Chapter - 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR

In literature, the term ‘Deviant Workplace Behaviour’ has been interchangeably referred to as Counterproductive Work Behaviour or CWB (Fox et al., 1999), Dysfunctional Workplace Behaviour (Griffin et al., 1998), Antisocial Behaviour (Giacolone and Greenberg, 1997), Retaliatory Behaviours (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997), Workplace Aggression (Baron and Neuman, 1996), Organizational Misbehavior (Vardi and Wiener, 1966), or Workplace Deviance (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Despite the conceptual differences among these various constructs of negative behaviours, they are measured in largely the same way since they are having overlapping items. All above constructs share similarities like a) voluntary behaviour, b) violating significant organizational norms, c) targeting individuals or organization and d) harming organization, its members or both.

Deviant Workplace Behaviour has been defined as voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). The definition focused on violation of norms, willingly by the employees, in order to harm the organization, its members or both, in the workplace. Employee deviance is considered voluntary may be because employee either lack the motivation to conform to the normative expectations of the social context or they become motivated enough to violate those expectations (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Various attempts were made to define deviant workplace behaviour by the earlier researchers.

Vardi and Wiener (1996) defined Organizational Misbehavior as any intentional action by the members of the organizations that defies and violates shared organizational norms and expectations and/or core societal values and standards of proper conduct. Giacalone and Greenberg (1997) defined Antisocial Behaviour as any behaviour that brings harm, or is intended to bring harm to an organization, its employees, or stakeholders. Andersson and Pearson (1999) defined a different though overlapping
of Workplace Incivility as low-intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. The uncivil behaviours are characteristically rude, discourteous and display a lack of regard for others. Whereas, Lawrence and Robinson (2007) proposed that Workplace Incivility may be a form of organizational resistance. Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB) was defined as the behaviour by organizational members that are counter to the legitimate interests of the organization (Sackett, 2002). Gruys and Sackett (2003) refer to deviance as an intentional behaviour, on the part of an organizational member, which an organization views as contrary to its legitimate interests. Thus, all the constructs define workplace deviance differently, but with overlapping content. Recently, authors defined deviant behaviour with a new term as Insidious Workplace Behaviour (IWB) which is defined as “a form of intentionally harmful workplace behaviour that is legal, subtle, and low level (rather than severe), repeated overtime, and directed at individuals or organizations” (Edwards and Greenberg, 2010). Importantly, insidious workplace behaviour is viewed as a particular form of several varieties of deviant behaviour.

Robinson and Greenberg (1998) examined the various definitions of workplace deviance constructs and found out some commonalities among them. According to them the five common characteristics shared by all definitions were:

1. **Perpetrator**: The perpetrator is the first common element in all definitions. It refers to the insiders who are the employees working in the organizations, current or former (Green, 2014). As can be recognized, most definitions include ‘organizational members’ in their definitions. O’Leary-Kelly et al., (1996) have proposed that organizational insiders initiate much more severe organizational harm than do organizational outsiders.

2. **Intentionality**: This second characteristic describing the deviant workplace behaviour definition is also common in most of the definitions (Baron and Neuman, 1996; Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Sackett and DeVore, 2001; Vardi and Wiener, 1996). Thus, any behaviour that cause harm accidentally or without any purposeful goal of doing so is not considered to be a deviant one. Further, Vardi and Wiener (1996) categorized the intentions of the perpetrators into three aspects: (i) intending to benefit oneself,
(ii) intending to benefit organization or (iii) inclined to damage or be destructive to both the members of the organization and organization itself.

3. **Target:** The target is usually defined as ‘all organizational stakeholders’ (Robinson and Greenberg, 1998), which includes, besides employees of the organization, former employees, clients of the organization or the public at large. Robinson and Bennett (1995) provided another distinction for the target of deviance. According to them, individuals, the organization itself or other organizations can be targets of deviance at workplaces. Vardi and Wiener (1996), indicated that insiders were found the most prevalent victims of organizational deviant behaviour. They further categorized the insider targets into three parts: (i) the work itself, (ii) the organization's property, resources, symbols or regulations and (iii) other members or co-workers of organization.

4. **Nature and Execution of the Action:** The fourth characteristic of the definitions of deviant workplace behaviour was given as the nature and execution of the action along which various definitions differ. In most of the definitions of deviant workplace behaviour, an action is considered to be deviant if it violates societal or organizational norms (Martinko et al., 2002; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Vardi and Wiener, 1996). Baron and Neumann (1996) classified nature of actions as (i) direct (actions directed to the target) or indirect (aimed at the target by way of an agent), (ii) active (inflicting harm) or passive (withholding benefits) and as (iii) verbal or physical actions.

5. **Consequence:** Consequence or the effect is the last characteristic of deviant workplace behaviour construct which has been differentiated across various definitions. Consequence is an attribute that results from the deviant actions. Most researchers define the action as deviant if the action gives harm to a person or an organization. While some other researchers are interested in the intention of giving damage to a person or the organization. Other interesting point to be noted here is that, the deviant behaviour can result in either positive or negative consequences. There might be some occasions where the deviant workplace behaviour may result in a positive consequence for the person, its co-worker or the organization as a whole (Spreitzer and Sonenshein, 2004; Warren, 2003).
According to Robinson and Bennett (1995), firstly in order to be labeled “deviant” the behaviour must go against the organization’s norms regardless of the society’s norms. For example, if an organization dumps its toxic waste into the river, by definition this would not be a deviant behaviour in the eyes of organization because it is not against their organizational norms, but it is against the society’s norms as per society. Therefore, the term “deviant” means only that behaviours which deviates from the obvious and assumed norms of the organization. Secondly, the behaviour must threaten the health of an organization, its members, or both. This means that the violations must be relatively serious. Robinson and Bennett (1995) also noted that deviant behaviours may or may not be ethical. As they pointed out, behaviours such as blowing whistle may be viewed as extremely ethical by many, but would also fit the definition of deviance. Lastly, the deviance is voluntary or intentional and is not accidental, means individuals involve in deviant acts intentionally to harm organization. And they believe that they have been wronged by someone can blame somebody at workplace (Aquino et al., 2001).

Robinson and Bennett (1995) noted that although many behaviours might meet one of their above three definitional criteria of workplace deviance (i.e. of voluntary; violations of organizational norms and threatening well-being of organization or members), but they focused only on those behaviours that met all three criteria and were likely to be deviant in most organizational contexts. They also stated that employee deviance excludes minor infractions of social norms, such as wearing a suit of the wrong style to the office that is not directly or usually harmful to the organization or its members. The violation of organizational norms, in context of this definition is the violation of formal and informal organizational policies, rules, and procedures as prescribed by the organization which are not expected to be violated by its members and is specified in the deviance definition because here deviance must be defined in terms of the standards of a specified social group rather than in reference to a system. Hence, in current study, the definition proposed by Robinson and Bennett (1995) will be used which was defined as “voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both”. The main reason for the choice of the term “Deviant Workplace Behaviour” (DWB) is the extensiveness of its scope among all the definitions.
2.1.1 Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviour

Deviant workplace behaviour phenomenon has been the topic of several studies and this concept may arguably be considered the most fully developed among all other constructs of deviant behaviour (Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Few authors have made good attempts to classify deviant behaviours. The concept of property deviance and production deviance was first introduced by Mangione and Quinn (1974), and later by Hollinger and Clark (1982). However, these mentioned frameworks and classifications do not account for deviant acts of interpersonal nature, such as physical aggression and sexual harassment but only include acts directed against the organizations. Robinson and Bennett (1995) argued that an accurate typology of employee deviance should take into account not only the behaviours directed towards organizations, but also those that are directed towards individuals.

Consequently, Robinson and Bennett, (1995) empirically developed a comprehensive typology of deviant workplace behaviour that includes all possible negative behaviours with the aid of multidimensional scaling procedure and thereby validated potential methods for measuring workplace deviance. The results produced a two dimensional configuration of deviant workplace behaviours (see Figure 2.1).
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The vertical block of the perceptual map was labeled as the organizational-interpersonal dimension. This dimension represents the target of the deviant workplace behaviour. The dimension ranged from deviant behaviours aimed at the organization (e.g., sabotaging equipment, leaving early etc.) to deviant behaviours primarily directed towards members of the organization (e.g., verbal abuse, endangering co-workers, blaming etc.). The second dimension of perceptual map represents the severity of the deviant behaviour on the horizontal axis. Deviant behaviour on this dimension varied on a continuum from minor forms of deviance like gossiping about co-workers, intentionally working slow, to serious forms of deviant behaviour for e.g. physical abuse or stealing from the office. The perceptual configuration based on these two dimensions results in
four quadrants or four classifications which Robinson and Bennett (1995) referred to as four classes of deviant workplace behaviour namely:

1) **Production Deviance**: Behaviours in this category are less severe or harmful, and target the organization. Production deviance refer to behaviour that directly interfere with the work being performed in the organization and effect the performance of the company and its growth, for example like reading a newspaper instead of working, wasting the resources, leaving early, taking excessive long breaks, calling in sick when you are well and so on.

