

Workplace deviance & Predictors of Workplace deviance: A Systematic Review of Literature

Muhammad Raees Ashraf

PhD Scholar, University of Gujrat
raees.ashraf.uog.edu.pk

Syed Raza Ullah Shah

razashah801@gmail.com

Sadaf Shahzadi

sadaf.shahzadi@uskt.edu.pk

Dr.Ahsan Ali Ashraf

University of Sialkot
ahsanali.ashraf@uskt.edu.pk

Abstract

This study examines recent conceptual advances in workplace deviance constructs through a systematic literature review (SLR). This study also focuses on particular types of deviant behavior at work which have been studied more frequently since last seven years and whether they include interpersonal or organizational forms of workplace deviance. The study also investigated mediating and moderating variables of workplace deviance. An SLR included Scopus and Web of Science database articles published between 2015 and 2022. This evidence suggests that interpersonal forms of deviant work behavior, rather than organizational forms, have received more attention in recent studies. In terms of antecedents, the findings indicate that personality factors remain prevalent. The study has both theoretical and practical limitations.

Keywords: Workplace deviance, Systematic Review

Introduction

One of the most pressing issues firms confront today is the failure of employees to carry out their responsibilities (Bennett & Robinson, 2003; Henle, 2005). All levels of a firm are affected by the negative behavior of its employees (Coccia, 1998). In the eyes of many, employee deviant conduct occurs when an employee defies the rules or policies of the firm or its employees (Christian & Ellis, 2011; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Harmful or destructive behavior harms both the firm and its people, whereas positive behavior boosts efficiency and improves the quality of work. As in the case of unproductive or deviant behaviors that increase expenses and limit organizational growth, organizations must counteract, manage, and minimize these behaviors (Huang et al., 2017). Deviance in the workplace can take many forms, ranging from the seemingly insignificant (such as being late to work or leaving trash on the ground) to the downright criminal (such as fraud or theft). An example of interpersonal workplace deviance might be a coworker disparaging another employee. However, activities that harm the organization as a whole constitute organizational workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). As Dunlop and Lee (2004); Sackett (2002) and others have found, it lowers task performance, harms team performance, increases coworkers' stress levels, and makes them less productive (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001). Therefore, Henle et al. (2005) estimate that workplace deviance costs money, although this estimate might not even be a good one because these actions are typically hidden. The high costs of workplace deviation have prompted research and practice in workplace deviance prevention and prediction. However, even though earlier meta-analyses of the association between personality and work place deviance have made significant progress, a meta-analysis that solely looks at personality as a predictor of workplace deviance would be highly helpful. Many unsolved issues are still concerning these relationships, making this even more critical. As a first step, earlier meta-analyses (Berry et al., 2012; Salgado, 2002) looked at only a small number of effect sizes. They also discovered that the effect sizes of various Big Five (B5) and Five-Factor Model of Personality (FFM) scales varied widely. The HEXACO personality domain scales have been used to predict workplace misbehavior in several primary studies, such as Chirumbolo (2015) and Louw, Dunlop, Yeo, and Griffin (2016). However, no previous meta-analyses of workplace deviation have incorporated the HEXACO personality domain

measures. Many believe that negative behavior might be beneficial. According to Warren (2003) and Appelbaum et al. (2007), negative deviance can benefit society. The term "workplace deviance" refers to an employee's intentional attempt to deviate from organizational norms. In this kind of deviance, the organization can be saved from failure by taking steps like disagreeing when it is essential, minimizing extremism, blowing the whistle, and engaging in productive disobedience. Organizations benefit from "constructive deviance" in management research, according to Galperin (2012). According to Mainemelis (2010), this is what she said. Creativity, according to him, is a process that brings to make new products, services, or technologies. He also asserted that deviating creatively forces one to discard previous thoughts instead of fresh ones.

