BRITISH ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT

BAM CONFERENCE

3RD-5TH SEPTEMBER
ASTON UNIVERSITY BIRMINGHAM UNITED KINGDOM

This paper is from the BAM2019 Conference Proceedings

Development and Validation of Witness Behaviour Towards Workplace Deviance Behaviour Scale in India and the USA

Kanimozhi Narayanan*

Lecturer in Organisational Psychology

Aston University, Aston Expressway, Birmingham B4 7ET

Phone: +44 (0) 121 204 3658 Email: k.narayanan@aston.ac.uk

Dr. Tom Booth

Senior Lecturer in Quantitative Research Methods

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH8 9JZ

tbooth@exseed.ed.ac.uk

Development and Validation of Witness Behaviour Towards Workplace Deviance Behaviour Scale in India and the USA

Summary

We draw on several literatures and interviews conducted to define the construct Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance behaviour (WBTWD), discuss its roots in theories of helping behaviour and distinguish it from related constructs. Two studies are reported which (Study 1) develop a self-reported measure of WBTWD and (Study 2) examine the validity of the scale to determine the convergent and discriminant validity with other related constructs. The study revealed that WBTWD affected behavioural outcomes of job commitment, engagement and satisfaction of the individuals. We conclude with recommendations for future research.

Key words

Tolerance, scale development, workplace deviance behaviour, construct validity, reliability.

Words

6958

Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance behaviour

The workplace deviance phenomenon has captured the attention of several management researchers due to its economical, organizational and individual consequences of these behaviours. It is defined as a voluntary behaviour that violates the norms of the organization and threatens the well-being of the organization or its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Though, it is a voluntary behaviour, the intention of an individual need not be towards harming the organization. The individuals who are on the receiving end of interpersonal deviance (Behaviours that include verbal abuse, making offensive comments, involving in ethnic or racial slurs) are known to be suffering from psychological distress, work dissatisfaction (Cortina et al., 2001; Vartia, 2001). These deviance induced stress may in turn result in anger, frustration, individual isolation, a desire to involve and reciprocate these deviant behaviours, high turnover intention and low commitment towards the job for the individuals (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Pearson et al., 2001) which would also destruct the organization's well-being (Porath & Pearson, 2010). Though research along interpersonal deviance domain has explored the repercussion of being a target of these behaviours (Cortina et al., 2001; Milam et al., 2009) the research on the effects of these behaviours on individual observers is yet to flourish (Ferguson & Barry, 2010).

Most of the research on workplace deviance has focused on deviance as an outcome due to stress, perception of support, fairness, leader member relationship prevailing within the organizational context. Some studies has focused on the organizational and leader reactions towards deviance i.e. whether a person who is involved in deviant activities are being punished or not so that individual understand the behaviours that are acceptable within the organization (Appelbaum et al., 2007; Hogan & Emler, 1981; Trevino & Brown, 2005). Studies have also focused on the leader follower perspective where individuals follow leader's behaviour irrespective of their own ethical views considering the reward the leader was given from his organization that would facilitate employee imitation (Kemper, 1966; Trevino & Brown, 2005). These studies have explored whether an individual would engage in a behaviour after determining the consequences of involving in them.

Though deviance harms the target organization or the individual, it is still important to understand how witnessing these behaviours would affect the individuals. As, the individual might accept deviance or make it a culture among their workgroup (Ferguson & Barry; 2010). However, no studies so far has explored to measure the behaviour of an individual towards organizational/interpersonal deviance while being a witness. This is where the contribution of the present study lies.

Focus of the present research

Most of the previous studies have focused on individual's engagement in deviant behaviour like bullying, drug usage, alcohol consumption, harassment and cheating in classroom and workplace context given his relationship with others in the social and work context and have focused mainly on health issues (Jessor & Jessor, 1977; Chekroun & Brauer, 2002; Salmivalli et al., 2004). The present study proposes to provide a comprehensive scale that would measure the behaivor of individuals towards organizational and interpersonal deviance in the organizational context from the witness perspective.