2) **Political Deviance**: Behaviours in the political deviance category are relatively less severe, and victims of these behaviours are individuals in the organization. Political deviance refers to milder interpersonal harmful behaviour like showing favoritism towards someone, blaming co-workers, gossiping excessively with co-workers thereby wasting crucial work time and competing non-beneficially with the co-workers.

3) **Property Deviance**: Behaviours in this category target the organization and are relatively more harmful. Property deviance refers to employee destroying or misusing an organization’s property. Employees might indulge in sabotaging equipment, stealing from organization property, lying about the hours worked, misusing expense accounts and so on. Clearly, these acts bring direct costs for the organization in having to replace the stolen or damaged equipment and thereby hampering the productivity because work cannot be done until replacement equipment arrives.

4) **Personal Aggression**: Behaviours targeting the individuals of the organization and relatively harmful comprises personal aggression category of deviance. Personal aggression is more harmful interpersonal behaviour than political deviance as it involves acts like sexual harassment, physical and verbal abuse, endangering co-workers or stealing from co-worker at the workplace.

This typology has been widely used among organizational researches to present and discuss the prevalence of such behaviours in an organized and systematic manner.
Gruys and Sackett (2003) put up on this typology of Robinson and Bennett (1995) and explored workplace deviant behaviours differently along two dimensions; interpersonal-organizational and task relevance. The task relevance dimension varied on a scale starting from behaviours which are relevant to the task being performed, such as quality of work, to those which are less relevant to the direct performance of task, such as theft. Cullen and Sackett (2003) differentiated between initiated and reactive counterproductive behaviours. They showed that individuals may initiate a deviant behaviour (steal from the organization) in order to satisfy motives of pleasure, greed, thrill seeking, risk taking, or attention seeking. While, counterproductive behaviours are reactive when an individual engage in such behaviours in response to some actual or perceived organizational event, in order to fulfill the motives of retaliation, revenge, release, and or escape.
Interest has been reflected towards more integrative treatments of a range of deviant behaviours (Griffin et al., 1998; Robinson and Greenberg, 1998). As a result, Spector et al. (2006) in order to further classify deviant behaviours into specific categories, developed an instrument of 45 items, a checklist named Counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist (CWB-C) which included the Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) organizational and interpersonal dimensions, along with five other categories:

1. **Abuse**
   Abuse against others consists of harmful behaviours against the co-workers, to inflict physical or psychological harm through threats, inappropriate comments, ignoring or undermining a co-worker’s ability to work efficiently.

2. **Production Deviance**
   The production related deviance being relatively more passive than sabotage include, intentionally not doing the tasks as efficiently as required.

3. **Sabotage**
   Sabotage behaviour (more active) refers to any physical impairment or destruction of the property belonging to the employer.

4. **Theft**
   Theft simply relates to the stealing of objects, office supplies and information related with data, processes and so forth, from the employer or co-workers.

5. **Withdrawal**
   Withdrawal consists of behaviours that involve intentionally working slow and less, remaining absent, arriving late to the workplace and taking more frequent breaks than allowed.

In the current study, Spector et al. (2006), typology of deviant workplace behaviour has been used and examined, which has been classified into either as organizational deviance (DWBO) and interpersonal deviance (DWBP) dimensions or along as with five other categories, which are abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. All these seven dimensions were analyzed throughout this study to meet the research objectives of this study relating to their prevalence and extent, their relationship with organizational role stress as a predictor variable along with identification of the demographic variations in these types of deviant behaviours.
2.1.2 Predictors of Deviant Workplace Behaviour

In literature, deviant workplace behaviour like negative phenomenon were found to be best predicted with a combination of both individual level and situational level factors, present at the workplace (Colbert et al., 2004; Herschovis et al., 2007; O’Leary-Kelly et al., 1996; Peterson, 2002a; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Vardi, 2001; Vardi and Wiener, 1996).

However, some researchers argued that deviant workplace behaviour has been influenced by only individual attributes, while others have explored organizational factors as the only antecedents of deviance. For example, Appelbaum et al., (2005), suggested that operational environment is a good predictor of employees’ engagement in deviant workplace behaviour. The research also suggested that it is the workplace environment characteristics, rather than individual personality characteristics, that are good predictors of workplace violence, an extreme form of deviance. Thus, the predictors of deviant workplace behaviour in literature were mostly classified under two headings as “individual or personality related factors” and the “situational or organizational factors” determining deviance.

Moreover, still other researchers have argued that different antecedents explain different types of deviant workplace behaviours. For example, organizational factors might be more likely to influence deviance directed at harming organizations, whereas individual variables may be more likely to explain interpersonal forms of deviance harming individuals (Everton et al., 2007; Robinson and Bennett, 1995). In the same vein, empirical evidence suggested different antecedents displaying different effects on different types of workplace deviance (Colbert et al., 2004; Fox et al., 2001, Fox and Spector, 1999; Lawrence and Robinson, 2007; Peterson, 2002a; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).

Fox and Spector (1999) tested a model of work-frustration and aggression, with the help of structural equation modeling and zero order correlation techniques, on data of 185 subjects, working full time in eight corporations of Florida and Illinois. The study founded a positive relationship between events that are frustrating employee’s achievement of individual and organizational goals and aggression (both interpersonal and organizational aggression). This positive association between situational constraints
experienced by employees and aggression has been found to be mediated by affective responses experienced by employees like job dissatisfaction and frustration. In addition to this, individual attributes like personality (trait anger and anxiety), external locus of control and likelihood of punishment were found to be associated with aggression (deviant workplace behaviour). Results showed that anxiety trait is strongly linked to interpersonal deviant behaviour, and anger trait to the organizational deviant behaviour. Similarly, Bennett and Robinson (2000) identified a strong relationship between frustration and workplace aggression, a form of deviant behaviour.

Among individual attributes, personality is a relevant factor in predicting deviant workplace behaviour. An entire integrity test industry has grown around the idea that personality tests can predict the deviant behaviour at workplace during selection process (Ones et al., 1993). In a meta-analytic research of twenty eight studies, regarding the validity of pre-employment integrity tests, it has been found that personality traits predict the absenteeism at workplace and thereby imply that measures of personality traits can be used to select job applicants during selection process in organizations in order to reduce absenteeism (Ones et al., 2003).

Another meta-analysis study of forty seven studies, since 1990, was done to investigate, whether Big Five personality dimensions predict the counterproductive behaviours like absenteeism, turnover, and accidents rates, by Salgado (2002). Results posed that conscientiousness dimension of Big Five personality predicted deviant behaviours and turnover, whereas extroversion, openness, agreeableness and emotional stability predict only the turnover criterion. But, the results of Ones et al., (2003) study of personality based integrity tests, predicting absenteeism were much more encouraging, than the results of meta-analysis of Big Five personality scales and absenteeism conducted by Salgado (2002), in which none of the Big Five personality dimensions except conscientiousness predicted the absenteeism substantially. Similarly Lee et al., (2005) identified Big Five personality dimensions as correlates of antisocial behaviour, using sample of 267 Korean employees where conscientiousness has been found to be related with antisocial behaviour targeting organization and agreeableness to antisocial behaviour targeting individuals. The sixth dimension of Big Five personality, Honesty-Humility also predicted antisocial behaviour at workplace. Big Five Personality traits of
conscientiousness and agreeableness were again identified as strong predictors of deviant workplace behaviour (Kluemper et al., 2015; Oh et al., 2014).

Aquino et al., (1999) research revealed a direct relationship between negative affectivity and deviant workplace behaviour. Negative affect is a personality characteristic which means the extent to which an individual feels distressing emotions like anger, fear, hostility and anxiety. Researchers examined whether deviant behaviours were reflective of perceptions of justice or are directly related to negative affectivity. In their study they proposed a model linking unfavorable perceptions of three kinds of distributive, procedural and interactional justice as well as negative affectivity to organizational and interpersonal deviance. The results showed that perceptions of interactional justice by persons were stronger predictors of deviant workplace behaviours directed against organization and its members, rather than either the distributive or procedural justice perceptions. It was concluded that negative affectivity is a stable personality trait and directly influenced deviant behaviours than justice perceptions variables. Wilkin and Connelly (2015) study indicated that envy mediates the relationship between distributive justice and theft. Also perceived lack of organizational support caused employees to act deviant (Colbert et al., 2004).

In another study by Duffy et al., (1998), it was found that high positive affectivity, long job tenure, and high job satisfaction depicted less deviant workplace behaviour. While, Douglas and Martinko (2001) found that trait anger, attribution style, negative affectivity, and other person factors account for a large amount of the variance in workplace aggression. Still in several other studies, trait anger was shown to be a significant correlate of deviant workplace behaviour (Jockin et al., 2001; Martinko et al., 2002).