Workplace Deviance

First, defining deviance and how it has been characterized in the literature is critical before discussing deviant workplace behavior. Deviated means "to depart from the customary course of action or standards," according to the Oxford Dictionary. As stated in the literature, workplace deviance is a "voluntary activity that breaches significant organizational standards and adversely impacts the well-being of the organization or its employees or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Deviance in the workplace, the workplace as a whole, workplace as an individual have been examined. For purposes of this definition, employee deviation means any conduct that is not following the company's stated policies or norms (Jones, 1980). Leo and Russell-Bennett (2014); Singh and Kishore (2014). There are two types of deviance at workplace: OD (organizational deviance) and ID (interpersonal deviance at workplace) (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). For researchers and practitioners, predicting and mitigating workplace deviations is a major focus area, especially regarding hiring (Ones, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Judge, 2007). The business's environment can influence deviant conduct in the workplace. Researchers and practitioners are concerned with predicting and preventing workplace deviance, particularly in job selection (Ones, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Judge, 2007). For example, personality differences (Hastings & O'Neill, 2009) may lead to deviant workplace conduct. Individual characteristics such as age, gender, and work experience have been investigated as probable predictors of deviance at workplace, but personality may be the most significant (Berry et al., 2012; Ng, Lam, & Feldman, 2016). The business or an individual can be the target of these bizarre behaviors (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Deviant behavior in the workplace can contribute to low morale and stress, leading to little self-esteem and lack of self-confidence, as well as increased anxiety and even mental health problems (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew, 1996). Deviance in the workplace can take two fundamental forms: positive and negative. These behaviors were previously viewed as opposite sides of coin while observing at each outcome independently, either good or bad behavior (Vardi & Weitz, 2004; Peterson, 2002; Tobin, 2000). According to (Appelbaum et al., 2007). A variety of names are used in describing undesirable behaviors, including antisocial conduct (Giacolone & Greenberg, 1997), unproductive behavior (Sackett & DeVore, 2001), and misbehavior (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). Classifying all of these activities as directed toward the organization or people is possible. Disturbing deviant behavior is the topic of this paper because of the confluence of these behaviors (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Prosocial and extra-role behaviors can also predict positive conduct (Brief & Motowildo, 1986). As cited in (1966) by Katz and Khan that, the bulk of these behaviors is taken into account because they fall under the umbrella of "constructive deviant activity" (Galperine, 2002). Research on deviant behavior has concentrated mostly on the outcomes of either destructive or constructive behavior, with few studies looking into the origins of both constructive and destructive behavior in organizations. While developing typologies, Robinson and Bennett (1995) discovered four distinct types of deviant behavior in the workplace, including those directed towards both organizations and individuals. The four categories are production deviance, property deviance, political deviance, and individual violence. There are five sorts of DWBs: misuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal, according to an article published in 2013. Tormenting or injuring employees physically or psychologically with threats or insulting statements constitutes a kind of personal aggression and abuse. Delaying work, squandering resources, and intentionally underperforming are examples of production deviance. Equipment sabotage, destruction, and theft are all examples of property deviation. Employer

property and equipment, cash, and delaying work for overtime are all considered theft. Work restrictions and deferrals are the final withdrawal behaviors. Excessive or longer breaks are instances of this behavior, as are tardiness, early departure, and other forms of non-showing up. Management or authorities need the help of support personnel to maintain and improve the quality of services in their communities. To help public sector organizations achieve their goals more effectively, efficiently, economically, and morally, it can provide high-quality services to the public. However, Malaysian media has extensively reported that public sector support personnel are engaged in erratic behavior (Abdul Rahman, 2008; Awanis, 2006). Workplace deviance, such as drug misuse and corruption, has become a big problem among support staff (Abdul Rahman, 2008). Workplace misbehavior has also been linked to job happiness. Dissatisfied workers may engage in deviant behavior more than their more satisfied counterparts.

Table # 1: Workplace Deviance Studies

Sr	Author	Antecedents	Moderators	Mediators	Level of Analysis
1	O'Connor P.J., Stone S., Walker B.R., Jackson C.J.,(2017)	Workplace Deviance			Individual Level
2	Yi Li, Dacheng Li and Nana Li,(2019)	workplace deviance	Employee psychological work maturity		Individual Level
3	Ellende Jong · Wim Bernasco, Marre Lammers,(2019)	workplace deviance			Individual Level
4	Aniruddha Bagchi and Siddhartha Bandyopadhyay, (2015)	workplace deviance			Individual Level
5	Dr. Norashikin Mahmud, Muhammad Asim Faheem, (2015)	workplace deviance			Individual Level
6	Farhadi, H. , Fatimah, O. , Nasir, R. & Wan Shahrazad, W.S., (2012)	workplace deviance			Individual Level
7	Sharron M. Graves, Stephen F., (2006)	workplace deviance			Individual Level
8	Canan Baysala, Fulya Mýsýrdalý Yangilb and ³erafettin Sevimb, (2020)	workplace deviance	demographic attributes		Group Level
9	Sainath Malisetty1 and K. Vasanthi Kumari2, (2016)	workplace deviance	Work-family conflict	work family policies	Individual Level
10	Fiori M.,Krings F., Kleinlogel E., Reich T., (2016)	workplace deviance		experimental mediation	Individual Level
11	Malisetty S.,Vasanthi Kumari K., (2016)	workplace deviance	work-family policies	Job satisfaction	Individual Level