For over four decades research has been carried out for individual behaviour towards deviance factor and researchers have concentrated on individual's involvement in bullying and anti-social behaviours, which was found to have a relationship between problem behaviour

(Cheating, drug abuse, drinking alcohol etc.,) and attitudinal intolerance of deviance (Jessor et al., 1995). Attitudinal Intolerance of deviance was measured by respondent's opinion on how wrong they felt by giving various deviance behaviours as examples (Donovan et al., 1999; Jessor et al., 1968, Ridenour et al., 2011). These scales were focused on the belief of "moral wrongness" of the individual. When an individual feel that a behaviour is wrong then he is said to be intolerant towards that behaviour compared to others. The problem behaviour determines that tolerance of deviance is due to the willingness to behave against the personality characteristics and predefined norms taking into account the individual's belief and perception of others (Jessor et al. 1968; Donovan et al., 1999).

The concept of attitude towards deviance has also emphasised on the individual cultural orientation i.e. whether an individual considers himself to be an individualist or a collectivist is said to influence his decision to engage in deviance (Bond & Smith 1996; Jetten & Hornsey, 2014; Welbourne et al., 2015). Hawdon (2005) and Rothwell (2009) argued that individualism and cultural ideology are factors that influence the individual's tolerance to deviance. It has been found that individualism can lead to an increase in tolerance of behaviours that are normally against and deviate from known policies and norms as these individuals are more prone to challenge the prevailing social structures (Hawdon, 2005; Rothwell & Hawdon (2008). This is due to fact that in individualistic culture the individual's benefit is important and they will involve in innovative positive behaviours and also in negative behaviours as his own goal is important to him (Chirkov et al., 2003). People in collectivistic cultures would work in groups and are more prone to conform to various behaviours that the group endorses as the peer group's behaviour would influence the behaviour of the individual and also his tolerance to deviance (Sutherland, 1939). The individuals who are ethical, need to conform to the group norms be it negative or positive to work in harmony with the other members. According to the social learning theory the individuals in close association with the deviants will also engage in deviant behaviours (Bandura, 1977). In order to increase the overall success of the group these individuals become highly tolerant. Recent research based on societal norms adherence has determined that individuals in individualistic cultures have a high tolerance for deviance and is called a loose culture. A collectivistic culture on the other hand has low tolerance and is called as tight culture (Gelfand et al., 2011). Thus given the importance of individual cultural perspectives, the present study proposes to develop a scale that would be generalizable across different cultures taking into views of individuals from two different countries.

Work group member behaviours is also said to influence individual employee behaviour (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998; Thau et al., 2007a). According to Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998) the behaviours of a group has its roots in the behaviour of the members of the groups. In order to get a sense of belonging to a workgroup an individual enact behaviours influenced by their co-workers (Thau et al., 2007b). More research has been focused on gaining indirect information of an individual regarding a particular behaviour in group settings (Degoey, 2000; Greenberg, 1997; Pearson & Porath, 2004) and little is known about directly witnessing deviant activities.

Direct observation of an event will lead to an individual making his own interpretation of the activity. Porath and Erez (2009) suggested that witnessing an interpersonal deviance may prime the interpretation of that individual which may affect peers. Thus direct observation of an activity provides cues about acceptable behaviour in a work environment (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Overtime individuals may perceive that deviance is appropriate and even commendable thus leading to less resistance against activities that are against the norms of the organization (Bandura, 1973; Wheeler & Caggiula, 1966). Members look up to their colleagues

to determine which behaviours are acceptable in order to advance in the organization (Festinger, 1954).

Robinson et al., (2014) carried out a review of literature to determine the impact of co-worker's deviant or CWB on individual employees. They came up with a framework that reveals the impact of deviant behaviour on individual attitudes, affect and actions through 3 routes: "(a) direct impact, whereby an employee is the target of co-workers' deviant behaviours; (b) vicarious impact, whereby an employee is impacted by witnessing or learning of co-workers' deviant behaviours; and (c) ambient impact, whereby an employee is impacted by working in an environment characterized by collective co-worker deviant behaviour" (p.123). Our contribution lies in the actions outcomes of Vicarious impact route where very few studies have been carried out (Ferguson and Barry, 2010; Hung et al. 2009; Wilkerson et al., 2008) and suggest direct or indirect knowledge about a co-worker behaviour would prime the individual to engage in deviance. The present study focus on the behaviour of the individual itself as a witness rather than on the consequences these behaviours would have on him.

Thus given the implications that witnessing deviance behaviour has on the individual, the present study proposes to develop a scale to measure the behaviour of an individual where an individual's decision to react would be focused various personal and situational considerations such as socialization, career aspects, personal belief, empathy and reputational consequences into account to aid in construct development.