Robinson and O’Leary-Kelly (1998) examined the influence of work group’s antisocial behaviour on the antisocial behaviour of individual employees. It was found that antisocial behaviour exhibited by a work group, is a significant predictor of an individual’s antisocial behaviour at work. The study was conducted on 35 groups consisting of 187 employees working in 20 organizations. Results depicted that the influence of work group’s antisocial behaviour on an individual’s antisocial behaviour become stronger with time, as the individual’s time spent in that group increases. This
finding suggested that, as the richness of the group’s experience increases, members of the group are more likely to match their level of antisocial behaviour to that of the group level antisocial behaviour. Also if an individual employee exhibit less antisocial behaviour than his/her group, he or she will be less satisfied with the coworkers and can resort to quit the organization. Finally, if the task interdependency in a group is high, it will lead to the strengthening of relationship between group’s and individual’s antisocial behaviour. This result has been found to be consistent with the monkey see, monkey do phenomena in nature.

Peterson (2002) in a research predicted specific types of deviant workplace behaviours through certain types of ethical climates within the organizations. The study explored how ethical climate types are related to four classes of deviant behaviours, identified by Robinson and Bennett (1995). The results demonstrated that organization’s ethical climate predicts the property and production deviance better that the political deviance and personal aggression, thus concluding that ethical climate of an organization partially predicts the deviant workplace behaviours and being an organizational factor is related to the organizational deviance. Also personal aggression is not associated with any particular type of ethical climate and might be better explained by characteristics of individual. The caring climate type and political deviance show strong relationship, thereby implying less engagement in deviance if management is caring. Similarly, there is correlation between property deviance and climates of rules and professionalism, and workers who protect self-interests are more likely to engage in production deviance. On the same grounds, Appelbaum et al., (2005) also explained the relationship of ethical climate and deviant workplace behaviour, to suggest that more and more organizations should step up and take necessary actions by nurturing strong and positive ethical cultures, so that when their employees confront with an ethical dilemma, the management knows in advance how to deal with it.

Martinko et al., (2002) in an integrative piece summarized the major theories of counterproductive work behaviours and discussed how both individual differences and situational variables influence counter productivity at workplace. Although these theories have addressed many apparently divergent types of behaviours, yet many similarities exist between and among these various perspectives. They discussed that gender, locus of
control, attribution style, core self-evaluations, integrity and negative affectivity were not
the fundamental determinants of deviant workplace behaviour, while attribution theory
was the pivotal determinant of deviant workplace behaviour. They also argued that
individuals' causal reasoning about the environment and expected outcomes drive
individual level deviant workplace behaviour. This integrative piece helps to understand
why and how individual differences and situational variables are related to deviant
workplace behaviour.

Herschovis et al., (2007) in a meta-analysis of 57 empirical studies concerning
workplace aggression has revealed that both individual (trait anger, negative affectivity,
and biological sex) and situational level factors (injustice, job dissatisfaction,
interpersonal conflict, situational constraints, and poor leadership) predict interpersonal
and organizational aggression separately. The interpersonal conflict, trait anger,
situational constraints and job dissatisfaction were found strongest predictors of
workplace aggression. The study suggested that trait anger and gender were significant
predictors of aggression, with men being more aggressive than women.

Penney and Spector's (2002) empirical paper is based on Baumeister's theory of
threatened egotism and aggression. They found support where individual differences in
narcissism, moderated the relationships between job constraints and counterproductive
work behaviours. Narcissism was found as a distal determinant of deviant workplace
behaviour, while more proximal determinant of trait anger. Trait anger mediates the
relationship between deviant workplace behaviour and narcissism. The individuals high
in narcissism reported more deviant workplace behaviours, when job constraints were
high.

At the same time Marcus et al., (2002) developed and validated a German self-
report measure of deviant workplace behaviour and revealed self-control and integrity as
better predictors of such behaviours. They also suggested that counter productivity may
be best described as a higher order behavioural construct loading on the sub dimensions
that carry unique variances. Later on, adopting a general perspective on the theory of
devious workplace behaviour Marcus and Shuler (2004) examined the relationships
between twenty four independent variables and general counterproductive behaviour. Self
control was found to be the most dominant predictor among other twenty four predictor
variables. The results of this research pointed to the condition that, developing a workforce consisting of sufficiently self-controlled individuals would prove to be a highly effective countermeasure for problems associated with acts of deviant nature.

Liao et al., (2004), in a study showed, the impact an employee’s dissimilarity to co-workers (in terms of personality and demographics), will have on an employee’s deviant workplace behaviour. The research revealed that dissimilarities in ethnicity, agreeableness and openness to experience were significantly related with organizational deviance, whereas dissimilarities in gender, conscientiousness and extraversion were related with the interpersonal deviance at workplace. Perceived organizational support and commitment along with co-worker’s support and satisfaction mediated the relationship between dissimilarities among employees and deviant behaviours. Their findings implied that, dissimilar employees, in terms of ethnicity and agreeableness to their work groups, were less engaged in organizational deviance, while, age dissimilarity positively predicted the co-worker support. High organizational commitment and co-worker support lead to low interpersonal and organizational deviance.

Another study examined the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviours (Mehta, 2004). The investigation controlled the effects of situational factors on the counterproductive work behaviours thereby providing a stronger test of the role of dispositional motivation. The study showed that both approach and avoidance motivation tendencies are related to counterproductive work behaviours, organizational citizenship behaviours and task performance. The results demonstrated that although the achievement approach motivation was negatively related to the counterproductive work behaviours, the general approach motivation and avoidance motivation were both positively related to the deviant behaviours.

Lim and Cortina (2005) in a study on females within a large public sector organization examined the relationships and outcomes of incivility and sexual harassment as a form of interpersonal mistreatment at the workplace. Findings revealed that incivility and sexual harassment tends to co-occur in organizations, with gender harassment making bridge between the two and results in declined occupational, psychological, and physical health as well as well-being of the women employees with the addition of each
kind of exploitation at the workplace. Incivility alone is sufficient to trigger the psychological and physical harm.

Other researches have linked machiavellianism and incidence of deviant behaviour within individuals. Machiavellianism is a person’s general strategy to deal with people, or an individual’s inclination to manipulate others in order to achieve personal goals. Machiavellianism has been found to be associated with both interpersonal and organizational deviance (Bennett and Robinson, 2000).

Lawrence and Robinson (2007) developed a conceptual model of workplace deviance, as a form of resistance to organizational power. They argued that systems and episodes (types) of organizational power lead to frustration among the organizational members which in turn triggers the motivation in individuals to resist it by potentially involving in deviant acts. Authors examined how different types of power produce specific types of workplace deviance. They argued that types of power that are systemic (discipline or domination) will tend to incite property and production deviance, whereas power that is episodic (influence or force) will tend to provoke personal aggression and political deviance targeted at individuals in organization. Also, the power that objectifies the employee (force or domination) will tend to encourage relatively severe deviant behaviours, whereas power that relies on the target’s agency (influence or discipline) will tend to provoke less severe deviant behaviours.

A study investigated the relationship between job attitudes (job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and counterproductive work behaviours. Attitude strength moderated the relationship between job attitudes and counterproductive work behaviours. Results from a sample of 296 employed undergraduates indicated that more counterproductive work behaviours were significantly related to less supervisor satisfaction, less coworker satisfaction, less affective organizational commitment, and less normative organizational commitment (Hammond, 2008).

In order to examine the impact of the organization structure of academic department on the faculty members’ job performance, job satisfaction, and the prevalence of counterproductive work behaviours, a sample consisting of 1135 full time faculty members working in 229 academic departments throughout the United States and Canada was selected for analysis. The results of the study suggests that faculty members who
were working in a more organically structured department reported higher levels of job satisfaction and commit fewer instances of counterproductive behaviours than those who were working in more mechanistic structured departments (Kessler, 2007).

Reio and Ghosh (2009) explored the antecedents and outcomes of uncivil behaviour from instigator’s point of view rather than from that of victim’s in order to help Human Resource Development professionals understand how to prevent such acts of incivility at workplace by making prospective instigators aware of the consequences of being uncivil. The article investigated the relationships among select demographics, workplace adaptation, negative affect and incivility (as independent variables), and employee physical health and job satisfaction (as dependent variables) from the instigator’s perspective. The results showed that high negative affect and low adaption to workplace predicted more uncivil behaviours, whereas high adaptation and positive affect among employees predicted less uncivil behaviours and favored the physical health and satisfaction of employees.