12	Faheem M.A., Mahmud N.,(2015)	workplace deviance		Individual Level
13	Nair, Nisha,and Deepti Bhatnagar,(2011)	workplace deviance		Individual Level
14	Abbasi A., Ismail W.K.W., Baradari F., Zureigat Q.,Abdullah F.Z., (2022)	workplace deviance	Job Satisfaction	Group Level
15	Brougham P.L., Uttley C.M., (2017)	social deviance	risk	Individual Level
16	Sethi V., Sternin M., Sharma D., Bhanot A., Mebrahtu S.,(2017)	positive deviance		Individual Level
17	Mertens W., Recker J., Kohlborn T., Kummer T.-F., (2016)	positive deviance	Moral violation, Internal attribution	Group Level
18	Kenneth S.Kendler, John Myers,Danielle Dick, (2015)	Peer group deviance		Group Level
19	Hong J.S., Kim D.H., Piquero A.R., (2017)	Peer group deviance	Socially withdrawn behavior, Deviant peer affiliation	Individual Level
20	Lo Iacono J., Weaven S.K.,Griffin D., (2016)	organizational deviance	customer orientation	Individual Level
21	Rahim, A. R. A., & Nasurdin, A. M. , (2008)	interpersonal deviant behavior	locus of control;	Individual Level
22	Kevin S. Cruza and Jonathan Pintob, (2019)	groups deviance	Action identification	Group Level
23	Patricia L. Brougham, ID and Clarissa M. Uttley, (2017)	groups deviance		Individual Level
24	Levine J.M., Marques J.M., (2016)	groups deviance		Group Level

19	Hong J.S., Kim D.H., Piquero A.R., (2017)	Peer group deviance	Socially withdrawn behavior, Deviant peer affiliation	Individual Level
25	Kalemci, R. Arzu, Ipek Kalemci - Tuzun, and Ela Ozkan - Canbolat. , (2019)	Employee deviant behavior		Individual Level
26	Sanda RASIC JELAVIC and Marta GLAMUZINA,(2021)	Deviant Workplace Behavior		Individual Level
27	Gatzweiler A., Blazevic V., Piller F.T., (2017)	deviant content		Individual Level
28	Dootson P., Lings I., Beatson A., Johnston K.A., (2017)	deviant consumer behavior		Individual Level
29	Dootson P., Johnston K.A., Beatson A., Lings I., (2016)	deviant Consumer behavior		Individual Level
30	ROBERTA ROSA , GIUSEPPE MADONNA, (2020)	deviance		Individual Level
31	Peters K., Jetten J., Radova D., Austin K., (2017)	deviance	Gossip	Individual Level
32	Kelly B.C., Harris E., Vuolo M., (2017)	deviance		Individual Level
33	Briggs D., Ellis A., (2017)	Deviance		Individual Level
34	Mortimer G., Wang S., (2022)	Customer oriented deviance	tenure	Individual Level
35	Mertens W., Recker J., Kummer T. - F., Kohlborn T., Viaene S., (2016)	Constructive deviance & Workplace deviance	Psychological empowerment	Individual Level

