = -0.087$ and at a level of 1%. This model shows that older workers increase their absenteeism for some reason that might be related to their health or work circumstances. Less educated workers had less absenteeism, as they may not be able to find another job should they lose the current one, a result that was confirmed in the first model. The variables explained 47% of the variance in absenteeism.

The third regression explains the relation of the predictor variables with the worker's opinion of *work quality*. Results show that WH had a negative effect as expected by *H2a* with $\beta = -0.118$ and significance level 1%. Education and living standards had negative relations with $\beta = -0.142$ and -0.209 respectively and both were significant at 1%. Gender displayed a negative association with $\beta = -0.238$ and 1% level of significance. Again, WH is an important condition that determines the opinion of the workers about the quality of the work. Education and worries about life matters also reflect how a person would evaluate work. Females had a smooth opinion about the work quality relative to males. The model $R^2 = 68\%$.

The fourth regression explains *job satisfaction* in light of the predictor variables. WH had a negative effect on job satisfaction as expected by *H3a*. Education had a negative effect with $\beta = -0.075$ and a p-level of 1%. Living standards displayed a negative effect with $\beta = -0.595$ and p-level of 1%. Gender showed a positive association with job satisfaction with $\beta = 0.233$ and a p-level of 1%. The model proves that the predictors were important to explain 83% of the variance in job satisfaction. Education negative result might shade light that uneducated people had limited options in the market, which made them more accepting of their current work; this relation boosts the results of the former regressions that a non-educated worker had to accept difficult circumstances and conditions applied by their supervisors and managers in order to keep their current jobs.

The fifth regression explains the variance caused by the predictor variables on *work engagement*. WH exhibited a negative effect as in *H3a* and with $\beta = -0.101$ and at level 5%. Living standards had a positive and significant relation with $\beta = 0.955$ and level 1%. Gender had a negative association with work engagement at a level of 1% and $\beta = -0.568$. The model explains 48% of the variance of job engagement. Females seem to have less work engagement than males. When living standards and worries about life commitments increased, the worker's enthusiasm and engagement towards the job increased.

Regression number six explains the variance of *antisocial behavior* in light of the independent variables. WH had a positive effect on antisocial behavior as expected by *H4a* and at a level of 5% and $\beta = 0.626$. Age showed a negative effect at 1% with $\beta = -0.059$. Education displayed a significant negative association with $\beta = -0.658$ and p-level at 1%. Living standards had a positive relation with $\beta = 2.477$ and p-level of 1%. Gender showed a negative association with $\beta = -0.641$ and p-level at 1%. The model explained 81% of the antisocial behavior variance.

The seventh regression shows the effect of the predictors on the attitude of the worker towards *revenge*. WH, and as expected by *H4a*, had a positive effect on revenge with $\beta = 0.641$ and p-level at 1%. Age and education had a negative influence with $\beta = -0.021$ and -0.236 respectively and p-level at 1%. Living standards and gender demonstrated a positive effect on revenge at level 1% with $\beta = 1.971$ and 0.583 respectively. The model explained 85% of the variance of the dependent variable. It appears that females had a higher tendency towards revenge than males, despite that they had less antisocial behavior as shown in regression (6). All hard circumstances as WH and living standards sound to have increased harassment towards other coworkers. Getting older seems to decrease the attitude of workers toward vengeance.

The regressions show that, as expected, WH had an unfavorable effect on all work outcomes. When workplace emotional harassment exists or increases in an organization, workers start to withdraw from work by searching for other jobs or narrowing their attendance by increasing their absence. In the meantime, increased WH decreases the opinion about the quality of the work; it also worsens the attitude toward other coworkers. The other variables had important associations with the outcomes. Age showed a sensitive relation that older workers might face circumstances that oblige them to accept their current work as their options elsewhere might be difficult. Females seem to be more tolerant of difficult work circumstances, as they might not have the freedom to search for better options as males do. Personal life conditions like education and living standards have their shades on the workplace as well.

Table 4. Regressions of DV and control variables on withdrawal from work, work quality, and job attitude

Predictor variables	Outcomes						
	Withdrawal from work		Work quality	Job attitude			
	1. Intention to leave	2. Limited ability days	3. Approval of work quality	4. Job satisfaction	5. Work engagement	6. Antisocial behavior	7. Revenge
DV	0.195*** (3.574)	-0.103*** (-5.032)	-0.028* (-1.728)	0.104*** (3.309)	0.225*** (5.043)	0.153*** (3.629)	0.195*** (3.574)
Age	0.018*** (4.455)	0.001 (0.312)	0.003 (1.094)	-0.009 (-1.908)	-0.064*** (-9.543)	-0.018** (-2.906)	0.018*** (4.455)
Education	-0.249*** (-5.833)	0.014 (0.426)	-0.122*** (-4.737)	0.016 (322)	-0.328*** (-4.584)	0.061 (0.907)	-0.249*** (-5.833)
Living standards	0.447*** (10.537)	-0.616*** (-18.760)	-0.774*** (-30.194)	0.722*** (14.449)	2.194*** (30.767)	2.486*** (36.872)	0.447*** (10.537)
Gender	-0.049 (-0.516)	-0.258*** (-3.485)	0.259*** (4.484)	-0.600*** (-5.321)	-0.777*** (-4.834)	0.579*** (3.811)	-0.049 (-0.516)
Constant	0.351*** (4.563)	0.519** (2.964)	1.757*** (12.977)	-1.220*** (-11.538)	1.420*** (6.884)	0.796** (2.707)	1.439*** (5.171)
Adjusted R ²	0.697	0.623	0.654	0.754	0.484	0.817	0.844
Observations	490	490	490	490	490	490	490

Note: ***, **, * indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels. Values for each of the variables represent β coefficients and t -values (in parentheses).

The next group of regressions tests the effect of domestic violence (DV) on the outcome variables, withdrawal from work, approval of work quality, and job attitude as shown in Table 4. The first regression shows that DV had a positive and significant effect on worker's intention to leave work with a $\beta = 0.124$ and p -level at 5% as expected by *H1b*. Education had a negative relation with the intention to leave with a $\beta = -0.088$ and p -level at level 1%. Living standards had an important positive effect with $\beta = 0.391$ and p -level at 1%. Gender had a negative association with the independent variable with $\beta = -0.229$ and at the level of significance of 1%. The model showed that educated workers separate between their home circumstances and work to some extent, though high living obligations might have increased the need to search for other work opportunities. This relation was more obvious in males than in females. The model explained the variation in the dependent variable by 70%.