The magnitude and types of counterproductive work behaviours among a group of white-collar employees of different firms of Turkey, has been explored by Bayram et al., (2009). Organizational constraints were found to be strongly correlated with counterproductive work behaviours, followed by interpersonal conflict and quantitative workload. Except for income, no statistical significant relationship has been reported between demographic variables and deviant workplace behaviour. Abuse and withdrawal have been found to be the most frequent deviant behaviours.

Nair and Bhatnagar (2011) proposed a general model of workplace deviance, which can be applied to non-profit organizations. The authors have reviewed the existing literature on workplace deviance and identified some unique characteristics of the non-profit organizations. They proposed an integrative conceptual framework for explaining and predicting workplace deviance in non-profit organizations. There model depicts antecedents (individual level and situational level), types of deviance (destructive and constructive targeted at individuals and organization) and consequences of deviant behaviours (both positive and negative). Unique characteristics of non-profits like importance of values and ideologies, loose organizational structure, few controls, little punitive action, high autonomy, lack of role clarity, high ambiguity, and high
organizational commitment were identified. The presence of higher number of females, positive affect, high conscientiousness, agreeableness, emotional stability and idealism were proposed as likely contributors to the decreased deviance in non-profit organizations. Muafi (2011) determined intent to quit, dissatisfaction, and company contempt as causes of deviant behaviours. On the other hand, decreased productivity, stress, lost work time and high turnover rate were identified as consequences of deviant behaviours, among workers in an Indonesian manufacturing firm.

Sackett (2002) reviewed extant literature for addressing the need of understanding covariance among different dimensions of counterproductive work behaviours and their inter correlations with other facets of job performance (task performance and organization citizenship behaviours). Generally, positive interrelationships were found among the full range categories of counterproductive behaviours, making it useful to view counterproductive behaviours in aggregate. The article examined three large data set studies to identify interrelationships among task performance, organization citizenship behaviour and counterproductive behaviours. Very low relationship was found when task performance is operationalized as task proficiency (what employee can do) and much stronger when task performance is operationalized as typical task performance (what employee will do). Relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive workplace behaviour obtained was consistently low among studies which question the possibility of two these domains being opposite poles of a single dimension with organizational citizenship behaviour as positive and counterproductive workplace behaviour as negative. This bipolar view has implications, as there are examples of the highly productive employee, also engaging in extensive counterproductive behaviour. Also the fact of high correlation between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive workplace behaviour can be used for further research on identifying the common antecedents, and a composite of the two reflecting an individual's contribution to the organization can be created, without adopting a bipolar single dimensional view.

In the same vein, Dalal (2005) meta-analysis results indicated a negative relationship between deviant workplace behaviour and task performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. Moreover, organizational citizenship behaviour and
counterproductive workplace behaviour exhibited somewhat distinct patterns of relationships with the antecedents. However, Kelloway et al., (2002) in a research showed that organization citizenship behaviour (OCB) and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) are distinct constructs, but not the opposite poles of a single continuum, even though the two sets of behaviours are correlated. Similarly, Sackett et al., (2006) demonstrated that organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour represent two distinct constructs. The relative importance of the correlates of organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour have been investigated by O’Brien and Allen (2008), and found individual differences (e.g. conscientiousness, locus of control and trait anger) accounted for more variance in both types behaviours (OCB and CWB), as compared to organizational attitudes (e.g. organizational justice, perceived organizational support and job satisfaction).

Viswesvaran (2002) reported a summarized literature through meta-analysis, the relationships between absenteeism and indices of job performance (organizational records of productivity and quality; and supervisory ratings of effort and interpersonal behaviour). The results revealed that absenteeism is highly correlated with organizational records of quality, and supervisory ratings on interpersonal behaviours. Rahman et al., (2013) also founded a negative relationship between job performance and deviant workplace behaviour. Aleassa (2014) developed a model that explained the negative influence of performance appraisal satisfaction on counterproductive behaviors.

According to Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) emotional intelligence is defined as the set of verbal and non-verbal abilities that enable a person to generate, recognize, express, understand, and evaluate their own, and other’s emotions, in order to guide the thinking and action that successfully cope up with environmental demands and pressures. Therefore, an individual with high emotional intelligence is inclined to be a better performer, implement ethical values at the workplace, and tends to be a better corporate employee towards his or her organization and tends to engage less in aggressive behaviour (Petrides et al., 2004), than those with low emotional intelligence (Deshpende et al., 2005). Trust in management is another organizational level factor found in judging the probability of employees engaging in deviant workplace behaviour. Trust in management means, a subordinate’s trust in the management of an organization at
different levels of its hierarchy, and not necessarily his/her immediate manager (Ozyilmaz, 2010). A lack of trust, on the other hand leads to deviant behaviour at the workplace (Aquino and Bayron, 2002) and proves financially counterproductive to the organisation (Bensimon, 1997). The Table 2.1 provides summary list (not exhaustive) of the predictors and criteria identified in the literature review of the deviant workplace behaviour. The criteria variables (dependent variables) are the different forms of deviant workplace behaviour. And the predictor variables (independent variables) are divided into individual level and organizational level variables.

**Table 2.1: Summary of Predictors and Criteria Identified through Literature Review of Deviant Workplace Behaviour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Criteria Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deviant Workplace Behaviour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographics</td>
<td>• Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personality</td>
<td>• Workplace Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attitudes</td>
<td>• Interpersonal Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locus of Control</td>
<td>• Organizational Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Machiavellianism</td>
<td>• Incivility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trait Anger</td>
<td>• Absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>• Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Control</td>
<td>• Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narcissism</td>
<td>• Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpersonal Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motivational Traits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethical Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Situational Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work Frustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workplace Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workplace Affect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS (ORS)

Stress

In psychophysiology, term ‘stress’ refers to some stimulus resulting in a detectable ‘strain’ that cannot be accommodated by the individual and which ultimately results in impaired health and deviant behaviours. To define, stress is an adaptive response to an external situation that results in physical, psychological and behavioural deviations (Luthans, 1995). Canon (1914) first used the term ‘stress’ to describe emotional states that had detrimental physical impact on individuals. Later on, Canon (1935) modified the use of the term ‘stress’ to describe it as physical stimuli and used the term ‘strain’ to mean the individual’s response.

Again, Selye (1936) was first to use the term stress in a biological context. Stress has been defined as a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, any constraint, or any demand related to what a person desires and for which the outcome has been perceived to be both uncertain and equally important (Selye, 1936; Selye, 1956). Later the concept of stress has been broadened and popularized to include inappropriate physiological responses to any demand. In the usage, ‘stress’ has been referred to a condition and the ‘stressor’ to a stimulus causing that stress. Thus, the term stress refers to the state of an organism which can be the resultant to the environment. ‘Stress’ is how a body reacts to a ‘stressor’, which can be real or imagined. And a ‘stressor’ refers to the causative event or stimulus, in opposition to ‘strain’, which has been defined as the resulting state of stress experienced by an individual.

Stress has been even compared with sin and defined in any one of the three ways: as an environmental stimulus, or as an individual’s psychological and physical response to such environmental stimulus, or as an interaction between these two events (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). The term stress, as used in literature has been referred to, as an area of work or study that includes stressors and strains (Ivancevich and Ganster, 2014). Therefore, the ‘word stress’ has not been used for any one of its specific elements i.e. stressor or strain. In spite the term ‘stressor’ has been used to refer to the environmental stimulus (Beehr, 1984; Beehr and Bhagat, 1985; McLean, 1979; Selye, 1975) and the term ‘strain’ has been used to refer to an individual’s response (Beehr, 1984; Caplan et al., 1975).
The strains can be physical, psychological or behavioral, but they are by definition indicators of ill health and well-being of the individual (Ivancevich and Ganster, 2014). The resulting signs of stress may be cognitive, emotional, physical or behavioral. These signs include poor judgment, having a general negative outlook, excessive worrying, irritability, bad temper, agitation, inability to relax, feeling lonely, isolated or depressed and pains, diarrhea or constipation, nausea, dizziness, chest pain, causing rapid heartbeat, eating too much or less, sleeping too much or not enough, social withdrawal, procrastination or neglect of responsibilities, increased intake of alcohol, nicotine or drug consumption with nervous habits like wandering about or nail-biting. The current study has paid attention mainly on the negative behavioral outcomes (Deviant Workplace Behaviour), as a resulting response to the organizational role stress (acting as stimulus), experienced by the employees. For example, neglect of responsibilities, increased intake of alcohol, nicotine or drug consumption, stealing office supplies or from colleague, sabotage production, absenteeism, aggression, verbal abuse, avoiding phone calls etc., which are being referred to as negative or deviant behaviours in the literature of organizational behaviour.