Workplace Deviance and Outcome Variables

As revealed by the literature review, employees' organizational and personal beliefs and their behavior toward the organization are independent variables (Demir, Demir, & Nield, 2015) Organizational. Individual, organizational decisions and values are thought to support the development of personal habits and attitudes. According to researchers (Farhadi & Fatimah, 2015), aberrant behavior reflects an individual's personality, and consistent individual traits may be used to anticipate negative behavior. According to planned behavior theory, which predicts deviant behavior in the workplace, the function of behavior can be explained by individual variations. "Voluntary action that breaches significant organizational norms, rules, and the well-being of an organization" is how (Faheem, 2015) defines workplace deviance. Practitioners assert a connection between the behavior's rising prevalence in the workplace and its astronomical cost (Sun & Chen, 2017). Fiset (2017) claim that citizenship work behaviors and unproductive work behaviors are two separate concepts that do not share the same behavior. workplace misbehavior by employees. The main method for determining whether or not social norms are being observed is to use behavioral values and norms. According to the socialization process, deviance and adherence to social rules are the results. People's attitudes, beliefs, and ideas shift in response to new information. There are many different types of deviant and human behavior, including committed, episodic, and compulsive conduct (Herranz de Rafael & Fernandez-Prados, 2018). Thus, deviant behavior is actions that violate social norms, including implicit and overt societal expectations and rules. Previous research suggests that various forms of abnormal workplace behavior significantly influence and are connected to corporate culture. By applying the idea of deviance as a behavior that violates acknowledged organizational standards, they created a typology of deviant workplace behaviors using multidimensional scaling approaches. Ana A. Aleksic (2019). (Ali Ozturen *et al. 2019) contend that member satisfaction in an organization need not always be a factor in deviant behavior. Employees behave irresponsibly and are frequently absent from work, which drives them out of the company. An organization's deviant behavior can be extremely hostile and harmful to its development and profitability. In 2019, Magdaline Enow Mbi Tarkang Maryl, According to the (COR) theory, persons under much stress tend to use less energy and effort overall. According to Krischer et al. (2020), deviant and withdrawing conduct results in the loss of resources for individuals or employees of the company, and the loss of resources results in stress at work for employees. Stress at work causes employees to behave negatively and against the laws and regulations of the company. The goal of the behavioral attachment system in one's environment, according to attachment theory, is to protect against potential dangers. Employees can change or display aberrant behavior at any time while working (Luke, 2020). Activities may go against organizational policies and legal requirements when only youth are involved. Claims measure the deviation in two ways (Christian & Ellis, 2011). A formal record serves as the first, and self-discovery serves as the second. (Haldorai, 2020) found that customers' hostile attitudes and behaviors in front of employees serve as motivation for criminal behavior. Customer happiness, which in turn affects customer loyalty, is significantly impacted by employee deviation. Chenhong Hu et al. (2020) developed the idea of deviant behavior and identified a certain type of deviant behavior that can benefit and advance organizational personnel. The practice has a twofold impact: on the one hand, it is moral and extremely beneficial to the organization; on the other, it is viewed as unethical conduct and modifies all of the organization's norms and values. Communities may discover and use the knowledge they already have by using positive deviance as a social transformation strategy. By locating and promoting community-derived, diffused, and owned solutions, the positive deviance strategy seeks to achieve long-term behavioral and societal change. Workplace deviance is any behavior that modifies the norms and values of a governing society and its members. Deviant behavior at work contravenes organizational rules and is tolerated by a group of people or a single person (Fagbenro & Ola-supu, 2020). According to recent studies, deviant workplace conduct has become a significant problem (Alhasnawi, 2021). It has both advantageous and detrimental effects. According to social learning theory, employees learn from one another through observation and conduct. It illustrates how rumors influence workplace behavior and how negative and positive conversations improve listeners' learning ability (Zhu, 2022).

Mediators and Moderators in Antecedents–Workforce Deviance Behavior Relationships

It was discovered that there is a negative correlation between interpersonal deviance and team focus. The level of action identification that team members possess can act as a mediator in the relationship between the three factors of team focus, interpersonal deviance, and organizational deviance. Castro & Pinto (2019), after investigating the relationship between tenure and employee dishonesty, the researchers discovered that long-tenured workers have a significantly lower likelihood of committing consumer-related crimes than those with shorter employment histories. Employees with short tenures and those with long tenures showed significantly different consumer-oriented deviance behavior, according to Mortimer and Wang (2021). Organizational justice and workplace deviance are strongly related to one another. The detrimental effects of organizational justice on workplace misconduct have been the subject of numerous studies. Abbasi, et al. (2022) found a link between abnormal behavior and workplace gossip. The incidence of deviant behavior can be reduced, and its control can be achieved by engaging in gossip, it has been discovered. Peters, et al. (2017), one of the ways constructive deviance can assist a company in enhancing overall performance is by using it as a strategic tool to enhance organizational performance. Mertens, et al. (2016). Interpersonal deviance and trust in organizations are directly correlated, but production and property deviance are not. On the other hand, production and property deviation is directly correlated with a lack of trust in organizations. Further investigation revealed that the relationship between organizational trust and abnormal behavior at work was moderated by the degree of local control. Rahim and Nasurdin (2008) shows an inverse relationship between work-family conflict and workplace well-being and a direct link between work-family conflict and inappropriate workplace behavior. Studies examine the role of emotional exhortation as a moderator in the relationship between work-family conflict and workplace deviance or employee well-being. Chen et al. (2020) political activities impact interpersonal deviation. Political activity increases interpersonal deviance in proportion to its intensity Xiu et al. (2022). It was discovered that there is a direct correlation between narcissistic leadership and workplace deviance. The parties in this relationship were brought together by the organizational aggression (Abbas & Alhasnawi, 2021).

