Chapter - I

INTRODUCTION

“The quest for peace begins in the home, in the school, and in the workplace.”

~Silvia Cartwright

AN OVERVIEW OF WORKPLACEDEVIANCE

Human beings are social animals. They like and prefer to live together and work together. As human needs evolved and realized their dependency they formed different social organizations and workplace to perform their job. An organization is a collection of employees who aspire together for a common goal and therefore work in a group. Workplace is a forum where employees are seen behaving in variety of manners. People spend a lot of time interacting with each other in their workplace. Many a time some of the employee’s behaviors are so subtle that individuals do not find it hard to get affected. Sometimes the impact of these behaviors leave positive effect on other’s wellbeing and sometimes they do harm in a manner that lives of employees become surrounded by negativity and other harmful consequences. Therefore, managing the behaviour of employees is a major concern of authorities. Apparently, organizations wish to have employees who do not bring harm to the workplace and carry out tasks, duties and responsibilities of their position. Such behaviour which causes harm to the organizations is undesirable and is considered to be deviant.

The consequences of these behaviors are harmful to the every individual employee and also the whole organization. Usually the kind of behaviors discussed here go outside the norms and customs of the organization. According to Coccia (1998) norms prescribed by an organization refer to combination of “expected behaviors, languages, principles and postulations that permit the organization to function at a suitable pace”. However, when employees start behaving in the way which organization do not prescribe and allow then they are considered to be departed from these rules, which in turn affects the organization on various levels and results in heavy loss for all. For instance, it influences the processes involved in making decisions and its
productivity decision making processes, productivity and financial costs (Coccia, 1998). Apart from these for-profit organizations, incidence of deviance can also be found in non-profit organizations or nongovernmental organizations (Nair & Bhatnagar, 2011).

Since the evolution of this concept, researchers in this area have given different titles to these behaviors and therefore synonyms used in the literature for these behavior include workplace deviance proposed by Bennett and Robinson, (2003); counterproductive behaviors proposed by Mangione and Quinn, (1975); maladaptive behavior proposed by Perlow and Latham, (1993) and anti-social behaviors proposed by Giacolone and Greenberg, (1997). Normally, employees’ behaviors and their actions are measured as deviant when they either violate or act against the prescribed norms of the organizations, traditions and its guidelines. As a result they endanger the entire organization and its members.

Employee deviance leads to huge organizational losses. The costs associated with these sort of behaviors leave many questions how much workplace deviance an organization can confront. These losses associated with organizations make researchers and practitioners to ponder about its detrimental outcomes.

The sustainability of any firm becomes difficult with these sorts of corporal incidents. These kinds of discretionary behavior cannot be always measured in monetary terms. These can be considered in terms of impalpable harms, for instance, employee frustration, sabotage, absenteeism, arriving late at work, burnout, and turnover intention and so on. Dunlop and Lee (2004) examined the relationship between deviant workplace behaviour and employees’ performance. They concluded that there was a negative relationship between workplace deviant behaviour of employees and their performance.

Other than the financial costs pertaining to property deviance, these researchers further notice the substantial amount of related budgets which are associated with business that are not doing well because of the prevalence of workplace deviance. Furthermore, victims and perpetrators of deviant behavior are found to be stressed which later is reported to affect productivity of the organization in a decreased way.
Malisetty (2015), in his review paper provided a theoretical framework on some predictors namely person-organization fit, participative decision making and careerism where work alienation played a mediator role. In recent years, employees have cleverly developed some means to involve in negative activity. To name a few, using internet for playing online games, download porn contents, setting up rogue websites to junk and refuse their firms to the world, and also menacing and/or threatening someone through emails (Leonard, 1999; Ackroyd & Thompson, 1999; Bennett & Robinson, 2003). In this way the traditional and deadly manifestations of workplace deviance continue to happen. A difficult endeavor in this regard would be to produce an accurate calculation of the cost associated with workplace deviant behavior. Included here are its many types- corporate fraud, employee theft in the organization, harassing and bullying, seeking revenge, withholding job effort, drug and alcohol abuse and violence- and the measures taken to prevent and correct them.