**Eustress and Distress**

Stress has been categorized as: Eustress or Distress. When stress enhances the functions (physical or mental, such as through strength training or challenging work) it has been considered as ‘eustress’. Eustress is a positive stress while distress is the negative stress aspect (Fevre *et al.*, 2003; Sullivan and Bhagat, 1992). The difference between the experiences which result in either eustress or distress has been determined by the difference between an experience either real or imagined, the personal expectations, and resources, to cope with the stress. Such alarming experiences, which can be real or imagined, possibly trigger a stress response in an individual. Every person has a natural urge and need to work for his/her own benefits. This message has been found in the favor of employees and organizations. Both the negative and positive stressors can lead to stress. Some of the common categories and examples of stressors may include: sensory input, environmental and social issues, life experiences, organizational role and more.

Eustress (good stress) as a job stress is observed when employees’ knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes match with their work demands and pressures in the
organizations. Eustress experience may increase the ability of an employee to manage his or her physiological and psychological type of stresses (Adler et al., 2006; Cartwright and Cooper, 1997; Wetzel et al., 2006). Conversely, distress (bad stress) as a job stress has been observed when employees’ knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes cannot match to their work demands and pressures in the organizations. Therefore, distress may decrease the ability of employees to control and manage their physiological and psychological stresses. For example, it can disturb the self-regulatory process because of which employees cannot meet their duties and responsibilities as members of an organization (Cox et al., 2000; Fairbrother and Warn, 2003; Critchley et al., 2004).

**Organizational Role Stress**

According to Pareek, (1983), each individual has certain obligations (role) towards any social system such as a family or an organization which provide him or her, a place (position or office) in the system. So a ‘role’ assumed by a member of an organization can be defined by the functions one performs in response to the expectations of significant other members of the social system and one’s own expectations. A role is a system of the organization which in itself is an arrangement of roles. People play multiple roles in organizations. Each member of the organization belongs to a particular role set, which is an association of individuals who share the interdependent tasks and thus perform the formally defined roles, which are further influenced both by the expectations of others’ and also by one's own personality and expectations. For example, an individual in an organization has his superior, coworkers and subordinates as significant members of his role set having varied expectations from each one. This system of roles to which an individual belongs to also extends to outside the organization as well, and influences an individual’s functioning within it. For example, a man's role as a spouse, a parent and a son are all intertwined with each other and with his set of organizational roles which create role space.

In situations, individuals occupy such roles which are in conflict with their own value systems or with other roles or with each other and thereby results in role conflicts or role stress. As a consequence, there exists various opportunities for role conflict to occur as the various roles interact with one another. Hence, role conflicts become the ‘stressors’. Mild to moderate levels of stress enables the people to perform some tasks
more effectively. The rationale behind this is that improved performance can be attributed to increased arousal. However, if the stressor continues for long term, it eventually takes its toll, and results in decreased performance and deleterious behavioral and health consequences.

For purpose of the present study, role is defined as ‘any position one holds in an organization as defined by the expectations various significant persons, including oneself, have for that position’ (Pareek, 1976, 1993, 2002). Role occupant connects himself/herself with the organization through his/her role. It represents a position occupied by an individual which is characterized by the expectations of significant others as well as those of a role occupant itself. Due to the very nature of the role, there are inherent problems in the performance of a role. Hence, role stress is inevitable.

Kahn et al. (1964) were the first to describe the organizational stress in general and the role stress in particular. Role stress refers to the conflict and tension due to the roles being enacted by a person at any given point of time (Pareek, 2002). Enacted in the context of organizations, such role stress has been called organizational role stress (ORS). Katz and Kahn (1966) continued this research and suggested that an organization can be defined as a ‘system of roles’, and they used three categories to define role stress: role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload. Organizational role stress model of Pareek (1976) further expanded the scope of role stress. The breakthrough work of Pareek (1983) then included ten dimensions of role stress, which have been widely used in researches and has largely been contributed to the role stress literature. The current study is an attempt to determine the relationship between such role conflicts being stressors and the resultant deviant workplace behaviours of the employees.

Thus, stress arising because of a role played by an individual is termed as organizational role stress (Pareek, 1993). Role is defined as a set of functions, which an individual has to perform in response to the expectations of others and his own (Khan et al., 1964). In order to meet the expectations of others an individual faces conflict among various roles played by he/she and his/her own self. Such conflicts induce role stress among the individuals. Therefore, it becomes extremely important for, both the individuals and the organizations to work and lay emphasis in the area of role stress management.
2.2.1 Typology of Organizational Role Stress

Organizational Role Stress scale developed by Pareek (1983) is relevant for the study of role stress in organizations. It is important to understand that an organization is a system of roles and role in itself is a system. A role occupant encounters the following two role systems (Pareek, 1993) in an organization: ‘role space’ and ‘role set’. These role systems have inbuilt potential for conflicts. These conflicts give rise to ten types of role stresses as explained under:

Role Space Conflicts:

The role space has three variables; the self, the role itself and the other roles he or she occupies. Any conflict within this field is referred as role-space stress. Each individual occupy and play a variety of roles, say, being a daughter, sister, spouse, mother, grandmother, an executive, or so on simultaneously. All these roles establish role space. At the center of the role space resides the self. Role space, thus, can be defined as a dynamic interrelationship between both the self, the various other roles he or she occupies and amongst these roles. It includes:

1. **Self Role Distance (SRD):** The conflict between self-concept and one’s expectations from the role stress arises when role occupant has to do what she dislikes and feels having unutilized capacity and skills within.

2. **Role Stagnation (RS):** When a role, an individual has occupied for long time, does not provide opportunities to grow in career further, the individual experiences role stagnation stress.

3. **Inter-Role Distance (IRD):** A conflict may arise among various roles when an individual occupies more than one role. For example, one often faces a conflict when an individual unable to make a balance between organizational role and non-organizational or familial role requirements.

Role Set Conflicts:

An individual’s role in the organization is defined by the expectations of other significant roles (e.g. role of a superior, a coworker or a subordinate) and those of the individual’s own self. The role set is the pattern of relationship between the role being considered and other roles. It includes:
1. **Role Ambiguity (RA):** Role ambiguity is defined as the conflict faced by an individual when he or she is not clear about various expectations people have from him or her. Role ambiguity is experienced by people occupying roles in newly created organizations or the organizations undergoing change.

2. **Role Expectation Conflict (REC):** The role occupant may face stress when different role senders like superiors, subordinates or peers, coworkers, send conflicting demands or expectations from him or her.

3. **Role Overload (RO):** A role occupant experiences role overload stress when there are too many expectations from the significant role senders and one is required to do too much.

4. **Role Erosion (RE):** The role erosion stress is experienced by the role occupants that have functions or roles performed by them are performed by some other role occupant. Role erosion stress is inevitable in organizations that redefine their structures.

5. **Resource Inadequacy (RIn):** Resource inadequacy stress develops when resources like information, finance, material or facilities to perform the role effectively by the role occupant are not available to him or her.

6. **Personal Inadequacy (PI):** An individual not possessing enough knowledge, skill or training may not perform a role effectively and generally experiences personal inadequacy stress. People who are assigned new roles without enough orientation are likely to face this type of stress.

7. **Role Isolation (RI):** When linkages between roles are not strong, the role occupant may feel psychologically that certain roles are closer and others are at distance and causes role isolation stress and rather than being integrated with other organizational roles, he or she is being isolated from the mainstream of organizational life.

According to Pareek (2004) the concept of an organizational role and being a member of an organization have inbuilt potential for stress. And stress due to the occupation of an organizational role is known as organizational role stress (ORS). He stated that each individual in the society perform a variety of roles. All such roles constitute one's role space. The self is the centre of the role space. The individual plays
various roles around one’s self. Since the roles are at various distances from the self and from each other, these relationships define the role space. Each role has its own systems, which has been called role set. Role set is the pattern of relationships between the role being considered by role occupant and other role occupants who have expectations from the former role occupant. In this, the role of the role occupant is in the center and all other roles are around the person's particular role. Among role behaviours of an individual various variables are involved like the self, the other roles, the expectations by the other roles, expectations by the self, other role expectations by the self and other roles undertaken and performed by the individual. Hence, it is in the nature of the ‘role’ that it has an inbuilt potential for conflict and stress. Therefore, stress is a natural variable in the organizational role concept. While performing a variety of roles or within one's role, a person finds that no way is leading to one’s desired goal. The consequences are disillusionment, frustration, tension, conflict and, stress. In other words, role performance carries stress.

A study conducted by Aziz (2003), investigated the intensity of organizational role stress among women information technology professionals of the Indian private sector. Resource inadequacy has emerged as the most potent role stressor, followed by the role overload and personal inadequacy. The research also identified the differences in the levels of stress, between married and unmarried employees on several role stressors. However, the level of education did not emerge as a significant differentiator of stressors.

Based on the fact that stressors vary from one job category to another while depending on the personality characteristics of subjected person, a study was conducted by Pestonjee (1987a) which explored role stress on three categories of management personnel, namely top management, middle management and administrative officers using the correlation analysis. The average age of the three job sample categories chosen was 48.22, 41.60 and 42.90 years, respectively. The findings of this study indicated that inter-role distance and role erosion were found to be the most dominant contributors of role stress, whereas role ambiguity and personal inadequacy were the least dominant contributors of role stress among all the three job categories.