Table # 2: Workplace Deviance & Moderating variables Studies

Sr	Author	Antecedents	Moderators	Mediators	Level of Analysis
1	Yi Li, Dacheng Li and Nana Li,(2019)	workplace deviance	Employee psychological work maturity		Individual-level
2	Mortimer G., Wang S.,(2022)	Customer-oriented deviance	tenure		Individual-level
3	Canan Baysala, Fulya Mýsyrdalý Yangilb and ^a erafettin Sevimb,(2020)	workplace deviance	demographic attributes		Individual-level
4	Sainath Malisetty and K. Vasanthi Kumari,(2016)	workplace deviance	Work-family conflict	Work-family Policies	Individual-level
5	Lo Iacono J., Weaven S.K., Griffin D.,(2016)	organizational deviance	customer orientation		Individual Level
6	Malisetty S.,Vasanthi Kumari K.,(2016)	workplace deviance	Use of work family policies, Number work family policies	Job satisfaction	Organization Level

7	Rahim, A. R. A., & Nasurdin, A. M.,(2008)	interpersonal deviant behavior	locus of control;		Organization Level
8	Liu L., Wan Z., Lin Y., Wang X.,(2022)	Deviant Behavior	Moral Identity	Organizational Identification	Organization Level
9	Xiu J., Zheng J., Li Z., Zhang Z.,(2022)	Interpersonal Deviance	Chronic Job Strain, Moral Self-Efficacy	Job strain	Individual-level
10	Kruglanski A.W., Jasko K., Chernikova M., Dugas M., Webber D.,(2017)	Deviance	Ability, Social Network, and narrative		Individual level

Table # 3: Workplace Deviance & Mediating variables Studies

Sr	Author	Antecedents	Moderators	Mediators	Level of Analysis
1	Mertens W., Recker J., Kummer T.-F., Kohlborn T., Viaene S.,(2016)	positive deviance		Team member level of action identification	Group level
2	Malisetty S.,Vasanthi Kumari K.,(2016)	Workplace Deviance		Job Satisfaction	Employees from NGOs
3	Yan Chen 1,2, Feilian Zhang 1 , Yan Wang 3 and Junwei Zheng 4,(2020)	Workplace Deviance		Gossip	Individual students
4	Tingting Liu 1 , Yahui Chen 2 , Chenhong Hu1 , Xiao Yuan 1 , Chang E Liu 3,* and Wei He 4,(2020)	social deviance		risk	employed in academia and accustomed to the use of technology
5	Yun Hyeok Choi, Jae Kyu Myung and Jong Dae Kim,(2018)	Workplace Deviance	Work-family conflict	i-Presence of work-family Policiesii-Use of Work-family policies	Individuals
6	Yun Hyeok Choi, Jae Kyu Myung and Jong Dae Kim,(2018)	Workplace Deviance		experimental mediation	Individual Level
7	Zhu Q.,Martinescu E., Beersma B., Wei F.,(2022)	Positive Deviance		Moral violation, Internal attribution	

8	Liu L., Wan Z., Lin Y., Wang X.,(2022)	Constructive deviance		Psychological empowerment	
9	Xiu J., Zheng J., Li Z., Zhang Z.,(2022)	Workplace Deviance	Use of work family policies, Number work family policies	Job satisfaction	Organization Level
10	Alhasnawi H.H., Abbas A.A.,(2021)	Workplace Deviance		emotional exhaustion	Individual - level
11	Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., Chang, H. S., & Li, J. J,(2020)	Constructive deviance		moral justification	Group level
12	Ifinedo, P.,(2017)	Employee Deviance		Anomie	Group level
13	Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S. L., Maloles, C. M., & König, C.J.,(2010)	Interpersonal deviance		Vicarious learning	

Methodology

A thorough search of the published literature was conducted utilizing SCOPUS and Google Scholar. The search terms for relevant publications were workplace deviance and deviant work behavior. After removing duplicates, it was discovered that there were a total of 400 scientific articles. While reviewing earlier meta-analyses on workplace deviance and other characteristics, nine new scientific studies were located. Furthermore, several authors were approached and asked for additional material or papers on the issue, creating seven new publications. As a result, considering the time constraints and restricted access to the publications, The Scientific Journal published 86 articles. Every item underwent a thorough examination.