Workplace Deviance has been explained as behaviors that are deliberate and voluntary, that disrupts organizational norms and when exhibited, menaces the health and safety of individuals and the organization, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Employees’ behavior is considered deviant when the policies, customs, norms or internal ordinance and procedures of an organization are broken by an individual or the group that might imperil the welfare and prosperity of the business firms and its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Employee deviance is said to be voluntary because employees either are unable or lack the required motivation to conform to normative expectations prescribed by an organization or become inspired to promptly violate the expectations. We talk of organizational norms or those underlying by organizational policies formally and/or informally because the definition of workplace deviance must be explained in relation to the values of a social group specified in spite of referring to a system that comprise of complete moral standards.

Some researchers in the mid 1990’s independently began to concentrate on the phenomenon of dysfunctional or harmful behavior in the workplace in a more comprehensive fashion, attempting to conceptually integrate a range of dysfunctional behaviors into a meaningful whole. The grouping of counterproductive behaviours was
first done by Hollinger and Clark (1982). They grouped these behaviors into two broad classes: property deviance and production deviance. Property deviance was associated with gaining or destroying property that belongs to one’s boss or company say for stealing, and production deviance was connected with violation of organizational norms concerning the amount and value of worked done such as lateness and delays in work.

Later, Robinson and Bennett (1995) unified the various workplace deviant behaviors and configured it in a way to compile those separate research available on the topic into one elaborative frame. Thus, putting their effort in this manner, early researchers were able to assemble a number of deviant workplace behaviors into a single framework. They explain deviant behavior along two dimensions. The first facet of this explains organizational-interpersonal dimension. This dimension varies from deviant behavior which are targeted towards individuals to deviant behavior targeted towards the organization. The second facet depicts the extremity of deviant behavior from minor to serious. This typology arranges these unauthorized behavior into four categories namely - deviance related to production of the organization, deviance related to damaging property of the organization, deviance related to political incidences of the organization and lastly, deviance related to employees’ personal aggression.

1.1 CLASSIFICATION OF DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOR

In general, deviant workplace behaviors are classified in two categories namely - negative deviant behavior - those that contravene and violate norms of the organization, its policies or rules set by an organization and positive deviant behavior - those that honourably disobey the organizational norms and rules. The growing attention in the area of deviant workplace behaviour increased because of the extensiveness of this sort of behavior observed in the organization and of course the related charges with these sorts of behavior (Peterson, 2002). Hence, regardless of the classification of deviant behavior, if the behavior in the firm is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disobedient or non-compliant</td>
<td>Puffer (1987)</td>
<td>Behaviors which are unrelated to the task and have negative consequences on the organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace delinquency</td>
<td>Hogan and Hogan (1989)</td>
<td>Formal definition not available: quoted as a condition which results into employee “untrustworthiness.” Counterproductive behaviors are parts of this condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace deviance</td>
<td>Robinson and Bennett (1995, 1997)</td>
<td>Behavior that are intentional, displayed by employees of the organization and that disrupts important and noteworthy norms of the organization resulting into threats for subordinates and the supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational misbehavior</td>
<td>Vardi and Weiner (1996)</td>
<td>Any deliberate action taken by organizational fellows that contravene and break essential norms of organization and society also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace aggression</td>
<td>Folger and Baron (1996)</td>
<td>A form of behavior by individuals in organization that deliberately hurts present or former co-employees or the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 showing different definitions of workplace deviant behaviour given by authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization-motivated</td>
<td>O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin and Glew (1996)</td>
<td>Damaging behavior attempted and commenced by either an organizational inside or outside member that is provoked by some element in the organizational context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behavior</td>
<td>Giacalone and Greenberg (1997)</td>
<td>Any behavior that causes damage, or is aimed to bring damage to the organization, its workers, or other concerned person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational vice</td>
<td>Moberg (1997)</td>
<td>An act that deceives the confidence and trust of either individuals or the organizational community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational retaliation</td>
<td>Skarlicki and Folger (1997)</td>
<td>Hostile responses by disgruntled employees to the seeming injustice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

deemed noticed as deviant it costs tremendous loss to the organization every year, in one way or the other.