The second regression demonstrates the relation with the limited ability days. In accordance with *H1b*, DV had an important effect at the level of 1% and with $\beta = 0.195$. Education showed an important effect on the limited ability days with $\beta = -0.249$ and a p -level of 1%. Age and living standards had a positive relation with $\beta = 0.018$ and 0.447 respectively, and both at level 1%. It seems that older workers tended to stay in their jobs but alternatively, their attendance decreased substantially. The model explained the variation in the dependent variable by 62%.

In the third regression, DV had a negative and significant effect on the opinion of the worker on work quality at the level 1% and $\beta = -0.103$ as in *H2b*. Living standards and gender had a negative association at 1% and $\beta = -0.616$ and -0.258 respectively. The model explained 65% of the variation in work quality. It appears that living standards and gender, along with DV had an important share to construct a negative opinion about the quality of the work of the organization.

The fourth regression explains the relations with job satisfaction. DV had a negative effect on job satisfaction but the relation is not significant. Education decreased the level of job satisfaction with $\beta = -0.122$ and p -level at 1%. Living standards also affected job satisfaction significantly with $\beta = -0.774$ and with a p -level at 1%. Females seemed to be more satisfied than males. R^2 for the model is 75%.

The fifth regression displays the effect of the independent variables on work engagement. Surprisingly, DV had a positive effect with $\beta = 0.104$ at 1% level of significance which contradict *H3b*. It appears that when domestic aggression increases, workers become more enthusiastic to go to other places than a home like work. Living standards also had a positive relation at the level of significance of 1% and with $\beta = 0.722$. Again, work might have been an escape for the workers from the hard and heavy obligations in their lives. Females seemed to be less enthusiastic when going to work than males; this draws the assumption that females are usually the abused party when DV occurs in a household. R^2 for the model is 48%.

Regression (6) shows the results of antisocial behavior. As in *H4b*, DV expressed a positive relation with antisocial behavior with $\beta = 0.225$ and at 1% level of significance. Age decreased bullying of other coworkers at level 1% and $\beta = -0.064$. It appears that workers are less likely to engage in antisocial behavior when they are older. Living standards increased offensive behavior at work at level 1% and $\beta = 2.194$. Females showed less disruptive behavior relative to males. The model R^2 explained 82% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Regression (7) explains the effect of the independent variable on revenge. As anticipated by *H4b*, DV influence positively the appetite of the worker to revenge with $\beta = 0.153$ and p -level at 1%. Age had a negative influence at 5%. Living standards were positive at 1% and $\beta = 2.486$. Females seemed to have more belief in revenge than males with $\beta = -0.579$ and a p -level at 1%. The model R^2 is 84%.

The regressions of DV show the importance of this variable in affecting workers' stability and dedication in their jobs. It seems that when a worker experiences sentimental or/and physical aggression at home, she/he would prefer to remain at work despite her/his disapproval of the work quality or the dissatisfaction with the work she/he does. On the other side, even when workers prefer to remain in their jobs as DV increases, their behavior at work becomes less healthy towards other coworkers, i.e., their antisocial behavior and tendency towards revenge raise. Females show nearly the same direction as in the regressions of WH, they seem to have higher stability, acceptance, and peaceful behavior. On the other hand, they are more likely to be vengeful, and less engaged in their work.

Table 5. Regressions of *WH*, *DV*, and control variables on withdrawal from work, work attitude, and job attitude

Predictor variables	Outcomes						
	Withdrawal from work		Work quality	Job attitude			
	1. Intention to leave	2. Limited ability days	3. Approval of work quality	4. Job satisfaction	5. Work engagement	6. Antisocial behavior	7. Revenge
<i>WH</i>	0.323** (17.426)	0.289*** (8.169)	-0.206*** (-17.579)	-0.213*** (-18.895)	-0.098** (-7.797)	0.665* (19.794)	0.674*** (24.349)
<i>DV</i>	0.147** (14.007)	0.247** (4.357)	-0.104** (-5.520)	-0.033 (-1.051)	0.101*** (2.540)	0.368*** (5.302)	0.118** (1.952)
<i>Age</i>	-0.003 (-1.940)	0.019*** (5.021)	-0.001 (-0.111)	0.002 (0.793)	-0.009 (-1.850)	-0.064*** (-9.663)	-0.020** (-3.152)
<i>Education</i>	0.089*** (4.336)	-0.369*** (-5.116)	-0.113** (-0.3.229)	-0.163*** (-3.273)	-0.003 (-0.052)	-0.489*** (-5.919)	-0.168** (-2.267)
<i>Living standards</i>	0.316*** (8.822)	0.866*** (10.929)	-0.372*** (-12.468)	-0.670*** (-24.766)	0.788*** (9.141)	1.982*** (14.388)	2.115*** (16.372)
<i>Gender</i>	-0.221*** (-5.277)	-0.092 (-0.990)	-0.223*** (-3.137)	0.239*** (4.214)	-0.606*** (-5.363)	-0.756*** (-4.699)	0.617*** (4.089)
Constant	-0.231 (-0.919)	-1.788*** (-6.812)	-0.923* (-8.159)	-1.367* (-10.078)	1.936** (2.849)	-0.856 (-0.885)	-6.455* (-10.604)
Adjusted R ²	0.760	0.564	0.644	0.795	0.483	0.838	0.847
Observations	490	490	490	490	490	490	490

Note: ***, **, * indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels. Values for each of the variables represent β coefficients and *t*-values (in parentheses).

For robustness tests, Table 5 regressed all the independent variables including both types of violence (*WH* and *DV*) on the dependent variables to find out if a worker experiences harassment at work and at home, how would her/his reaction be in terms of withdrawal from work, work quality and job attitude.

The first regression shows that both *WH* and *DV* increased the worker's *intention to leave* at $\beta = 0.323$ and 0.147 respectively and both at a significance level of 5%. When a worker faced violence at home and at work, she/he tended to withdraw from her/his job. Education had a positive and significant effect at $\beta = 0.089$ and *p*-level at 1%. Living standards had a positive relation at the level of 1% and $\beta = 0.316$. Females' reactions to violence had no effect on their intentions to leave work. The predictors explained 76% of the changes in the intention to leave variable.