Satyanarayana (1995) research results revealed that role erosion, personal inadequacy, resource inadequacy, and role stagnation were dominant contributors of role
stress in employees and supervisors. Kumar (1989) studied the relationship between role stress, role satisfaction and role efficacy, using a sample of low and middle level employees from the different functional departments of an oil company. The major findings of the study revealed that marketing executives experienced maximum role stress in comparison to finance, production and personnel executives. On the other hand, personnel executives obtained the lowest mean scores on total role stress scale.

Sen (1982) conducted a research to explore the relationships between demographic variables and organizational role stress. The demographic variables chosen were age, gender, income and marital status. Some of the conclusions drawn showed that role stagnation decreased as people advanced in age, women experienced more role stress as compared to men and role stress was inversely related to income, whereas, unmarried persons experience more stress than married persons, this may be due to their comparative lack of security need, resulting in higher self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization needs. Similarly, the role of gender on work-related stress has been investigated in a number of studies (Aditya and Sen, 1993; Frankensteiner, 1991; Jick and Payne, 1980; Kapur, 1969; Srivastava and Srivastava, 1985). These studies have highlighted the existence of high organizational stress among working women as compared to men. Conversely, Aziz (2003) studied organizational role stress among Indian IT employees and reported that men were more stressed as compared to women. This study also reported resource inadequacy. On the other hand, Daga and Husain (2001) researched on the effect of social support on social and family role stress on 300 working Indian women, and reported that social support acts as a buffer against stress.

A study of organizational role stress in relation to the job burnout has been conducted by Klenke-Hamel and Mathieu (1990). The results of the study revealed that organizational role stress is highly correlated with job burnout and the sources of stress included excessively high self-expectations, the pressure to secure financial support for research, insufficient time to keep up with developments in the field, inadequate salary, manuscript preparation, role overload, conflicting job demands, slow progress on the career advancement, frequent interruptions, and long meetings. Hence in this study Pareek (2002), typology of organizational role stress with ten dimensions has been taken into consideration to determine its impact on the deviant workplace behaviour incidences.
Predictors of Organizational Role Stress

One of the factors of organizational stress is the pressure originating from workload (Al-Aameri, 2003; Alexandros-Stamatios et al., 2003; Buchanan and Kaczynski, 2004; Topper, 2007; Wilkes, 1998), because rapidly changing global scene is increasing the pressure on workforce to perform for maximum output and enhance the competitiveness. Indeed, to perform better in the job, there is a requirement for employees to perform multiple tasks in the workplace simultaneously to keep abreast with changing technologies. In fact, a study in UK indicated that the majority of the workers were unhappy with the current culture where they were required to work with extended hours and have to cope with large workloads, while simultaneously meeting the production targets and deadlines (Townley, 2000). The increase in the work load in the organization without taking into account the availability of staff to carry out the tasks, may lead to occupational stress. Therefore, the work load increase in any organization should correspond with the availability of work force. In addition to workload, some typical causes of stress in an organizational setting were identified as inadequate physical working environment, inappropriate job design, poor management style, poor relationships, and uncertain future with divided loyalties (Buchanan and Huczynski, 2004; Weinberg et al., 2010).

Role ambiguity is another aspect that affects job stress at the workplace. Role ambiguity has been found to exist when an individual is lacking information about the requirements of his or her role, and how these role requirements are to be met, and what are the evaluative procedures available to ensure that the role is being performed successfully (Beehr et al., 1976; Dyer and Quine, 1998; Ursprung, 1986). Also, role ambiguity leads to such negative outcomes, which reduces confidence, a sense of hopelessness, anxiety, and depression among the individual (Jackson and Schuler, 1985; Muchinsky, 1997).

Lim and Teo (1999) identified through surveys and interviews, the key factors at the workplace which generated stress among 308 information technology personnel in Singapore. They suggested that factors which generate stress can be grouped into 4 broad categories as 1) Lack of career advancement related to the problem of high rate of employee turnover, 2) Work overload resulting in spillover of workload at home and guilt
and dissatisfaction for being less attentive to family, 3) Risk taking and decision making consisting of fear of making mistakes and Employee morale and 4) organizational culture related to a lack of participation in decisions affecting their work, undue blame for machine failure and difficulty in team work considering the fluid and noninvolved nature of work.

The role of management of an organization is one of the important aspects that affect work-related stress among workers (Alexandros-Stamatios et al., 2003). Workers in an organization face occupational stress, because of the workload that management gave to the employees. Also, family and work are inter-related and interdependent to that extent that experiences in one area affects the quality of life in the other. Home-work interface can be known as the overlap between work and home-related roles. This two way relationship involves the source of stress at work (demands from work at home, no support from home, absence of stability in home life). It affects home life, and the source of stress at home affects work life. It creates conflicts among individuals (Alexandros-Stamatios et al., 2003). For example, questions arises whether the employees have to take the work at home, or should they have the ability to forget about work, when are at home. According to Lasky (1995), demands associated with family and finances can be a major source of extra organizational stress that can complicate, or even precipitate the workplace stress. Thus, home-work interface balance is important for the workers to reduce the level of work-related stress.

Tehrani (2002) argued that stress is caused by unsympathetic organizational culture, poor communication between managers and employees, lack of involvement in decision-making, bullying and harassment, continual or sudden change, insufficient resources, conflicting priorities, and lack of challenges. Communication channels in the organization should be open to all employees and employee should be allowed to participate in the decision-making process of the organization. Lack of involvement of employees by the management, will make them feel stressed. Similarly, another study reported that stressors which seemed to be popular among employees in the workplace includes work overload, insufficient time to do the work, stressful environment, relationship problems with co-workers or boss and monetary insecurities. Conflicts
between home and work, and the impact on personal relationships are also contributing factors to stress (Fairbrother and Warn, 2003).

Kirkcaldy et al., (2002) argued that the causes of organizational stress include inadequate guidance and support from superiors, lack of consultation and communication, lack of encouragement from superiors, feelings of isolation, discrimination and favoritism and inadequate or poor quality training/management development. In addition, other factors which contribute to stress were keeping up with new technologies, ideas, technology or innovations in organizations, attending meetings, lack of social support by people at work and simply being visible or available. All these stressors are related to factor management.

Individual factors like family, socio-economic and financial status, mental and physical health contribute greatly to work stress. While other causes of stress include role ambiguity, conflicting performance expectation, political climate of the organizations and poor relationship with co-workers (Manshor et al., 2003). Stress is also caused by environmental factors and these include employment conditions, such as flexible employment contracts; working conditions such as physically demanding work, and social relations at work such as mobbing expenses (Otto and Schmidt, 2007).

Harvey and Brown (2006) for instance argued that the major stressors in the workplace include changes in technology, downsizing, sudden reorganization and unexpected changes in the work schedules, competition for promotional opportunities, lack of participation in the decision making, and lack of employee empowerment. Still other comprises conflicts with other employees at the work place, inadequate time to accomplish tasks and violence at workplace. The issue of acts of violence at work place committed by both employees and customers contributes a lot to the employees stress level. Occupational stress can have grave consequences as the American Institute of Stress (AIS) indicated homicide is the second leading cause of fatal occupational injury, and for working women it is the leading cause of death.

Pestonjee and Pareek (1997) explained role as the totality of formal tasks, informal tasks and acts as organized by an individual. Stress can be caused either by environmental, organizational, or individual variables. Organizational factors or variables have been known to induce the job stress for employees at the workplace. These factors
are commonly termed as the organizational stressors, because these factors serve as agents that trigger the various stress reactions in individuals.

Alienation at the working place can also induce stress. Thoits (1995) in his study discovered that alienation has a positive impact on the job stress. Feelings of alienation are likely to come, when employees are required to work alone. When workers believe that there is a separation between their own job and other work related contexts, a sense of frustration in the form of apathy is likely to occur. This is found to be particularly intense for employees having high social needs. Working alone on one's job without having social support from his or her peers and supervisors would lead to job stress. Work overload, being quantitative and qualitative has been empirically linked to a variety of physiological, psychological, and behavioral stress symptoms (Beehr and Newman, 1978). Heavy workload lowers one's motivation, resulting in job stress. Additionally, a work environment which is associated with the unpleasant organizational climate, lack of privacy, having a lot of hassle in conducting work, and various distractions can result in higher stress levels.