1.2 POSITIVE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Apart from behaviour that bring harms to organizations in many aspects and cost organizations heavily every year, there are behaviors which give benefits to organizations even being departed from the norms. It is an uncommon practice found in organization and confers advantage to its people who practice it as compared to rest of the members. These sorts of behaviors are likely to be affordable and sustainable because of already in practice by people. These behaviors are also referred to as pro-social types of behaviors. Positive deviance refers to “intentional behaviors that depart from the norms of a referent or related group in honorable ways” (Sprietzer & Sonenshein, 2003). To put it differently, these constructive behaviors necessarily be admirable and concentrate on activities with an intention to admire it without considering the consequences (Sprietzer & Sonenshein, 2003). Organizational
researchers have been argued on the research available on workplace deviance leave unnoticed how establishments and their associates display and manifest positive kinds of behaviors and not merely negative ones. The available works on constructive deviance is nearly negligible compared to the harmful side of workplace deviance. For instance, Sagarin (1975) explored about forty various meanings and explanations of deviance and he found only two definitions as nonnegative. Dodge (1985) expanded the area of organizational behaviour. He holds the privilege for coining the term positive deviance.

Constructive behaviors comprise of behaviors which organizations do not accept or allow, rather they benefit the organization reaching its monetary and financial aims. Therefore these sorts of behaviors may comprise activities such as whistle-blowing, organizational citizenship behavior, corporate social responsibility and innovations. All these mentioned positive and helpful types of behaviors can in fact be categorised as ‘positive deviant behaviors’ provided that the behavior separates from organizational standards and its principles, these behaviors are willingly shown, and the purpose is solely honourable (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004).

1.3 NEGATIVE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Research has been attentive on behaviors that are undesirable and that may be carefully thought deviant such as withdrawal from the work or organization, absenteeism, withholding effort. These behaviors create to inequality in organizations (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Studies mostly covered on negative workplace deviant behavior studied before 1995 were bothered with isolated attempts to answer particular and certain question about particular deviant acts, for instance, unethical decision making, organizational theft and sexual harassment of employees.

According to the forms of workplace deviance, production deviance (e.g., taking excessive leaves and leaving the office early) and property deviance (stealing from company, sabotaging equipment) fall on the axis of organizational deviance from minor to severe pole. Similarly, political deviance (e.g. showing preferences to
someone and blaming co-workers) and individual aggression (e.g. verbal abuse, sexual harassment,) lie on the axis of interpersonal deviance.

Figure 1: Categories of Deviant Workplace Behaviors adapted from Robinson and Bennett (1995).

1.4. GENESIS OF DEVIANCE: A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

In sociological literature there exist two perspectives to define deviance. Social labelling theory, the first perspective, asserts that deviant or unethical behavior is the outcome of social structure and it does not entails any behavioural element (Becker, 1963; Goffman, 1963). Therefore, if any group person is labelled as deviant by any
group, he/she is considered a deviant, in spite of the absence and insufficiency of proof that the individuals’ behavior leaves from a norm. The labelling viewpoint surrounds both constructive and destructive aspects of deviance. For instance, Becker (1963) formulated and designed labels which describes deviant person as a ‘harm to society’ (for instance, offenders and lawbreakers) or a ‘welfare to society’ (for example, moral businesspersons). The conceptualization proposed by Becker about positive and negative deviance, however, requires more support in providing help to researchers who believe that deviance is adhered to particular behaviors. In this way, the interest of a social labelling theorist might not be in searching means to encourage and nurture or deject certain behaviors in order to influence levels of deviance, because deviance is necessarily not related to specific behaviors. The approach of this theorist is to recommend that deviance is an outcome of perception rather than behavior (Goffman, 1963). Labelling approach to deviance stressed the relatively componential aspect of deviance and recommend that labels such as deviance, whether beneficial or damaging, are a reflection of the groups and normative standards used to judge the behavior.