The second regression shows a positive and significant impact of *WH* and *DV* on *absenteeism*. *WH* had a more significant impact than *DV* with $\beta = 0.289$ and 0.247 respectively and *p*-level at 1% for *WH* and 5% for the *DV*. It seems that when a worker faced harassment at home and at work, her/his attendance to work decreased because of the *WH* rather than the *DV*. Age increased absenteeism, while education decreased it significantly at a significant level of 1% and $\beta = -0.369$. It appears that while *WH* increased absenteeism for educated workers as in Table 3, and as *DV* decreased it as in Table 4 when both types of violence existed in a worker's life, she/he has chosen to stay in work despite the harassment as shown in Table 5. Living standards had a positive and significant impact on workers' attendance to their work at level 1% and $\beta = 0.866$. The regression explained 56% of the changes in the dependent variable.

The third regression confirms the results of the regressions on *WH* and *DV*. Both types of violence decrease the approval of the worker about the *work quality*. Education had a negative effect at 5% level of significance and $\beta = -0.113$. Living standards and gender had a negative association with work quality at level 1% and $\beta = -0.372$ and -0.223 respectively. *R*² was 64%.

The fourth regression on *job satisfaction* shows a negative and significant relation with *WH* at level 1% and a coefficient of -0.213 , while the *DV* had a negative but not important effect. Education was

significant at level 1% and had a negative relation with job satisfaction with coefficient of -0.163 and *p*-level of 1%. Living standards affected worker's satisfaction negatively and significantly at the level of 1%, and females were more satisfied than males at level 1%. The model explained the variation in the dependent variable with an *R*² = 80%.

The fifth regression was on *work engagement*. *WH* affected the workers' enthusiasm towards their jobs negatively while the *DV* effect was positive. Both effects were significant at levels 5% and 1% respectively. Moreover, living standards had a positive relation at 1% level and $\beta = 0.788$. Females were less engaged in work than males with a $\beta = -0.606$ and at level 1%. It seems that several contradicting issues affected a worker's engagement towards work. While *WH* decreased the engagement, *DV* increased it.

The sixth regression shows the effect of the variables on the *antisocial behavior* of a worker. *DV* was significant at level 1% and $\beta = 0.368$. It was more important than the effect of *WH* which had a level of significant of 10% and $\beta = 0.665$. Age reflected a negative relation at a level of 1%. Older workers preferred not to engage in bullying activities at work. Education also exhibited a negative effect, which indicated that educated workers do not engage in harassing activities against other coworkers. Living standards had a positive and significant effect on antisocial behavior with $\beta = 1.982$ and at level 1%. Females seemed to have fewer bullying actions than males at a level of 1% and $\beta = -0.756$. The model explained 84% of the variation in the dependent variable.

The seventh regression shows that *WH* and *DV* had a positive effect on the attitude towards *revenge* with *p*-level 1% and 5% respectively. Age and education had a negative effect at level 5% both and with $\beta = -0.020$ and -0.168 respectively. Living standards exhibited a positive effect at level 1%. Females seem to have higher attitude toward revenge than males at level 1%. The model explained 85% of the variation of the revenge variable.

Results of the regressions show that work place harassment had disagreeable effects on the perspective and reaction towards work as in Table 3. The needed attitude for the benefits of the work will decrease (like work quality, job satisfaction, and work engagement) and vice versa, the unwanted attitude will increase (i.e., intention to leave and

limited ability days). Moreover, work place harassment from managers and supervisors on workers would create unpleasant relations between coworkers, which is certainly not the optimal situation an organization would want.

Furthermore, domestic violence as in Table 4 and the general atmosphere inside the workers' households in the Jordanian communities seem to hold an equal importance on the general behavior of the workers toward the work and other coworkers. This is an important issue that the management may neglect which in turn would have crucial consequences on achieving the organization productivity targets. It seems that as organizations decide to work in the informal economy to benefit from certain cost reductions, especially in labor costs, they must consider important consequences related to the attitude and maybe after that the loyalty of the workers, which may have ramifications over the organization goals.

Table 5 shows evidence that the difficult circumstances of the workers in the poor communities and the informal sector when a worker has to bear harassment at work and at home. In some variables, the coefficient and/or the t-values become higher. For example, the effect of WH on intention to leave was 0.092 as in Table 3 and increased to 0.323 when it was introduced with DV as in Table 5. Meanwhile, the DV had a coefficient of 0.225 on antisocial behavior in Table 4. It increased to 0.368 in Table 5. This may indicate that the presence of both types of harassment in a worker's life would soar the overall negative results on work outcomes.

The results of Table 5 show that while both WH and DV have unfavorable effects on work outcomes, DV has some contradicting relations, which can shade the choice of the worker when she/he has both harassments in life. It is important to understand that despite the WH, work gives some financial support to the worker, which is considered a security in life. When a worker has harassment at work and at home, she/he starts to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the negative outcomes like leaving the work on her/his life in general. It seems that she/he concludes that the negative outcomes at work which may lead to leaving the work would not develop or add any better consequences to her/his life. Accordingly, when the two harassment exist in a worker's life, she/he decides to stay at work with all the bad conditions, and that increased work engagement as they may become psychologically self-persuaded that they want to continue doing the current job happily while searching for another one or increasing their absenteeism.

It is important to note that other factors have an important influence on workers' attitude at work like education and living standards. In the study population, education decreased some antisocial behavior and the attitudes towards revenge. It seems that education reduced the tendency of workers towards saying or doing unkind things to purposely hurt other coworkers while at work, or towards criticizing coworkers negatively to embarrass them, or to start negative arguments intentionally with other coworkers. On the other hand, educated workers have perceptions against revenge like their belief in the motto 'an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth'.

Results with gender reveal some gender issues that exist in the population of the study. Females do

not have the freedom to change work when they have one; in fact, as per the Department of Statistics (2020) data report that unemployment rate of bachelor holders and higher females in 2019 in Jordan was 80%, against 25% males. Moreover, many social matters oblige females to stay with their current work. Consequently, females' withdrawal from work becomes low. Rather, their engagement and enthusiasm toward their work lessen. Furthermore, while females do not engage in antisocial behavior as males, they surprisingly, have a higher attitude towards vengeance than males, which again raises a question about their ways to express their lack of reassurance and relief.

In order to explore the situation of females in the sample, Table 6 shows in detail the ratios of females' responses to the questions within each variable (as explained in the methodology). It is important to note that 43% of the females did not attend school or finished only primary school. Only 14% of them finished a degree at a university. This fact might have some implications for the rest of the observations. From the 12 types of workplace harassment expressed in 12 questions, at least 57% of the females answered positively for 7 questions affirming the harassment to occur more than 6 times during the last 12 months. The WH included criticizing her in a bad manner, shouting at her, questioning her ability and judgment, embarrassing her in front of the workers, unfairly accusing her of a negative outcome, embarrassing her with sensitive details about her private life in front of coworkers, and sneering at her.