2.2.3 Consequences of Organizational Role Stress

Stress has been widely accepted to be having two opposite effects on individuals: the positive and the negative. Acceptable level of stress helps to improve the individual’s performance whilst excessive amounts of stress can lead to decreased performance (Stevenson and Harper, 2006). Organizational stress has increased risks of work-related diseases and accidents in both developed and developing countries that have experienced rapid industrialization (Manshor et al., 2003). Organizational stress if not managed properly may lead to increase in absenteeism, internal conflicts and low employee morale (Christo and Pienaar, 2006). The negative effects of organizational stress include reduced efficiency, decreased capacity to perform, dampened initiative and reduced interest in work, increased rigidity in thought and lack of concern for the organization and colleagues and a loss of responsibility (Greenberg and Baron, 2000; Ivancevich et al., 1990).

Stevenson and Harper (2006) in their study on workplace stress and student learning experience reported that the consequences of stress might leads to absence from the work, conflict with others and seeking employment elsewhere. In addition, on the
There were some positive effects of stress also such as enforcement of deadlines and improved performance. According to McHugh (1993) organizational stress had contributed to low motivation and morale, decreased performance, high turnover, sick leaves, accidents, low job satisfaction, low quality products and services, poor internal communication and conflicts.

Therefore workplace stress poses a big threat to the quality work force in the organizations. Good performers in the organizations may tend to quit, when they start experiencing the symptoms of organizational stress. Such turnover rates effect the organization adversely thereby increasing the recruitment and selection costs of the organization (Ongori, 2007). In addition, organizational stress affects the physical and psychological being of an individual. This may lead to heart diseases, hypertension, peptic ulcers, sickness, alcoholism, depression, suicidal tendencies, and anxiety as well as other mental disorders (Christo and Pienaar, 2006).

Cohen and Single (2001) listed symptoms of stress under five categories, firstly as emotional: anxiety, nervousness, worries, depression, anger, irritability, guilt, moodiness, and loss of enjoyment, solitude, loss of humor, lack of confidence, isolation, and job dissatisfaction. Secondly as physical: feeling restless, feeling uptight, jumpy, high blood pressure, back and neck muscle tension, lack of energy, dry mouth, headaches, insomnia, dizziness, loss or increase in appetite, and ringing in threats. Thirdly as behavioral: impatience, impulsiveness, hyperactivity, short temper, aggressiveness, alcohol and use of drugs, avoiding difficult situations, and over-working. Fourthly as mental: frequent lapses of memory, constant negative thinking, being very critical of oneself, inability to make decisions, difficulty getting things done, distorted ideas, very rigid attitudes and difficulty in concentrating. Lastly high blood pressure, higher than usual susceptibility to colds and flu, migraines, irritable bowel symptoms, ulcers, stomach disorders, heart attacks, angina, strokes, asthma and skin rashes. Therefore, there is need for management to develop appropriate interventions to manage stress in organizations. The review of extant literature pointed towards the importance of research in the area of identifying different types of deviant workplace behaviour incidents prevalent in the organizations which may result because of experience of organizational role stress by the employees.
2.3 DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics play a pivotal role in the potential for deviant workplace behaviour. Demographic dissimilarity, which has been explained by Barsness et al., (2005), as the degree of dissimilarity between an individual and other organizational members on various demographic characteristics such as gender, age and race dissimilarity, has been stated as the starting point for deviant workplace behaviour. Hence so, it is important for the managers to hire likeminded employees.

Various research studies results revealed that men are more likely to commit workplace deviance than women; young people are more likely to contribute in deviance in comparison to older people; short tenured employees behave more unethically than workers who have stayed longer in an organization; highly qualified employees with many degrees behave ethically than those with less education; permanent employees engaged less in deviant behaviours than temporary or on contract based employees (Appelbaum, et al., 2007; Baron et al., 1999; Berry et al., 2007; Ford and Richardson, 1994; Huiras et al., 2000; Santos and Eger, 2014; VanSandt et al., 2006). Also, Flynn (2013) research work suggested that men were more likely to steal from workplace than women. All the three male respondents interviewed admitted to stealing from the workplace, while not even one of the females interviewed admitted to involve in stealing behaviour. Women on the other hand were more inclined towards leaving work early and call in sick for no reason. Boateng et al., (2014) findings supported the assumption that demographic variables influence workers attitude towards workplace stealing, workers understanding of the causes of workplace theft and their behaviour in relation to workplace stealing.

Moreover studies have shown men reporting to engage in workplace aggression (a form of DWB) more than women, thus implying gender as a strong predictor of interpersonal directed aggression than organizational directed aggression (Baron et al., 1999; Hershcovis et al., 2007; McFarlin et al., 2001). While, other researches showed no significant relationship between aggression and gender (Douglas et al., 2003), and still other researchers’ results showed that females were more aggressive than males (Namie and Namie, 2000). As such, meta-analysis reports addressing aggression as a form of deviant workplace behaviour, reported boys to engage more in verbal and physical
aggression than girls, while there was a tendency for girls to engage in slightly more indirect aggression (Archer, 2004; Card et al., 2008). Additionally, Spector (2002) also reported males performing more than females in overall deviant workplace behaviour and interpersonal deviance, abuse and aggression scores, while there were no gender differences for organizational directed deviant workplace behaviours such as sabotage, theft or physical aggression.

The role of demographic variables in influencing deviant workplace behaviour in developing and developed economies has received little attention. The variables identified through literature were age, gender, education, tenure, religion, position of an employee in the organization, years of employment, status of employment (part-time/full-time), marital status of employees, culture, personality type, leadership and income levels (Appelbaum et al., 2005, 2007; Farhadi et al., 2012; Fleet and Griffin, 2006; Greenberg and Barling, 1996; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Lau and Sholihin, 2005; Loo, 2003; O'Fallon and Butterfield, 2005; Peterson, 2002; Robinson and Bennet, 1995; Robinson and Greenberg, 1998; Valentine and Rittenburg, 2007; Vardi and Weitz, 2004; White, 1999; Yunus et al., 2012).

The relationship of the demographic variables with deviant workplace behaviour has remained uncertain in the past empirical researches (Berry et al., 2007; Bowling and Eschleman, 2010; Dalal, 2005; Mount et al., 2006; Salgado, 2002). Hence, the findings of demographics and deviant workplace behaviour researches have been found inconsistent throughout. For example, some research findings depicted differences in the deviant workplace behaviour among employees with different demographic backgrounds whereas other findings did not depict any differences. In all, age, gender and marital status were all found as valid predictors of deviant workplace behaviour with age and gender as the strong predictors (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Lau and Sholihin, 2005). As such, our examination of the relationship between demographics and deviant workplace behaviour remains descriptive.

The present study contributes to the expanding literature of deviant workplace behaviour by investigating the link between demographic variables and deviant workplace behaviour in the Indian corporate sector. The demographics examined in the current study will be: gender, age, marital status, family structure, category, education
qualification, nature of academic degree, place of schooling, type of organization, nature of organization, job level, total work experience and annual income. The research question to be answered later in the study is: Does demographic variations among employees have varying impact on the propensity to engage in different types of deviant workplace behaviours. For example, do males differ from females in their propensity to engage in different types of deviant workplace behaviours? Hence on the basis of above literature review following proposition is advanced:

Proposition 1: Demographic variations do have varying impact on the propensity to engage in different types of deviant workplace behaviours.

2.4 DEVIANT WORKPLACE BEHAVIOUR AND ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS

The role of job stressors in promoting deviant workplace behaviour has received little attention (Appelbaum and Shapiro, 2006; Greenberg, 1990; Penney and Spector, 2005). A number of job stressors such as role ambiguity, role conflict, workload, organizational constraints, and interpersonal conflict have been found to be positively linked with deviant workplace behaviour (Chen and Spector, 1992; Fox and Spector, 1999; Fox et al., 2001; Hershcovis et al., 2007; Marcus and Schuler; 2004; Penny and Spector, 2005). For example, Spector et al. (2006) found job stress to be strongly related to abuse and workplace sabotage dimensions of deviant workplace behaviour. Workload has been shown to be related to a small extent especially to the sabotage dimension of the deviant workplace behaviour (Chen and Spector, 1992).

As observed from above literature review, strain is an outcome of the stress experienced at job. And the strains can be (a) psychological strain such as anxiety, frustration, depression, job dissatisfaction or turnover intention, (b) physical strain like somatic symptoms of dizziness, stomach ache, headache or physiological reactions in form of increased blood pressure, cancer etc, or can be in the form of (c) behavioral strain reactions such as smoking, abusing, absenteeism, accidents or withholding effort. Deviant workplace behaviour is a manifestation of behavioral strain (Fox et al., 2001). Thus, deviant workplace behaviour as a behavioral strain is the outcome of job stressors experienced in the workplace. Some common examples of job stressors from literature
were role conflict and ambiguity (Kahn et al., 1964), interpersonal conflict (Spector et al., 1988), and situational constraints (Peters and O’Connor, 1980). Thus, among different types of strains due to job stressors, this study will specifically focus on the phenomenon of behavioural strain reactions such as abusing, absenteeism, accidents, smoking, or withholding effort, which constitute together as deviant workplace behaviours, reported as outcomes of stress experienced at the workplace.