Discussion & Conclusion

This SLR was done to map recent conceptual changes in the following areas, counterproductive work behavior and studies in the last ten years and recent studies looking at workplace deviance. Also, we tried to cover all of the research that had already been done on the personality traits that can be used to predict these kinds of behaviors. Three main types of questions can be asked when looking into the causes of bad behavior. New methods are being developed that consider how a person's social and organizational situation might affect their lousy behavior. These new ways of doing things consider how these situations might affect a person. O'Boyle et al. (2011); Faldetta (2020); and Tepper et al. (2017), are focusing on the role of the leader, not just because they are the ones who are responsible for wrong or abusive leadership, but also because they are the ones who set the tone and decide what is acceptable, rewarded, or punished. More and more people are interested in this subject. The focus is on observed instances of deviance: bystanders see how leaders and members of the organization make decisions, and the deviance indirectly hurts them because they feel like they are being maltreated (Dhanani & LaPalme, 2019; Schilpzand et al., 2016). The multilevel effects of a person's bad behavior are only one part of this approach, which is moving toward a more in-depth look at teams and organizations' lousy behavior (Carpenter et al., 2020). Third, even though this discussion covers a wide range of destructive behaviors, it seems that most of the things that lead to destructive behavior are the

behaviors, it seems that most of the things that lead to destructive behavior are the same. As more research is done on the wrong things about deviant behavior, the good things are being shut down. Even though the good things about deviant behavior are much more likely to bring about change in companies and the people who work there, this is still the case. Organizations would do well to use this framework to figure out how the climate and culture of the organization play a key role in explaining the link between how employees act and how the organization works. It would be helpful for businesses. With the help of the framework, this could be done. People are more likely to do constructive deviance than destructive deviance if they think their environments are encouraging, rewarding, warm, structured, and free of risks. It is because there is a strong link between climate and these kinds of deviations. Furthermore, culture would have an even more significant effect on these results, with collectivists doing more constructive deviance and less destructive deviance than others (Triandis et al., 1985). These results make it possible to start a new line of research into why people do bad things when they think their organization supports and rewards them, and they can get away with anything because of their relationship with the organization and their superiors. People will do bad things if they think their boss supports and rewards them for their work. People would also be less likely to do constructive deviance. It is because group norms are essential in modern businesses, which is why culture is so influential. Culture is important because it makes people less likely to do things that are good for them. Because of this, the research would add to what is already known about deviant behavior and cross-cultural management by figuring out how climate and deviant behavior affect each other while considering different cultural norms. Because of this, management may find it easier to change the workers' negative attitudes and set up conditions that encourage good behavior. In the future, research can be done to find the overall result of people's bad behavior at work by taking into account their personality traits and the situations in which they live.

Future Research

Some academics recently offered new perspectives on workplace incivility. It is significant for future research directions because some academics have recently opened the way. Kabat-Farr et al. (2020) suggest that workplace incivility may target devalued or stigmatized groups. Ingroup and outgroup processes, gender composition, power and status, and cyber situations can mistreat individuals.

References

- Abbasi, A., Ismail, W. K. W., Baradari, F., Zureigat, Q., & Abdullah, F. Z. (2022). Can organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior reduce workplace deviance?. *Intangible Capital*, 18(1), 78-95.
- Abdullah, A., & Marican, S. (2015). Relationship between leadership perception and engagement in workplace deviant behavior. *The Malaysian Journal of Social Administration*, 11(1), 131-150.
- Alhasnawi, H. H., & Abbas, A. A. (2021). Narcissistic Leadership and Workplace Deviance: A Moderated Mediation Model of Organizational Aggression and Workplace Hostility. *Organizacija*, 54(4), 334-349.
- Alhasnawi, H. H., & Abbas, A. A. (2021). Narcissistic Leadership and Workplace Deviance: A Moderated Mediation Model of Organizational Aggression and Workplace Hostility. *Organizacija*, 54(4), 334-349
- Ali, H. (2019). Impact of despotic leadership on employee's performance with the mediating role of anger rumination and the moderating role of trait anxiety. *Capital University*.
- Anwar, M. N., Sarwar, M., Awan, R. U. N., & Arif, M. I. (2011). Gender differences in workplace deviant behavior of university teachers and modification techniques. *International Education Studies*, 4(1), 193-197.
- Bhatti, O. K., Alam, M. A., Hassan, A., & Sulaiman, M. (2016). Islamic spirituality and social responsibility in curtailing workplace deviance. *Humanomics*, 32(4), 405-417.
- Chen, Y., Zhang, F., Wang, Y., & Zheng, J. (2020). Work-family conflict, emotional responses, workplace deviance, and well-being among construction professionals: A sequential mediation model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6883.
- Chen, Y., Zhang, F., Wang, Y., & Zheng, J. (2020). Work-family conflict, emotional responses, workplace deviance, and well-being among construction professionals: A sequential mediation model.