Domestic violence seemed to be an important situation females had to endure on a daily bases. 86% of the working females faced emotional aggression more than 1 time a day. Only 14% of the respondents did not experience physical aggression in the last 12 months. This indicates the severe circumstances a working female live continuously at work and at home.

On the other side, and despite the high harassment at work, the limited ability days of the females was very low with 86% of them continuing their activities while experiencing poor physical or mental health and/or did not take off from work for a week time because of illness, stress, or injury. 71% of the females would try or already tried to search for another occupation. This reveals that despite that females tolerate many pressures at work and home, they continue their work.

The percent of the respondents who thought of the work quality to be poor or very poor is 43%. Most of the females were not satisfied with their jobs in terms of their wages, and the work environment. Regarding job satisfaction, most of the females thought that their jobs did not give opportunities to improve their skills and that their managers and supervisors did not acknowledge their accomplishments. Moreover, their level of engagement with their jobs seemed to have been very low as they were not happy in all three dimensions of the work engagement factor (vigor, dedication, and absorption). The answers indicated the stress a woman might face while living and working in poor conditions. Her options are very few. Even if she is not satisfied with her work, she needs it, and accordingly, she stays despite the difficult circumstances.

The questions about the antisocial behavior at work and the attitude towards revenge might show how females expressed their stress while at work.

The answers showed some negative attitude towards coworkers like saying unkind things, criticizing, embarrassing other coworkers, starting a negative argument intentionally with a particular coworker. The attitude towards revenge was very high. Respondents believed the notions to even the score, and to make another person regret an action.

The ratios of the answers may represent a reality faced by females who are living within needy circumstances that enforce them to accept

cruel and hard conditions at work. They also have to experience and tolerate acts of disrespect and violence at home. These conditions would certainly lead to unpleasant outcomes at work like low loyalty and engagement to work. It also leads females to manifest abuse towards other workers which certainly would increase tension at work and though affect the performance of the organization as a whole.

Table 6. Ratios of responses for females in the sample on the questions that represented the dependent, independent, and control variables

Workplace harassment	Never	Once	2-5 times	6 or more times	Not sure
WH Q1	14%	29%	29%	28%	0%
WH Q2	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%
WH Q3	14%	14%	14%	57%	0%
WH Q4	14%	14%	0%	72%	0%
WH Q5	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%
WH Q6	0%	14%	14%	72%	0%
WH Q7	0%	29%	14%	57%	0%
WH Q8	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
WH Q9	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%
WH Q10	0%	28%	72%	0%	0%
WH Q11	29%	14%	57%	0%	0%
WH Q12	14%	71%	14%	0%	0%
Domestic violence	Every month	Every week	Every day	More than once every day	Never
Home emotional aggression	14%	0%	0%	86%	0%
Home physical aggression	29%	20%	23%	14%	14%
Withdrawal from work	0 days	1-3 days	4-7 days	8-12 days	More than 13 days
Q1: Limited ability days	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Withdrawal from work	0 times	1-2 times	3-4 times	5-7 times	More than 7 times
Q2: Limited ability days	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Withdrawal from work	No	Yes			
Q1: Intent to leave	71.10%	28.90%			
Q2: Intent to leave	71.10%	28.90%			
Perception of work quality	Very excellent	Excellent	Accepted	Poor	Very poor
Work quality	0%	14%	42%	38%	5%
Job attitude	Satisfied	Not satisfied			
Q1: Job satisfaction	28%	72%			
Q2: Job satisfaction	14%	86%			
Q3: Job satisfaction	47%	53%			
Q4: Job satisfaction	13%	87%			
Job attitude	Yes	No			
Q1: Work engagement	29%	71%			
Q2: Work engagement	29%	71%			
Q3: Work engagement	43%	57%			
Q4: Work engagement	58%	42%			
Q5: Work engagement	29%	71%			
Q6: Work engagement	29%	71%			
Antisocial behavior	Never	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	More than 10 times
Q1: Antisocial behavior	47%	14%	24%	0%	14%
Q2: Antisocial behavior	16%	29%	14%	12%	28%
Q3: Antisocial behavior	18%	29%	10%	29%	14%
Attitude towards revenge	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
Q1: Revenge	0%	21%	8%	28%	43%
Q2: Revenge	0%	14%	29%	28%	28%
Q3: Revenge	0%	14%	14%	29%	42%
Education	University	College	Secondary	Primary	Did not attend school
	14%	14%	29%	11%	32%
Living standards	No worries at all	Rarely worry	Worry sometimes	Worry all the times	Extremely worry all the times
	0.00%	0.00%	14.40%	28.90%	56.70%

5. CONCLUSION

This research contributes to filling the gap in management research about the performance of organizations. It engages societal and psychological dimensions to reflect the effect on organizations within the context of poor economies. A major issue that is not highly addressed in other research is violence at work and at home. The effect of workplace harassment and domestic violence on important outcomes related to the organization like withdrawal from work, antisocial behavior and attitude towards revenge at work, job attitude like satisfaction and level of engagement, and the perception of work quality were explored.

Another important structure of the research is that it was applied within strict conditions of poverty and work within the informal economy in a developing country. Much of the research on poverty does not show the connection with a person's attitude towards work and coworkers. This application is very crucial because there is an important lack of research within this context, which entitles huge effects on society as well as the economy. There is evidence that experiencing eight years of chronic poverty leads later to delinquent behavior in the community and at work indicating that low income is an important root of people's overall well-being, satisfaction, happiness, and the overall development of the new generations (Dodson et al., 2012; Jarjoura et al., 2002).

This study concentrated on the socioeconomic dimension in the financially poor part of society. In this society, people cannot enter the formal economy, so they head towards the low-waged informal economy with its low-work conditions and rights, and, therefore, they will be affected in terms of their behavior, and personality traits, which is manifested at work through physical and psychological aggression. Psychological aggression is an important matter that needs to be addressed in organizations. It leads to a person being cruel to others. A person who delivers emotional abuse causes psychological pain to another person through an active or passive, and verbal or nonverbal communicative act, which promotes negative feelings that are expressed against other people like coworkers (Gámez-Guadix et al., 2010).