RQ1: What constitutes an individual response towards deviance?

RQ2: To what extent do supervisor, organizational, co-worker behaviour and personal belief influence an individual behaviour to organizational and interpersonal deviance?

Theoretical perspective: Theory of Planned Behaviour

Since the focus of the present research is to measure the behaviour of an individual considering his belief, values, various norms that would influence his decision to react towards deviance behaviour the theory of planned behaviour is chosen as the theoretical lens that could best explain the behavioural outcome. Theory of planned behaviour (TPB) (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) has been widely applied in studies based on individual behaviour especially in predicting the intention of an individual to behave and the actual behaviour. This is an extention of Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) theory of reasoned action according to which the intention of an individual determines the motivation behind an individual's behaviour, the stronger intention would result in greater possibility of him engaging in behaviours. Thus, intention acts as a direct predictor of behaviour. Moreover, the intention to engage in certain types of behaviour were based on the attitudes and the subjective norm towards that behaviour (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). The theory later was extended into theory of planned behaviour to predict the behaviours even those an individual does not wish to engage at will. This theory has been applied in various studies involving binge alcohol, smoking and other health related behaviour (Godin & Kok, 1996; Marcoux & Shope, 1997; Norman et al., 1999). The widespread application of the TPB is its embracement of several new variables that can predict behaviour intentions (Lin & Chen, 2010).

The attitude towards deviance would refer to an individual's favourable and unfavourable evaluation concerning workplace deviance behaviour. It is an individual's expectation of involving in deviant activities would lead to certain consequences and his positive or negative interpretation of those consequences (Becker & Bennett, 2007). Applying this to the witness perspective on workplace deviance would result in determining an individual's attitude to

towards deviant activity considering the consequences like being fired from the job, being socially excluded, reporting to the management to benefit the organization, etc.,

The subjective norms with respect to deviance would be the social pressure perception of an individual to engage in deviant activities. This deals with the individual's belief about whether his manager or peers think that he should involve in deviance and the employees motivation to conform to that views (Becker & Bennett, 2007). The witness perspective towards deviance from the subjective norm point of view would enable the individual to rationalise the behaviour by witnessing the supervisor's and peer's behaviour. This would enable them to justify their own actions based on other's view supporting the use of social identity theory enforcing the importance of self-concept.

The perceived behavioural control towards workplace deviance refers to the extent to which an individual believes that the necessary resources like personal (justification for engaging in deviance), social (peers who are sympathetic towards them) and other resources (like opportunities to involve in deviant activities) are present to engage in workplace deviance. The usefulness of these resources while engaging in deviance is also taken into account (Becker & Bennett, 2007). The perceived behavioural control for a witness of a deviant activity would stem from the knowledge of getting away for performing a behaviour due to peers or supervisor involvement in it or trying to reduce deviance behaviour as he witnesses the implication of that activity.

In addition, the intention to involve in a behaviour is the extent to which an individual wishes to respond to deviant behaviours considering the perception of self and others towards the given behaviour. Finally involving in that behaviour. Fishbein and Ajzen (2010) suggested that the behaviour of interest should be defined clearly in terms of target, action and context. In the present research, the witness of workplace deviance (Target) decide to respond with behaviours (action) within the organization (context). Thus, the theory of planned behaviour along with self and social identity is preferred as a theoretical basis for the development of the new measure.

Study 1: Developing a Measure of WBTWD

METHOD

Participants and Procedures. Three samples were used to develop the WBTWD scale. Sample A consisted of 28 individuals ranging from , lower level employees, senior level managers, HR's, Senior accountants, Lecturers, technical analyst, programmer belonging to IT, BPO, Manufacturing, Communications, Banking and Education sectors from India and USA who agreed to participate in the research through personal contacts and with the help of the Edinburgh Business School Alumni office. There was a roughly equal mix of men and women (India: 60% men and 40% women; USA: 46% men and 54% women) with an average age of 31. Sample B was composed of n= 987 participants, n= 404 from India and n= 583 from USA. These two samples were further split randomly to conduct exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. The Sample 1 consisted of n=202, INDIAN participants who were full-time (66.8%) and part-time (33.2%) employees, male (50.5%) and female (49.5%) with an average age of 25. Sample 2 consisted of n=233, USA participants who were full-time (78.1%) and part-time (21.9%) employees, male (49.4%) and female (50.6%) and average age of 25. The Sample 3 consisted of n=202, INDIAN participants who were full-time (73%) and part-time (27%) employees, male (51%) and female (49%) with an average age of 25. Sample 4 consisted of n=350, USA participants who were full-time (78.9%) and part-time (21.1%) employees, male (49%) and female (51%) and average age of 25. This sample was obtained through qualtrics panel survey. Online panel reduces the cost involved in locating respondents who are