Other scientists relate the term deviance with particular behaviors that reflect dysfunctional characteristics of society. As Merton (1949) says, the incidence of deviance emerges because of a discrepancy between the goals of a society and reasonable ways and medium of achieving those goals. This divide becomes the cause of several types of deviant behavior, comprising behaviors that show a refusal and non-acceptance of unachievable societal objectives or restoring to undesirable ways for attaining society’s goal (e.g., stealing money). Merton (1995) talks about the likelihood of constructive deviance but theory given by him has generally been related with more harmful types of deviance, for example, organizational misconduct (Raelin, 1984; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Holinger & Clark, 1982).

The two perspectives mentioned above to defining deviance are enthralling and capturing, and our conceptualization of defining deviance has been taken from each of the theories just discussed. The behavioural perspective to deviance pays more attention on actions which may give some significant consequences for organizational and social prosperity, but it does so without straightforward elucidating a set of normative values for deciding behavior as constructive or destructive.
1.5 NEGATIVE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR: SOME ANTECEDENTS

Researchers have shown a number of reasons behind an individual’s engagement in deviant behavior in the organization. Sometimes the characteristic or tendency of the employees which impel them to involve in deviant behavior that they harm the organization to such an extent that it costs millions and billions. Seldom it is the organization where they work supports or encourages such behavior. In a common parlance persons who are honest and that are not cunning are valued by society, however, few organizations depend on corrupt and fraudulent employees who are deceitful and cunning to be popular. The characteristics mentioned here about the kinds of organizations are called poisonous that are identified by employee dissatisfaction, reduced performance, meagre decision making and employee anxiety beyond normal workload.

Following are some antecedents of negative deviant behaviour adopted in the present study:

1.5.1 Abusive Supervision

Deviant behavior is one of the results of supervisory mistreatment, which is demarcated as the “subordinate’s perception of the extent to which their supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviors”. Abusive supervision is a dysfunctional workplace behaviour that evokes scenes of an autocratic and dictatorial boss ridiculing and undermining their subordinates publicly. Social exchange theory is the one through which an invoked explanation for these acts are often understood.

Conferring to theory available in literature, in a workplace where an inter-reliant connection can be seen, mistreatment and poor handling by a supervisor shows mistrust and imbalance that employees want to correct this misbehaviour by involving in undesirable and destructive behaviors themselves. Therefore being abused by their
superiors, subordinates engage in such a behavior where they can return this maltreatment back to its wrongdoer, the superior. In this context, Lind & Tyler (1988) rightly point out that attention is paid by the members of the organization to the treatment which they feel to be interpersonal receiving from the authorities and their bosses.

When employees receive just and upright treatment it depicts that they are valued and respected as mentioned by Tyler, (1999) and Tyler & Lind, (1992) which in turn made them to feel that they hold a secure place in the business unit too (Van den Bos, Lind & Wilke, 2001). There are few theories described by early researchers which elucidate this concept. Fairness heuristic theory proclaim that once judgements of fairness takes a shape in people’s life, they practice these judgements in deciding how to act and perform their work; if superiors and authorities are perceived fair, subordinates will respond favourably. They would comply to demand or requirements with slight concern for consequences which are material in nature.

As proposed by Tyler and Blader (2003), the group engagement model conveys this right for behaviors which are discretionary; it connotes that subordinates who sense respect and value by their superiors, turn out to be very much devoted to their job and also to the group with an effort. In addition to this they feel inspired and stimulated to assist the group. This theory also provides a similar statement in that individuals return back the positive regard they recieve and experience from the organization and also its members. As a result these subordinates are seen engaging in constructive deviance, such as organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and other domains of organizational commitment (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 2000).