The results showed the importance of WH and DV on the organization outcomes. While the relation with job attitude towards work (job satisfaction and job engagement) varied between being negative with WH and positive with DV, it reflected the choices a worker had when balancing the consequences of both harassments in her/his life. Results also demonstrated the negative effects of harassment on essential outcomes to the business existence and productivity as it increased withdrawal from work factors. Moreover, the results stressed the health of the work social environment because harassment created abominable behavior between coworkers, which would affect the organization as a whole.

The control variables have their voice in the results. Age, education, living standards, and gender have their consequences on the human resource behavior in the organization towards the work or towards the coworkers, which implies that organizations and work owners must consider these factors for the benefit of their businesses.

The research ends with several policy implications and recommendations.

Firstly, the knowledge about the relation between a person's work conditions and her/his attitude and perceptions, especially in poor communities where earnings are more stratified and harassment at work and at home is not reported usually, and though no actions are taken against it. This effect on a worker's attitude and perception would be even more important if the worker is a parent and responsible for the family. An important part of the reaction from a worker would be against her/his children and adolescents, which in turn would affect the type of communities with future generations who were abused by their working parent or saw the abuse of their parent as children. Such knowledge could be used by policymakers and organizations responsible for quality assurance schemes to develop policy measures to assure a better work environment for workers. In fact, this matter should be taken seriously, as it does not only affect the performance of the organizations but also affect the whole communities and pass its effect through the future generations, which if applied on a whole level, will shape the future of the economy and society. Accordingly, the paper encourages all responsible leaders in research, public policy, and advocacy for low-income workers should seek opportunities to collaborate, and thus increase their effectiveness (Dodson et al., 2012) as this report profoundly links points from several interdisciplinary economics and organization performance and management behavior.

Secondly, it is important to note that a highly deregulated labor market may provide incentives for a variety of atypical working relationships such as zero-hours contracts and temporary agency working. On the other hand, strict employment protections for permanent jobs and/or liberal rules on temporary employment relationships may increase the incidence of informal employment. So, the balance may be needed.

Thirdly, it is important to establish and/or revise the labor market structure and institutions in developing economies where the relationship between the workers and the work owner should be clear by the law, which must take into account not only the standard employment relationships within the old-fashioned labor market. Modern and new employment practices alienated employers from their obligations toward workers. For example, the bogus self-employment, platform workers and umbrella companies, where employer obligations are entirely absent or temporary agency work, where the employer associated with zero-hours contracts may undermine traditional employer obligations. This may place the worker at the periphery, or even, outside labor market regulation and social protections (Hudson-Sharp & Runge, 2017).

Fourthly, unions, law institutions, and other governmental bodies should take a clear stand against malpractices of work owners towards workers like paying below the minimum wage and denying sick and holiday pay. On the other side, unions should be active and adopt plans and practices to enlighten, inform and educate workers of their statutory rights, and to encourage them to enroll in the unions and actively speak to their unions because workers do not often demand their rights, in the fear of losing future working opportunities with employers.

Fifthly, it is beneficial to make use of the experience of other countries, it is crucial to take the country-specific circumstances when planning or applying a reform (Blanchard & Landier, 2002). Copying other countries' experiences may waste resources on plans that were sewn for a specific national context with particular institutions, legislations, and traditions, which may not lead to the desired outcomes.

Sixthly, it is important to adopt and commit to a policy that reduces inequality between men and women (Duflo, 2012), and encourages all measures that would increase women's power at home and in society. Policymakers need to note that working may increase the risk of domestic violence against women, especially those with low education as their husbands seek to counteract their increased bargaining power. Accordingly, policies should overcome these obstacles, and others, that may hinder desired outcomes. Studies found that increasing women's power through increasing household assets and elevating education levels will decrease the risk that they face domestic violence

upon beginning work (Heath, 2014; Vyas & Watts, 2009).

Sexual harassment was a sensitive issue for respondents. Even with the anonymous nature of the questionnaire, it was hard for the respondents to answer questions that were considered taboo. However, that does not deny the importance of this factor in the workplace environment, the productivity of workers, as well as the image of the organization. Many studies in different cultures reported the existence of, and the negative effects of, sexual harassment especially against women (De Coster et al., 1999; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Gruber & Lars, 1982; Chamberlain et al., 2008; McDonald, 2012; UN Women, 2018; Yeung, 2004).

In the end, it is part of the social responsibility of the organization to consider its human resource as an important capital to respect and invest in through training programs and through restructuring policies and procedures and support workers experiencing domestic violence. Doing so would produce a better work environment in the organization and though increase labor outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, A. E., Tolman, R. M., Bybee, D., Sullivan, C. M., & Kennedy, A. C. (2012). The impact of intimate partner violence on low-income women's economic well-being: The mediating role of job stability. *Violence against Women*, 18(12), 1345-1367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212474294>
2. Adler, P., Brown, D., Dehejia, R., Domat, G., & Robertson, R. (2017). Do factory managers know what workers want? Manager-worker information asymmetries and Pareto optimal human resource management policies. *Asian Development Review*, 34(1), 65-87. https://doi.org/10.1162/ADEV_a_00081
3. Agarwal, B., & Panda, P. (2007). Toward freedom from domestic violence: The neglected obvious. *Journal of Human Development*, 8(3), 359-388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880701462171>
4. Ahmad, A. N. (2008). Dead men working: Time and space in London's ('illegal') migrant economy. *Work Employment and Society*, 22(2), 301-318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017008089106>
5. Aizer, A. (2010). The gender wage gap and domestic violence. *American Economic Review*, 100(4), 1847-1859. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.4.1847>
6. Aquino, K., & Douglas, S. (2003). Identity threat and antisocial behavior in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling, and hierarchical status. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 90(1), 195-208. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978\(02\)00517-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00517-4)
7. Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 491-509. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.211>
8. Azam Ali, P., & Naylor, P. B. (2013). Intimate partner violence: A narrative review of the feminist, social and ecological explanations for its causation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(6), 611-619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.009>
9. Barling, J., Rogers, A., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers' experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(3), 255-269. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.6.3.255>
10. Barrientos, S. (2013). Corporate purchasing practices in global production networks: A socially contested terrain. *Geoforum*, 44, 44-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.06.012>
11. Barrientos, S., & Smith, S. (2007). Do workers benefit from ethical trade? Assessing codes of labour practice in global production systems. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(4), 713-729. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701336580>
12. Batz-Barbarich, C., Tay, L., Kuykendall, L., & Cheung, H. K. (2018). A meta-analysis of gender differences in subjective well-being: Estimating effect sizes and associations with gender inequality. *Psychological Science*, 29(9), 1491-1503. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618774796>
13. Behling, F., & Harvey, M. (2015). The evolution of false self-employment in the British construction industry: A neo-Polanyian account of labour market formation. *Work, Employment and Society*, 29(6), 969-988. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017014559960>
14. Benjamin, N., Beegle, K., Recanatini, F., & Santini, M. (2014). *Informal economy and the World Bank* (Policy Research Working Paper). The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-6888>
15. Bertrand, M., Kamenica, E., & Pan, J. (2015). Gender identity and relative income within households. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(2), 571-614. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv001>
16. Björkqvist, K. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal, and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles*, 30(3), 177-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01420988>
17. Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18(2), 117-127. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337\(1992\)18:2%3C117::AID-AB2480180205%3E3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1992)18:2%3C117::AID-AB2480180205%3E3.0.CO;2-3)
18. Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20(3), 173-184. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337\(1994\)20:3%3C173::AID-AB2480200304%3E3.0.CO;2-D](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1994)20:3%3C173::AID-AB2480200304%3E3.0.CO;2-D)