appropriate, ensure instance availability with many benefits like identifying key samples, increased response rate and quality with ethical advantages (Göritz, 2002). Taking into account the requirement and sensitivity of the research, qualtrics was preferred as participant's behavioural outcomes were required from India and USA belong to different industries working part-time or full-time. Qualtrics recruits participants for survey panels through invitation-only to avoid professional survey takers and self-selection of respondents. The use of qualtrics have also been described as providing researchers with data of acceptable quality (Brandon et al., 2013) and several advantages (DeSantis, 2013).

Instrument Development. The goal was to develop a self-report witness behavior towards workplace deviance scale. Using an inductive approach, the interviews were used to generate items and to obtain definition of the construct. The items were generated separately by the author and another researcher. These lists were compared and items were screened to demonstrate inter-rater agreement and inter-coder reliability (Cohen, 1960). Initially the agreement was above 80% for all coding which was higher than the recommended 70% (Boyatzis, 1998). This was done to ensure the items were clear and concise. This process resulted in an initial set of 20-items. We began with a large list of items in order to allow future deletion. Our sample size allowed for 10:1 subject to item ratio. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they engaged in each of the behaviors during the past year while being a witness since our focus is on the self-report of the individual. Participants answered the all the item using the 5-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always).

Results

Common method bias. In organisational research, when data is obtained from a single source common method bias has been a major concern, as they are one of the major sources of measurement error (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The extensive study by Podsakoff et al., (2003) has identified four sources of common method variance – common rater effects, item characteristic effects, item context effects and measurement context effects. This error would lead to inconclusive results about the relationship present among the measures used in the study. In their review of CMV/CMB Podsakoff et al., (2003) suggests techniques for controlling CMV/CMB using both procedural and statistical remedies. To account for procedural remedy the questionnaires were designed in a random order to neutralize the effects of item-induced mood states given the length of the questionnaire. Also respondents were assured of their anonymity and that there were no right or wrong answers to reduce their desire to edit their answers (Eichhorn, 2014). Statistical remedy used in this study was measuring a latent factor allowing the indicators of other constructs to load on this latent factor as well as their hypothesized constructs. One of the criteria suggested by Hair et al., (2006) to determine the common method variance is the significant difference in goodness of fit between model 2 (with common latent factor) and model 1 (without the common latent factor) to predict the presence of bias due to method variance. The biased response due to social desirability would be reflected in terms of a higher value of chi-square in model 2. For Indian Sample, model 1 fitted the data well ($\chi2$=357.13 (p<.05), Df= 161, $\chi 2$/df= 2.22, CFI=.92, TLI= .94, RMSEA=.05). However, model 2, also fitted the data well ($\chi2$=279.79 (p<.05), Df= 141, $\chi 2$/df= 1.99, CFI=.96, TLI= .94, RMSEA=.05) and in fact, fitted a little better than model 1 $\varDelta$ $\chi2$ = (20, n=404) = 77.33, p<.05. For USA sample, model 1 fitted the data well ($\chi2$=703.53 (p<.05), Df= 161, $\chi 2$/df= 4.37, CFI=.91, TLI= .90, RMSEA=.07). However, model 2, also fitted the data well ($\chi2$=540.07 (p<.05), Df= 141, $\chi 2$/df= 3.83, CFI=.91, TLI= .90, RMSEA=.07) and in fact, fitted a little better than model 1 $\Delta \chi2$ = (20, n=583) = 163.46, p<.05. Thus providing evidence of no social desirability in responses.