- International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6883.
- Choi, Y. H., Myung, J. K., & Kim, J. D. (2018). The effect of employees' perceptions of CSR activities on employee deviance: The mediating role of anomie. *Sustainability*, 10(3), 601.
- Christian, M. S., & Ellis, A. P. (2011). Examining the effects of sleep deprivation on workplace deviance: A self-regulatory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 913-934.
- Chullen, C. L., Dunford, B. B., Angermeier, I., Boss, R. W., & Boss, A. D. (2010). Minimizing deviant behavior in healthcare organizations: The effects of supportive leadership and job design. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 55(6), 381-397.
- Cruz, K. S., & Pinto, J. (2019). Team focus in focus: Its implications for real teams and their members. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 35(2), 123-133..
- Curci, A., Cabras, C., Lanciano, T., Soleti, E., & Raccis, C. (2017). What is over and above psychopathy? The role of ability emotional intelligence in predicting criminal behavior. *Psychiatry, psychology and law*, 24(1), 139-151.
- de Jong, E., Bernasco, W., & Lammers, M. (2020). Situational correlates of adolescent substance use: An improved test of the routine activity theory of deviant behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 36(4), 823-850.
- De Paoli, S. (2017). Not all the bots are created equal: the ordering Turing test for the labeling of bots in MMORPGs. *Social Media+ Society*, 3(4), 2056305117741851.
- Demir, M., Demir, S. S., & Nield, K. (2015). The relationship between person-organization fit, organizational identification, and work outcomes. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 16(2), 369-386.
- Fagbohungebe, B. O., Akinbode, G. A., & Ayodeji, F. (2012). Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviors: An empirical analysis in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(5), 207.
- Faheem, M. A., & Mahmud, N. (2015). The effects of organizational justice on workplace deviance and job satisfaction of employees: Evidence from a public sector hospital of Pakistan. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 342.
- Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R., & Shahrazad, W. W. (2012). Agreeableness and conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behavior in the workplace. *Asian Social Science*, 8(9), 2.
- Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Hunter, E. M., & Whitten, D. (2012). A two-study examination of work-family conflict, production deviance, and gender. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(2), 245-258.
- Fiset, J., Al Hajj, R., & Vongas, J. G. (2017). Workplace ostracism was seen through the lens of power. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 1528.
- Galperin, B. L. (2012). Exploring the nomological network of workplace deviance: Developing and validating a measure of constructive deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12), 2988-3025.
- Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., Chang, H. S., & Li, J. J. (2020). Workplace spirituality as a mediator between ethical climate and workplace deviant behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 86, 102372.
- Harris, C., Vazsonyi, A. T., & Bolland, J. M. (2017). Bidirectional relationships between parenting processes and deviance in a sample of inner-city African American youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 27(1), 201-213.
- Herranz de Rafael, G., & Fernández-Prados, J. S. (2018). Subterranean Values and Deviance: An Empirical Investigation of the Case of Spain. *Social Sciences*, 7(9), 149.
- Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2013). Interpersonal justice and deviance: The moderating effects of interpersonal justice values and justice orientation. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 339-365.
- Hussain, M. (2013). Effect of breach of Psychological contract on workplace deviant behavior. Available at SSRN 2208642.
- Javed, R., Amjad, M., Faqeer-Ul-Ummi, U. Y., & Bukhari, R. (2014). Investigating factors affecting employee workplace deviant behavior. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 9(3),

1073.