19. Blanchard, O., & Landier, A. (2002). The perverse effect of partial labour market reform: Fixed-term contracts in France. *The Economic Journal*, 112(480), F214-F244. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00047>
20. Bloom, N., Eifert, B., Mahajan, A., McKenzie, D., & Roberts, J. (2013). Does management matter? Evidence from India. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(1), 1–51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjs044>
21. Blowfield, M., & Goerge Frynas, J. (2005). Setting new agendas: Critical perspectives on corporate social responsibility in the developing world. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 499–513. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00465.x>
22. Bone, J. (2006). 'The longest day': 'Flexible' contracts, performance-related pay and risk shifting in the UK direct selling sector. *Work, Employment and Society*, 20(1), 109–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017006061276>
23. Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 998–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998>
24. Briscoe, G., Dainty, A., & Millett, S. (2000). The impact of the tax system on self-employment in the British construction industry. *International Journal of Manpower*, 21(8), 596–613. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720010379501>
25. Carmo, R., Grams, A., & Magalhães, T. (2011). Men as victims of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 18(8), 355–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2011.07.006>
26. Carvajal, M. J., Popovici, I., & Hardigan, P. C. (2018). Gender differences in the measurement of pharmacists' job satisfaction. *Human Resources for Health*, 16, Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-018-0297-5>
27. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2000). *Measuring healthy days: Population assessment of health-related quality of life*. <https://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/pdfs/mhd.pdf>
28. Chamberlain, L. J., Crowley, M., Tope, D., & Hodson, R. (2008). Sexual harassment in organizational context. *Work and Occupations*, 35(3), 262–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888408322008>
29. Chow, A., Galambos, N. L., & Krahn, H. J. (2015). Work values during the transition to adulthood and mid-life satisfaction: Cascading effects across 25 years. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 41(1), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025415608518>
30. Clark, C. J., Bloom, D. E., Hill, A. G., & Silverman, J. G. (2009). Prevalence estimate of intimate partner violence in Jordan. *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*, 15(4), 880–889. <https://doi.org/10.26719/2009.15.4.880>
31. Community Links and Refugee Council. (2011). *Understanding the informal economic activity of refugees in London*. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/library-document/understanding-informal-economic-activity-refugees-london_en
32. Cools, S., & Kotsadam, A. (2017). Resources and intimate partner violence in Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Development*, 95, 211–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.02.027>
33. Croucher, R., Stumbitz, B., Quinlan, M., & Vickers, I. (2013). *Can better working conditions improve the performance of SMEs?: An international literature review* (ILO Report). International Labour Office. https://www.ilo.org/emment/Publications/WCMS_227760/lang-en/index.htm
34. Daunton, M. (2002). *Just taxes: The politics of taxation in Britain, 1914–1979*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511550027>
35. De Coster, S., Estes, S. B., & Mueller, C. W. (1999). Routine activities and sexual harassment in the workplace. *Work and Occupations*, 26(1), 21–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888499026001003>
36. Dehue, F., Bolman, C., Völlink, T., & Pouwelse, M. (2012). Coping with bullying at work and health related problems. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 19(3), 175–197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028969>
37. Dello, B. (2012). *Untapped enterprises: Learning to live with the informal economy*. Royal Society of the Arts.
38. Department of Statistics. (2010). *Report of poverty status in Jordan: Based on the household expenditures & income survey data 2008*. Poverty Statistic Division. http://www.dos.gov.jo/dos_home_a/main/Analasis_Reports/poverty_rep/Jordan_%20Poverty_%20Jordan_eng_2008
39. Department of Statistics (2020, March 9). *The unemployment rate during the fourth quarter of 2019*. http://dos.gov.jo/dos_home_e/main/archive/Unemp/2020/Emp_Q4_2019.pdf
40. Dodson, L., Albelda, R., Coronado, D. S., & Mtshali, M. (2012). *How youth are put at risk by parents' low-wage jobs* (Center for Social Policy Paper No. 68). Center for Social Policy, University of Massachusetts Boston. https://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1067&context=csp_pubs
41. Douglas, H. (2018). Domestic and family violence, mental health and well-being, and legal engagement. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 25(3), 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2017.1396865>
42. Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 547–559. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.547>
43. Duan, X., Ni, X., Shi, L., Zhang, L., Ye, Y., Mu, H., Li, Z., Liu, X., Fan, L., & Wang, Y. (2019). The impact of workplace violence on job satisfaction, job burnout, and turnover intention: The mediating role of social support. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 17, Article 93. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-019-1164-3>
44. Duflo, E. (2012). Women empowerment and economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(4), 1051–1079. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.50.4.1051>
45. Duncan, G. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Consequences of growing up poor*. Russel Sage Foundation.
46. Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.1.51>
47. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
48. Ela, M. (2013). An assessment on the relationship between informal economy and educational level in Turkey. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 3(4), 910–922. <https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/ijefi/article/view/610>
49. European Commission. (2008). Stepping up the fight against undeclared work [European Parliament resolution]. *Official Journal of the European Union*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:009E:0001:0011:EN:PDF>