Integrating the research on deviant workplace behaviour and job stress literatures, a job stress-emotion-counterproductive workplace behaviour model was developed (Spector, 1998; Spector and Fox, 2002) which suggested that the deviant behaviours were the outcomes of job stressors at workplace, with emotions mediating the stress-deviant workplace behaviour relationship. Therefore, job stressors acts as stimuli and deviant behaviours at workplace are responses to these stimuli in the form of behavioural strains.

Among the stressor-strain models that examined the antecedents of deviant workplace behaviour, the first one was examined by Spector and colleagues (Chen and Spector, 1992; Spector, 1978, 1997; Storms and Spector, 1987) as a frustration-aggression model of deviant workplace behaviour, which was based on the Dollard et al., (1939) frustration aggression theory. The frustration aggression theory states that emotional reactions mediate the relationship between frustration and deviant workplace behaviour. This means that when individuals experience frustration in the workplace, they have an emotional reaction towards it, and then behave accordingly either destructively or constructively towards the entity. Empirical evidence has consistently shown support for this model. For example, it has been found that locus of control moderates the relationship between frustration and counterproductive work behaviour (Fox and Spector, 1999; Storms and Spector, 1987).

On the same grounds, Spector and Fox (2002) also examined the job-stress model of deviant workplace behaviour. The model suggested that deviant workplace behaviours were responses to the job stressors. This job-stress model of deviant behaviour is an extension of the above discussed frustration-aggression model, which incorporated additional stressors along with the frustration. According to the job-stress model individuals experience ‘job stressors’, “conditions or situations that elicit a negative emotional response,” (Spector, 1998) at the workplace. For example, work constraints
such as lacking proper tools or information for doing a task. Individuals then have an emotional reaction to these job stressors or constraints which in turn influence job strains. Here, job strains are the reactions to stressors that can take the form of (a) behaviours (e.g., smoking, abusing, absenteeism, accidents, withholding effort or coping behaviours to deal with the problem), (b) psychological reactions (e.g., anxiety, frustration, depression, job dissatisfaction or turnover intention), or (c) physiological reactions (e.g., increased blood pressure, somatic symptoms of dizziness, stomach ache or headache). Furthermore, emotional reactions mediate the relationship between job stressors and job strains. It is important to note that this model does not always result in an individual committing negative deviant behaviour. Rather, an individual can engage in constructive behaviour to fix the constraint (e.g., ask supervisor for required tools) or behave in a counterproductive way such as engaging in theft, sabotage, or withdrawal. Thus, deviant workplace behaviours are the outcomes of job stressors (e.g. role conflict and ambiguity interpersonal conflict) and situational constraints experienced in the workplace.

Hauge et al., (2009) building on the stressor-strain model of deviant workplace behaviour, investigated the effects of both individual and situational factors as predictors of workplace bullying, on representative sample of the Norwegian workforce (N=2359). Results showed that a male victim of bullying has been strongly involved in bullying of others. And among the situational factors, role conflict and interpersonal conflicts significantly predicted workplace bullying.

In lieu of the above suggested theoretical framework of job stress and strain, Fox et al., (2001) explored the relationships among four types of job stressors (organizational constraints, interpersonal conflict, distributive justice and procedural justice), emotions, affective dispositions (trait anxiety and trait anger), autonomy in the work tasks, and counterproductive work behaviours. Results of this study depicted that job stressors were positively and significantly related with counterproductive work behaviours, while negative emotions strongly mediated this relationship. On the other hand, personality characteristics (trait anxiety and anger) were significantly related with interpersonal dimension of counterproductive behaviour, but were found as a weak support, being a moderator between job stressor and deviant behaviour relationship. However, autonomy did not significantly support the job stressor-counterproductive behaviour relationship.
Goh (2006) introduced hostile attribution style (HAS) as a variable while examining the stressors-counterproductive behaviour framework. Hostile attribution style refers to an individual’s tendency to perceive a neutral or ambiguous stimulus as threatening or hostile when in reality it is not so. It was found that individuals who were high on hostile attribution style engaged more in deviant behaviours, when stressors were high. Whereas, individuals low on hostile attribution style engaged in low levels of deviant workplace behaviour. The stressors analyzed in this framework were incivility, interactional justice, and interpersonal conflict as psychosocial stressors, while organizational constraints and workload as non-social or organizational stressors. Evidence was found to support the hypothesis that hostile attribution style mediates the link between deviant workplace behaviour and the individual difference variables of negative affectivity, trait anger, and Machiavellianism. Hostile attribution style has been found to moderate the relationship between deviant workplace behaviour and the stressors of interpersonal conflict and organizational constraints. In addition Machiavellianism was found to be negatively related to deviant workplace behaviour.

Penny and Spector (2005) used peer reported data to assess the effects of job stressors, organizational constraints, negative affectivity on employee satisfaction and counterproductive behaviours. Results indicated that incivility, organizational constraints, and interpersonal conflict were negatively related to job satisfaction and positively to counterproductive work behaviours. High negative affectivity in individuals strengthens the relationship between job stressors and counterproductive work behaviour and found acting as a moderator between the two. Additional studies have also supported these findings. Job stress and counterproductive work behaviour relationship has been explored by Salami, (2010) among 422 Nigerian secondary school teachers and found a positive relationship between the two. Negative affectivity has moderated the relation between job stress and deviant workplace behaviour, such that incidence of deviant workplace behaviour was high when job stress and negative affectivity were high (Salami, 2010).

Representing illegitimate tasks as a new stressor category Semmer et al., (2010) conducted a research to relate it with counterproductive workplace behaviour. Tasks were considered legitimate when they conform to the norms, about what can reasonably be expected from a given person and were considered illegitimate when people tend to
violate such norms. Illegitimate tasks therefore were taken as offending one’s professional identity, and thus, the self. Results depicted that illegitimate tasks incite counterproductive behaviours.

The current research is an attempt to represent organizational role stress as a new stressor category in the deviance literature, to identify its influence on the different deviant workplace behaviour dimensions, since stressful workers found engaged in theft activities in the retail industries and release their frustration with the organization (Jones and Boye, 1994; Lavelli, 1986). Also highly stressed police officers were more likely to assault the suspect by using weapon or pushing or shouting at the suspect and found consumed alcohol on paid working hours (Jones, 1980a; Jones, 1980b; Parker and Brody, 1982). Also, Hershcovis et al. (2007) indicated that deviance is a method of coping with work stressors. Stress had many negative effects on organizations and its members at the workplace (Spector and Fox, 2005). Stressful situations make individuals frustrated, impatient or irritated. As a consequence these types of emotions lead to variety of deviant behaviours (Vardi and Weitz, 2004).

Though the stressor-strain literature has been evident in postulating that organizational stressors are predictors of deviant workplace behaviours but rarely any researcher has thrown light on organizational role stress and its dimensions as can be a predictor of deviant workplace behaviour. The conflicts and tensions arising out of the multiple expectations by multiple roles from an individual are stressing people out, thereby being motivated enough to engage in deviant acts in response. The available research studies have not given importance to the multiple role expectations from an individual which might lead to conflicts and can incite deviant acts in exchange. Thus, current study intends to investigate the relationship between deviant workplace behaviour and organizational role stress. The objective is to investigate into the nature and strength of relationship between deviant workplace behaviour and organizational role stress and to determine the extent of organizational role stress in predicting deviant workplace behaviour and its dimensions. Hence, following statement can be proposed on the basis of above discussion.

Proposition 2: Higher the organizational role stress, higher the incidence of deviant workplace behaviour.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Deviant Workplace Behaviour (DWB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age</td>
<td>• Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marital Status</td>
<td>• Production deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Category</td>
<td>• Sabotage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Qualification</td>
<td>• Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nature of Degree</td>
<td>• Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place of Schooling</td>
<td>• Organizational Deviance (DWBO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of Organization</td>
<td>• Interpersonal Deviance (DWBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nature of Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organizational Role Stress (ORS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inter Role Distance (IRD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Stagnation (RS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Expectation Conflict (REC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Erosion (RE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Overload (RO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Isolation (RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal Inadequacy (PI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self Role Distance (SRD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Ambiguity (RA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource Inadequacy (RIn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, deviant workplace behaviour is usually predicted by both organizational level predictors such as organizational justice, structure, as well as individual differences such as demographics, negative affectivity, personality characteristics, locus of control and trait anger. Several reviews agree that these are some of the key antecedents to deviant workplace behaviours (Jockin et al., 2001; Martinko et al., 2002), whereas there was no consensus regarding other antecedents like organizational role stress. Consequently, demographics and organizational role stress will be analyzed in this study as independent variables, in assessing deviant workplace behaviour.