On the other hand, supervisors who breach and transgress the respectful interpersonal treatment of employees become a target and drop off employees’ perception of fair treatment and promote negative reactions. Ashforth (1997) concluded that abusive supervisors utilize their power to persecute their employees. They misbehave, yell, ridicule, lie and humiliate their subordinates and do all possible misbehaviour (Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Keashly, 1998). Employees, as a result, who are abused by their supervisors try to obtain and seek revenge or they want their perpetrator to suffer in some way.
Research has also support for these contentions. In their study, Tepper, Duffy and Shaw, (2001) found employees who have perceptions of interpersonal supervisory mistreatment are found more reacting and resisting their supervisor’s diplomacies and tricks to affect, refuse constructive work behaviors and engage in deviant behaviour which targets their supervisor (Innes et al., 2005; Baron et al., 1999) and the organization as well (Detert et al., 2007; Aquino et al., 1999;).

Tepper (2007) made an attempt to distinguish abusive supervision from similar constructs such as petty tyranny, supervisor undermining, supervisor aggression, destructive leadership and workplace bullying, based on type of hostilities and intention of the perpetrator to cause harm. The following segment aims to describe these similar constructs briefly.

**Petty Tyranny:** Like Abusive supervision, petty tyranny displays hostile acts, such as ‘belittling/disparage subordinates’ that are downward-focused from superiors to subordinates (Ashforth, 1997). However, there is a difference between petty tyranny from that of abusive supervision in that it includes non-hostile acts, such as self-aggrandizement i.e. to enhance the power (e.g. using authority or position for personal gain) and discourages initiative taken by employees (excluding employees from participating in decision making).

**Supervisor Aggression:** Supervisor aggression is another construct which is closely related to abusive supervision (Schat, Desmarais & Kelloway, 2006). Hostile acts are targeted at subordinates in this. It is distinct from abusive supervision in that it encompasses physical acts that are intended to cause harm and therefore, may have legal consequences.

**Destructive Leadership:** An emerging construct closely related and similar to abusive supervision is destructive leadership. Destructive leaders violate the interests of the organization and its employees, both. It includes behavior from all three domains of aggression, namely direct versus indirect aggression, passive versus active aggression, and physical versus verbal aggression. Destructive leadership also undermines subordinates’ well-being. Often these leaders engage in behaviors that sabotage the interests of the organization.
Workplace Bullying: Perpetrators of workplace bullying use abuse, social isolation and slander to attack their victims (Hoel & Cooper, 2001). Like abusive supervision, victims of workplace bullying are teased and insulted over a sustained period of time. Besides, workplace bullying includes physical and verbal attacks.

1.5.2 Organizational Justice

Researches in the area of equity and justice show that workplace deviance turn out because individuals are being treated inequitably in the workplace. This contention is supported by equity theory. According to this theory, employees compare their effort skill and input to their results i.e. with their pay, promotions, and raises. When subordinates experience similar outcomes in response to similar efforts and outputs comparing with other co-workers, they experience fairness and equally valued. Contrary to this, when subordinates feel disparity and inconsistency between their input and output ratio and others, they encounter injustice and partiality. Thus, to restore their sense of injustice, subordinates may often move and decide to engage in acts of deviance (Henle, 2005).

Organizational justice may be defined as perceptions of employees about the equity and impartiality in the organization and depicts a situation based description of deviant workplace behavior. Previous theories and extensive research have explained four different categories of organizational justice: distributive, procedural, interactional and interpersonal. Distributive justice is explained as perception of fairness pertaining to the distribution of outcomes which employees receive and distribution of resources (Adams, 1965). Procedural justice is explained as the equality of the processes which are used to make decisions inside an organization, and which is determined by the availability of some attributes like appeal process, voice, bias suppression, and consistency (Leventhal, 1980). Interactional justice refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment which employees experience when procedures are enacted and applied (Bies & Moag, 1986). Finally, informational justice describes the
appropriateness of the information which are adopted to explain the process of decision making and the thoroughness of the accounts provided.