50. European Commission. (2013). *Economic and social developments in Europe: Annual review 2018*. <https://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=19719&langId=en>
51. Ferri, P., Silvestri, M., Artoni, C., & Di Lorenzo, R. (2016). Workplace violence in different settings and among various health professionals in an Italian general hospital: A cross-sectional study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 9, 263–275. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S114870>
52. Fitzgerald, L. F., Sandra, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32(2), 152–175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(88\)90012-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(88)90012-7)
53. Gámez-Guadix, M., Straus, M. A., Antonio Carrobbles, J., Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., & Almendros, C. (2010). Corporal punishment and long-term behavior problems: The moderating role of positive parenting and psychological aggression. *Psicothema*, 22(4), 529–536. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/727/72715515001.pdf>
54. Geddes, A., Craig, G., Scott, S., Ackers, L., Robinson, O., & Scullion, D. (2013). *Forced labour in the UK* (JRF Programme Paper). Joseph Rowntree Foundation. https://www.basw.co.uk/system/files/resources/basw_120247-5_0.pdf
55. Grönlund, A., & Öun, I. (2018). The gender-job satisfaction paradox and the dual-earner society: Are women (still) making work-family trade-offs? *Work*, 59(4), 535–545. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-182708>
56. Gruber, J. E., & Lars, B. (1982). Blue-collar blues: The sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work and Occupations*, 9, 271–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888482009003002>
57. Gutmann, P. M. (1978). Are the unemployed, unemployed? *Financial Analysis Journal*, 34(5), 26–29. <https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v34.n5.26>
58. H&M probes abuse at Indian factory after death of woman worker. (2021, February 2). *Aljazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2021/2/2/hm-probes-abuse-at-indian-factory-after-death-of-woman-worker>
59. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
60. Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). “Same same” but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist*, 11(2), 119–127. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.11.2.119>
61. Hansson, H., & Lagerkvist, C. J. (2014). Defining and measuring farmers’ attitudes to farm animal welfare. *Animal Welfare*, 23(1), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.7120/09627286.23.1.047>
62. Harrison, A., & Scorse, J. (2010). Multinationals and anti-sweatshop activism. *The American Economic Review*, 100(1), 247–273. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.1.247>
63. Heath, R. (2014). Women’s access to labor market opportunities, control of household resources, and domestic violence: Evidence from Bangladesh. *World Development*, 57, 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.10.028>
64. Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 874–888. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020070>
65. Hudson-Sharp, N., & Runge, J. (2017). *International trend in insecure work: A report for the Trades Union Congress*. National Institute for Economic and Social Research. <https://www.niesr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/InternationalTrendsInInsecureWork.pdf>
66. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). (2020). *Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence in COVID-19*. <https://www.ifrc.org/document/prevention-and-response-sexual-and-gender-based-violence-covid-19>
67. International Labor Organization (ILO). (2017). *Jordan decent work country diagnostic*. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---arabstates/---ro-beirut/documents/publication/wcms_542358.pdf
68. International Labor Organization (ILO). (2020). *Impact of COVID-19 on workers in Jordan: A rapid assessment*. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---arabstates/---ro-beirut/documents/briefingnote/wcms_743393.pdf
69. Jarjoura, G. R., Triplett, R. A., & Brinker, G. P. (2002). Growing up poor: Examining the link between persistent poverty and delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 18, 159–187. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015206715838>
70. Jiang, B., Baker, R. C., & Frazier, G. V. (2009). An analysis of job dissatisfaction and turnover to reduce global supply chain risk: Evidence from China. *Journal of Operations Management*, 27(2), 169–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2007.09.002>
71. Johnson, M. P. (2011). Gender and types of intimate partner violence: A response to an anti-feminist literature review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(4), 289–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2011.04.006>
72. Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (2006). Sticks and stones: Verbal abuse in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 10(1), 121–126. <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/jocccvol10no12006.pdf>
73. Johnson, R. C., Kalil, A., & Dunifon, R. E. (2010). *Mothers’ work and children’s lives: Low-income families after welfare reform*. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. <https://doi.org/10.17848/9781441644886>
74. Jolliffe, D., & Sarajuddin, U. (2015). *Estimating poverty with panel data, comparably: An example from Jordan* (Policy Research Working Paper). The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-7373>
75. Kahneman, D. (2003). Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics. *American Economic Review*, 93(5), 1449–1475. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282803322655392>
76. Kath, L. M., Swody, C. A., Magley, V. J., Bunk, J. A., & Gallus, J. A. (2009). Cross-level, three-way interactions among work-group climate, gender, and frequency of harassment on morale and withdrawal outcomes of sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(1), 159–182. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X299764>
77. Katungi, D., Neale, E., & Barbour, A. (2006). *People in low-paid informal work: ‘Need no greed’*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. <https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/9781861348937.pdf>
78. Kitson, A., & Campbell, R. (1996). Corporate codes and ethics. In *The ethical organisation: Ethical theory and corporate behaviour* (pp. 118–132). Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24405-8_8
79. Kuvaas, B., Dysvik, A., & Buch, R. (2014). Antecedents and employee outcomes of line managers’ perceptions of enabling HR practices. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(6), 845–868. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12085>