- Kanten, P., & Ulker, F. E. (2013). The effect of organizational climate on counterproductive behaviors: An empirical study on the employees of manufacturing enterprises. *The Macrotheme Review*, 2(4), 144-160.
- Kura, K. M., Shamsudin, F. M., & Chauhan, A. (2013). Moderating effect of self-regulatory efficacy on the relationship between formal organizational controls and workplace deviance: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 15.
- LasisiOlukayode, J., Okuneye, M. Y., & Shodiya, A. O. (2014). Antecedents of counter work behavior in public sector organizations: evidence from Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(9), 58.
- Lee, C. H., Moak, S., & Walker, J. T. (2016). Effects of self-control, social control, and social learning on sexting behavior among South Korean youths. *Youth & Society*, 48(2), 242-264.
- Lee, J., & Jensen, J. M. (2014). The effects of active constructive and passive corrective leadership on workplace incivility and the mediating role of fairness perceptions. *Group & Organization Management*, 39(4), 416-443.
- Leo, C., & Russell-Bennett, R. (2014). Developing a multidimensional scale of customer-oriented deviance (COD). *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1218-1225.
- Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does taking the good with the bad make things worse? How abusive supervision and leader-member exchange interact impacts need satisfaction and organizational deviance. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 117(1), 41-52.
- Liu, J., Kwan, H. K., Lee, C., & Hui, C. (2013). Work-to-family spillover effects of workplace ostracism: The role of work-home segmentation preferences. *Human Resource Management*, 52(1), 75-93.
- Liu, L., Wan, Z., Lin, Y., & Wang, X. (2022). The Influence of Self-Serving Leadership on Deviant Behaviors in the Workplace: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 825154-825154.
- Liu, T., Chen, Y., Hu, C., Yuan, X., Liu, C. E., & He, W. (2020). The paradox of group citizenship and constructive deviance: a resolution of environmental dynamism and moral justification. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(22), 8371.
- Liu, Y., & Loi, R. (2012). Ethical leadership and workplace deviance: The role of moral disengagement. *In advances in global leadership* (pp. 37-56). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Lo Iacono, J., Weaven, S. K., & Griffin, D. (2016). An examination into the effects of job satisfaction on salesperson deviance: The moderating role of customer orientation. *Journal of business economics and management*, 17(2), 173-186.
- Lopez, A., Yoder, J. R., Brisson, D., Lechuga-Pena, S., & Jenson, J. M. (2015). Development and validation of a positive youth development measure: The Bridge-Positive Youth Development. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 25(6), 726-736.
- Luksyte, A., Spitzmueller, C., & Maynard, D. C. (2011). Why do overqualified incumbents deviate? Examining multiple mediators. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 16(3), 279.
- Marasi, S., Bennett, R. J., & Budden, H. (2018). The structure of an organization: Does it influence workplace deviance and Its' dimensions? And to what extent?. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 8-27.
- Mayer, D. M., Thau, S., Workman, K. M., Van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2012). Leader mistreatment, employee hostility, and deviant behaviors: Integrating self-uncertainty and thwarted needs perspectives on deviance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(1), 24-40.
- Mertens, W., Recker, J., Kohlborn, T., & Kummer, T. F. (2016). A framework for the study of positive deviance in organizations. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(11), 1288-1307.
- Mertens, W., Recker, J., Kummer, T. F., Kohlborn, T., & Viaene, S. (2016). Constructive deviance as a driver for performance in retail. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 30, 193-203.
- Mortimer, G., & Wang, S. (2021). Examining the drivers of deviant service adaption in fashion retailing: the role of tenure. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*.
- Muafi, J. (2011). Causes and Consequences of deviant workplace behavior. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(2), 123-126.

- Rahim, A. R. A., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2008). Trust in organizational and workplace deviant behavior. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, *10*(2), 211-235..
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S. L., Maloles, C. M., & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and negative emotions of employees. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *40*(1), 74-91.
- Salekin, R. T., Debus, S. A., & Barker, E. D. (2010). Adolescent psychopathy and the five-factor model: Domain and facet analysis. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *32*(4), 501-514.
- Tarkang Mary, M. E. M., & Ozturen, A. (2019). Sustainable, ethical leadership and employee outcomes in the hotel industry in Cameroon. *Sustainability*, *11*(8), 2245.
- Tuna, M., Ghazzawi, I., Yesiltas, M., Tuna, A. A., & Arslan, S. (2016). The effects of the perceived external prestige of the organization on employee deviant workplace behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
- Van der Linden, D., te Nijenhuis, J., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). The general factor of personality: A meta-analysis of Big Five intercorrelations and a criterion-related validity study. *Journal of research in personality*, *44*(3), 315-327.
- Xiu, J., Zheng, J., Li, Z., & Zhang, Z. (2022). An Ego Depletion Perspective Linking Political Behavior to Interpersonal Deviance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 802636.
- Yunus, O. M., Khalid, K., & Nordin, M. (2012). A personality trait and workplace deviant behaviors. *Human Resource Management*, *47*(1), 8678-8683.
- Zhu, Q., Martinescu, E., Beersma, B., & Wei, F. (2022). How does receiving gossip from coworkers influence employees' task performance and interpersonal deviance? The moderating roles of regulatory focus and the mediating role of vicarious learning. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *95*(2), 213-238.