A possible explanation of why justice holds an important place in employees’ life is given by group value model of justice. This model provides the central cause why justice holds an importance to people, also that it conveys how the group views an employees. Williams (2007) revealed that with such benefits and importance related to groups, persons are sensitive to differences in the sense how they are perceived and behaved by others. When an employees receive a polite treatment with interpersonally fair way, i.e. with self-respect and admiration, they think that they rights are respected and feel more confident about their standing in an organization (Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler, DeGoey & Smith, 1996). On the other hand, being treated unjustly with no value and dignity generates a feeling of low status and low-value positions. Additionally it creates a feeling to develop undesirable relationships with the organization or bosses. These sorts of feelings connotes unworthiness of one’s position as compared to those who receive more fair treatment. Researches in this direction have verily paid attention and noticed why employees involve in deviant acts. This contention suggest that the experiencing injustice is one of the big reasons of workplace deviance (Ambrose, Seabright & Schminke, 2002; Felson & Steadman, 1983). Particularly, perception of interpersonal injustice or whether one has received polite treatment, dignity as well as respect has been reasoned to be an essential antecedent of workplace deviance (Aquino, Lewis & Bradfield, 1999; Judge, Miller, 2001; Scott & Ilies, 2006; Tripp, Bies & Aquino, 2007).

1.5.3. Machiavellianism

Behavioral scientist have been concerned and taken keen interest in the theory of Machiavellianism for the past forty years. As soon as it originated in 1970s, researchers established and investigated this construct and they related this to Niccolo Machiavelli’s (1513/1998) unusual and unique work, The Prince, which will be always considered as a leader who was used to of dishonest and untruthful unscrupulous leadership practices.
Though researchers in this area, like Christie, (1970); Grams and Rogers, (1990); McHoskey, (1995); Gable and Dangello, (1994) have investigated Machiavellianism, most of them describe a Machiavellian as a cunning and shrewd person. If an individual scores high on existing Mach scale are considered to engage in deceitful and cunning behaviors, this is only one aspect of Machiavelli’s tactic. It is a personality trait which is seldom thought to be linked to the possibility of workplace deviant behavior within an individual or in groups. In modern psychology, Machiavellianism is thought as one of the dark personalities distinguished by a deceitful and cunning interpersonal style associated with cynical beliefs and pragmatic morality. It defines a person who has an unethical and evil reputation for dealing with others to fulfil his/her own purpose and objectives, and for using others for his/her own motives (Cristie & Geis, 1970).

A Machiavellian-orientation is a general strategy of an individual for handling cunningly with other people. It describes and tells about the amount to which people feel they can deploy and influence others in an interpersonal situation (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). A Machiavellian person in modern day employs aggressive, cunning, tactful, exploiting, immoral and unfair moves to achieve personal or organizational objectives (Calhoon, 1959). The needs, feelings or rights of others in the organization are secondary. These sorts of handling cunningly as well as deceitfully may lead to fall into immoral acts for the complete monetary interest and welfare of the organization, where moralities are sacrificed. As studied by Robinson and Bennett (2000), Machiavellianism was found to be associated with interpersonal and organizational deviance, both.

Machiavellianism in the workplace is the employment of cunning behavior and duplicity in a business setting. This personality trait is an increasingly examined phenomenon in organizational literature. The topic of Machiavellianism has been studied and explored widely for the past forty years as a characteristic of personality that shares attributes with deceitful leadership strategies. In recent times it is being modified and applied to the context of the workplace and organizations by many authors and academics. Typically, a Machiavellian person manipulates only at times where it is needed to achieve the necessary objectives.
1.6. SOME MODERATORS IN WORKPLACE DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Apart from the antecedents of workplace deviant behavior mentioned above for the present research problem, however, there can be a significant role of moderating variables which might play a crucial role in strengthening the relationship between the dependent and independent variable. Briefly quoting, a moderator variable in research is a qualitative or quantitative variable which affects and/or strengthen the direction of the two variables, i.e. the relationship between the predictor or independent variable and a criterion or dependent variable.