80. Lalley-Chareczko, L., Segal, A., Perlis, M. L., Nowakowski, S., Tal, J. Z., & Grandner, M. A. (2017). Sleep disturbance partially mediates the relationship between intimate partner violence and physical/mental health in women and men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(16), 2471-2495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515592651>
81. Lazear, E. P. (2000a). Performance pay and productivity. *American Economic Review, 90*(5), 1346-1361. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.90.5.1346>
82. Lazear, E. P. (2000b). The power of incentives. *American Economic Review, 90*(2), 410-414. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.90.2.410>
83. LeBlanc, M. M., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2014). Intimate partner aggression and women's work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(4), 399-412. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037184>
84. Leblebici, D. (2012). Impact of workplace quality on employee's productivity: Case study of a bank in Turkey. *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance, 1*(1), 38-49. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/374627>
85. Lund-Thomsen, P., & Lindgreen, A. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in global value chains: Where are we now and where are we going? *Journal of Business Ethics, 123*(1), 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1796-x>
86. McDonald, P. (2012). Workplace sexual harassment 30 years on: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 14*(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00300.x>
87. Merkin, R. S. (2008). The impact of sexual harassment on turnover intentions, absenteeism, and job satisfaction: Findings from Argentina, Brazil and Chile. *Journal of International Women's Studies, 10*(2), 73-91. <https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol10/iss2/7/>
88. O'Regan, N., Stainer, L., & Sims, M. (2010). Training in SMEs and its relationship to profitability. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 10*(2), 166-181. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHRDM.2010.031442>
89. Olsen, K., Harris, L.-A., Laird, I., Legg, S., Perry, M., & Hasle, P. (2010). Differential intervention strategies to improve the management of hazardous chemicals in small enterprises. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety, 8*(2), 57-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14774003.2010.11667748>
90. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2012). *Reducing opportunities for tax non-compliance in the underground economy* [Information note]. Forum on Tax Administration: SME Compliance Sub-Group. <https://www.oecd.org/tax/forum-on-tax-administration/publications-and-products/49427993.pdf>
91. Patel, P. P., & Cardon, M. S. (2010). Adopting HRM practices and their effectiveness in small firms facing product market competition. *Human Resource Management, 49*(2), 265-290. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20346>
92. Peate, I. (2017). Domestic violence against men. *British Journal of Nursing, 26*(6), 309. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2017.26.6.309>
93. Pfau-Effinger, B. (2009). Varieties of undeclared work in European societies. *An International Journal of Employment Relations, 47*(1), 79-99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2008.00711.x>
94. Pierotti, R. S. (2013). Increasing rejection of intimate partner violence: Evidence of global cultural diffusion. *American Sociological Review, 78*(2), 240-265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122413480363>
95. Pike, K., & Godfrey, S. (2014). Workers' perceptions of compliance with labour standards: Assessing opportunities and challenges for better work in Lesotho's apparel sector. In A. Rossi, A. Luinstra, & J. Pickles (Eds.), *Towards better work: Understanding labour in apparel global value chains* (pp. 191-211). Palgrave Macmillan London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137377548_9
96. Plank, L., Rossi, A., & Staritz, C. (2012). *Workers and social upgrading in "fast fashion": The case of the apparel industry in Morocco and Romania* (ÖFSE Working Paper No. 33). Austrian Foundation for Development Research (ÖFSE). https://publik.tuwien.ac.at/files/PubDat_211377.pdf
97. Price, J. L. (2001). Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *International Journal of Manpower, 22*(7), 600-624. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000006233>
98. Razouk, A. A. (2011). High-performance work systems and performance of French small- and medium-sized enterprises: Examining causal order. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(2), 311-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.540157>
99. Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Money see, money do: The influence of the work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(6), 658-672. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256963>
100. Rossi, A., Luinstra, A., & Pickles, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Towards better work: Understanding labor in apparel global value chains*. Palgrave Macmillan London. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137377548>
101. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* [Preliminary Manual, Utrecht University]. https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test_manual_UWES_English.pdf
102. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(4), 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
103. Schuler, S. R., & Nazneen, S. (2018). Does intimate partner violence decline as women's empowerment becomes normative? Perspectives of Bangladeshi women. *World Development, 101*, 284-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.09.005>
104. Shearer, B. (2004). Piece rates, fixed wages and incentives: Evidence from a field experiment. *The Review of Economic Studies, 71*(2), 513-534. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0034-6527.00294>
105. Shi, L. L., Zhang, D., Zhou, C., Yang, L., Sun, T., Hao, T., Peng, X., Gao, L., Liu, W., Mu, Y., Han, Y., & Fan, L. (2017). A cross-sectional study on the prevalence and associated risk factors for workplace violence against Chinese nurses. *BMJ Open, 7*(6), Article e013105. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013105>
106. Showalter, K. (2016). Women's employment and domestic violence: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violence Behavior, 31*, 37-47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.06.017>
107. Spell, H. B., Eby, L. T., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2014). Developmental climate: A cross-level analysis of voluntary turnover and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(3), 283-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.02.001>

108. Straus, M. A., & Fauchier, A. (2007). Manual for the dimensions of discipline inventory (DDI). *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/t37478-000>
109. Stuckless, N., & Goranson, R. (1992). The vengeance scale: Development of a measure of attitudes toward revenge. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 7(1), 25-42. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1992-33601-001>
110. Taedilat altedylat ealaa qanun aleamal aintaqasat min huquq aleamil al'urduniyi. [Amendments to the "Labor Law" detracted from the rights of the Jordanian worker]. (2021, February 2). *Roya News*. <https://royanews.tv/news/236623>
111. Tenney, E. R., Poole, J. M., & Diener, E. (2016). Does positivity enhance work performance?: Why, when, and what we don't know. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 27-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.11.002>
112. The World Bank. (2016). *Jordan — Promoting poverty reduction and shared prosperity: Systematic country diagnostic* (Report No. 103433). <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/463151481129266828/jordan-promoting-poverty-reduction-and-shared-prosperity-systematic-country-diagnostic>
113. The World Bank. (2018). *Jordan's economic outlook — April 2018*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/jordan/publication/economic-outlook-april-2018>
114. The World Bank. (2020). *Jordan economic monitor: Weathering the storm* (Report No. 150813). <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/895901594653936142/Jordan-Economic-Monitor-Spring-2020-Weathering-the-Storm>
115. Tourangeau, R., & Yan, T. (2007). Sensitive questions in surveys. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(5), 859-883. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.5.859>
116. Trades Union Congress (TUC). (2008). *Hard work, hidden lives: The full report of the Commission on Vulnerable Employment*.
117. UN Women. (November 2018). *Towards an end to sexual harassment: The urgency and nature of change in the era of #MeToo*. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2018/11/towards-an-end-to-sexual-harassment>
118. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2013). *The informal sector in the Jordanian economy*. <https://www.undp.org/jordan/publications/informal-sector-jordanian-economy>
119. Uzun, G. Ö. (2018). Vengeance scale: Reliability and validity study with gender differences. *Quality and Quantity*, 52, 1455-1469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-018-0726-5>
120. VanderWeele, T. J. (2017). On the promotion of human flourishing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(31), 8148-8156. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702996114>
121. Verkuil, B., Atasayi, S., & Molendijk, M. L. (2015). Workplace bullying and mental health: A meta-analysis on cross-sectional and longitudinal data. *PLoS ONE*, 10(8), Article e0135225. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135225>
122. Visagie, J. C., Uys, M., Linde, H. M., & Havenga, W. (2012). A comparative analysis of current trade union trends in the European Union and South Africa. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(44), 11095-11109. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM12.1105>
123. Vyas, S., & Watts, C. (2009). How does economic empowerment affect women's risk of intimate partner violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence. *Journal of International Development*, 21(5), 577-602. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1500>
124. Węziak-Białowolska, D., Białowolski, P., & McNeely, E. (2020). The impact of workplace harassment and domestic violence on work outcomes in the developing world. *World Development*, 126, Article 104732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104732>
125. Williams, C. C. (2014). *The informal economy and poverty: Evidence and policy review* (JRF Report). Joseph Rowntree Foundation. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2404259
126. Yeung, S. (2004). Hospitality ethics curriculum: An industry perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(4), 253-262. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110410537414>