1.6.1. Ethical Ideology

Ethical ideology is predicted to play a role in the occurrence of workplace deviance. A paucity of research examining the relationship between workplace deviance and individual differences in moral cognitions and philosophy makes this study imperative. Theories have been proposed to relate the differences in ethical ideology among individuals. Say for instance, Kohlberg’s (1983) different stages of moral development give stress to the explanations why an individual use to defend and rationalize moral choices. According to Forsyth (1992) there are many factors which influence an individual’s decision as to when and how to involve in socially disapproved behavior.

Ethical ideology describes about a system which is based on ethical values which people use to make moral judgements. It provides rules and procedures for deciding and correcting behaviour which might be ethically doubtful and contentious. Say for, people who possess ethical ideology are identified by a faith in restoring wellbeing of others and theirs too, they are considered to refrain from any activities, behavior or decisions that might harm others, potentially. Moral philosophy of an individual, or ethical ideology, is one aspect that explains variances in ethical judgments (Forsyth, 1992; Schlenker & Forsyth, 1977; Forsyth, 1980). It talks about the set of opinions, attitudes, and morals that might allocate people with a structure within which to think of ethical dilemmas. Ethical ideologies give support to individuals as they give judgments about ethical issues (Forsyth & Nye, 1990).
Schlenker and Forsyth (1977) and Forsyth (1980) propound that variances in peoples’ ideology in their ethics can be labelled by two dimensions: ‘relativism’ and ‘idealism’. The first dimension of this construct, relativism, relates the degree to which people discard universal moral rules or values (Forsyth, 1980). Individuals high on this dimension rarely believe in moral absolutes. They rely on the rightness and wrongness of an action rest on the particular situations involved in it. Contrary to this, Idealists, depend on doctrines and laws which are universal when assessing the ethics of an action (Forsyth, 1992). Furthermore, idealists believe that needed and appropriate outcomes can be acquired by involving in actions that are morally correct. Contrary to this, people low in idealism firmly accept that moral actions do not always lead to advantageous and sensible outcomes. Moreover, harming or hurting other people is seldom required to give exceptionally worthy for the large number affected by a decision (Forsyth, 1992).

1.6.2. Work Passion

Passion is defined as an intense and earnest inclination toward an activity and affair self-defined that one loves, that is highly valued, and to accomplish a good and substantial amount of time and energy is invested (Vallerand, 2010; Vallerand et al., 2003). Passion at work can be defined as a strong tendency and likeness toward one’s job, which is liked and valued immensely, and in which an individual puts his considerable amount of time and zest (Vallerand, 2010).

Proposed by Vallerand (2010) and Vallerand et al., (2003), dualistic model of passion makes an important difference as to how the activity is “internalized” into one’s character, which consequently determines the type of passion i.e. harmonious versus obsessive passion. Harmonious passion is defined as a stimulating and inciting force that prepares employees in the organization to perform their duty with a sense of volition and self-endorsement (Vallerand & Houlfort, 2003). It is an outcome of a self-governing internalization of the activity into the individual’s identity (Vallerand, 2003). In other words, it is a self-regulated internalization which happens when one has freely acknowledged the activity as essential and meaningful, sans any sense of attached contingency. When an individual feel harmoniously zealous and ardent about an action it takes an important place in one’s identity. When employees are seen loving their job
because they enjoy it doing, they are called harmoniously passionate. To gain the sheer benefit out of their work these employees devote themselves to their work.

On the contrary, obsessive passion results from a motivational force that pushes the employees towards the achievement and completion of their work. Research reveals that obsessive passion emerges from controlling internalization of the activity into one’s personality. In the words of Vallerand et al., (2003) a controlled internalization results from internal pressures, for instance to maintain high self-esteem, and external pressures, i.e. the need to be socially accepted or valued. Obsessive passion is connected to hard persistence (Ratelle et al., 2004).

Work passion of an individual is a constant, unvarying, emotionally positive, meaningful state of well-being, which originates from consistent mental and emotional appraisals of different situations in the context of job and organization. It results in regular, high-yielding and goal-directed behaviors. It is about producing as well as building significant progress on important aims in such a way that it challenges an individual. It is about quality of relationships one creates and the operation processes one applies to get the job done. Employees who are passionate are the franchise talent that an organization needs to build around. They are also considered to be productive, energized, devoted and an asset to an organization. On the other hand, unconcerned and non-committed employees often become burden, which in turn damage the productivity and morale. This work passion can sometimes influence work deviant behavior.

1.6.3. Power Distance

Power distance is a way to explain the handling of differences between groups existing in a system. It reflects a culture’s attitude towards inequality among human beings. In organizational perspective, it defines itself through a relationship that exists between manager-subordinate. In societies where low power distance is observed, relationship between managers and subordinates are egalitarian type where they have access to equal levels of powers. Hofstede (1980) describes power distance as “the extent to which a society agree to take the fact that there is an unequal sharing of power in societies and organizations.”
At an individual level, these differences are exhibited in an individual’s *power distance orientation* (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). Such differences have been found to affect individuals’ perception and their reactance to authority. For example, people high in power distance orientation accept the discrepancy in power between people who are leaders in their positions and those in inferior positions by perceiving authorities to be powerful and elite. As a result, people with high power distance orientation are more expected to obey, respect, defer to, and trust supervisors (Kirkman et al., 2009; Sully de Luque & Sommer, 2000). Individuals high on power distance orientation also believe that one should not go contrary to one’s superiors and tend to be compliant and obedient. Also they are responsive to their superiors’ decisions (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994).

Furthermore, employees who are high on power distance orientation cherish and appraise differences in status and accept the organizational hierarchy more often. People like this depict strong admiration and honor their authorities in the organization. For them, managers or leaders are different kind of people (Hofstede, 1980). Atwater et al., (2002) in their study demonstrated that individuals having high power distance orientation consider that replicating their manager’s behavior is wrong and should not appeal for information from higher authorities. Therefore, employees of these category desire to maintain a reduced amount of communication with managers and uphold a greater social distance (Farh et al., 2007). In contrast, employees who are low in power distance are found to be egalitarian and are less probable to give in to authority (Lam et al., 2002). Those employees prefer to contribute in decision making process in organization and see their superiors to be socially equal in terms of experience in their work and job accountabilities. In the present study power distance orientation has been adopted as another moderator for workplace deviance.

1.7. RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Workplace deviance has emerged as a serious issue in the recent past years. The topic of deviant behavior has been studied by both academicians as well as professionals pragmatically across the globe. The study of workplace deviance is different from the study of morals and principles in that deviance emphasizes and tries to resolve the behavior that break up and disrupts norms of the organization, while the
ethics pays attention on behavior that is right or wrong when evaluated in terms of law and justice or other guiding principle prescribed by society confirming the goodness of behavior. Burning issues like supervisory mistreatment, finding role model of deviant acts and perception of injustice in organizations are creeping all through the way which makes this study even more imperative. Besides these factors there are personal and social buffers like ethical ideology, work passion and power distance that may play moderating roles in the relationships between dependent and independent variable. The dominance and occurrence of deviance and its related organizational costs compels a detailed, organized, theoretically focused program of study in this piece of research. As per the researcher’s knowledge, a good amount of empirical research has spoken the unauthorized and unacceptable side of employee behavior, also previous researchers have identified behaviors that could be considered deviant, the present research will give a distinct conceptualization and findings as such. Although such research can examine the behaviors of a similar types as the study of employee deviance in the organizational context, and be valuable in accepting it, the incidence of counterproductive behaviors wishes to be investigated as a separate, diverse and essential organizational incident in its own direction.