Instrument analysis. Exploratory factor analyses was conducted using data from Sample A yielded a 9-item structure for WBTWD scale which is generalizable across India and USA. The principal component analysis was carried out with direct oblimin rotation (Field, 2005) as some correlation among factors is expected since behavior is rarely partitioned as independent units. Through an iterative process, items with loading below .30 or with cross loading above .35 were eliminated (Hair et al., 2006) resulting in a 9-item scale. Scale items, factor loadings, items means, items standard deviations and item reliabilities are presented in Table 1 and 2. The reliabilities for the resulting scale were well above the commonly accepted standard of .70. Items representing the self-serving (α_{India}=.77, α_{USA}= .70) and intervening (α_{India}=.83, α_{USA}= .85) behaviour were retained in the final scale forming a two-factor structure. These results were consistent with the extant literature in social, helping and workplace ethics behaviour (Chakrabarti, 2013; Chekroun & Brauer, 2002; Fredricks et al., 2011; Gaertner, Dovidio, & Johnson, 1982; Hart & Miethe, 2008; Low et al., 2007).

Using data from Sample 3 and 4, a confirmatory factor analysis was used to test the factor structure of the resulting 9-items from the exploratory factor analysis. Two competing models were tested: a one factor model and a two factor solution loading onto a second order factor (i.e. two subcomponents loading onto a second order WBTWD factor). For the USA Sample 4, the one factor model had a chi-square value of 9.09 (p<.01; df= 27), a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .15, a comparative fit index (CFI) of .77 and a goodness of fit index (GFI) of .84. In contrast, the two factor model loading onto a second-order factor had a chi-square value of 2.30 (p<0.05; df=26), a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .06, a comparative fit index (CFI) of .97 and a goodness of fit index (GFI) of .97. For the INDIAN Sample 3, the one factor model had a chi-square value of 3.0 (p<.01; df=27), a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .09, a comparative fit index (CFI) of .86 and a goodness of fit index (GFI) of .91. In contrast, the two factor model loading onto a second-order factor had a chi-square value of 1.20 (p<.01; df=26), a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .03, a comparative fit index (CFI) of .99 and a goodness of fit index (GFI) of .97. This suggest that the construct reflects a higher order construct consisting of self-serving and intervening behaviors components with a good fit.

Thus from the previous literature and interviews conducted the definition of the witness behavior towards workplace deviance is "**The behavioural response of an individual after witnessing workplace deviance behavior**".

Study 2

Construct validity is used to determine the relationship between the newly developed scale and the theoretical outcome it is designed to assess. Nomological validity, a form of construct validity determine the extent to which a construct behaves with other related constructs (DeVellis, 1991; Hinkin, 1995;1998). A measure depicts convergent validity when it has high correlation with other theoretically related constructs whereas discriminant validity is present when there is low or no correlation between the new construct and theoretically unrelated or distinct constructs (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Hinkin, 1995).This is an important criteria in developing a scale that is valid (Cronbach & Meehl, 1995). The convergent, discriminant and predictive validity was tested for the newly developed scale.

Convergent validity. To explore the convergent validity, the constructs of Exit, voice, loyalty and neglect and organization citizenship behaviour were used. The exit, voice, loyalty and neglect framework (Hirschman, 1970) suggests that an employee may react in different ways to work dissatisfaction: exit-leaving the organization, voice- appeal to the management in an effort to improve the situation, loyalty- remains loyal to the organization with a hope that the situations would improve or neglect- displaying a disregardful behaviour (Farrell, 1983). Voice describes behaviours that are similar to that of the intervening behaviour and loyalty and neglect has behaviours that are similar to self-serving behaviours, this is expected to have a positive relationship with the newly developed scale.

The organization citizenship behaviour represents the behaviours that are not part of their job description but is known to promote the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). The behaviours like civic virtue, sportsmanship and helping behaviour is expected to have a positive relationship with the newly developed scale. Civic virtue involves making suggestions to improve the workplace, sportsmanship involves behaviours that are required to go along with the necessary changes that happens in the work environment and helping behaviour involves helping other less-experienced employees with work related problems.

Discriminant validity. To test for discriminant validity the constructs of destructive and constructive deviance behaviour were taken. Constructive deviance represents those behaviours that break organizational norms but in doing so benefits the organization and its employees (Galperin, 2002). This is chosen to have a discriminant validity with the new scale because self-serving or intervening behaviour may lead to individuals involving in behaviours that would benefit themselves as it would make them part of the organization or stress-free from dealing with deviant activities. Destructive deviance on the other hand, though breaks the organizational norms it demerits the organization and the individuals working in it. The newly developed scale is expected to be distinct than this construct as being involved in self-serving and intervening behaviours is not to cause harm to the organization or individuals working in it. Thus, they are expected to be distinct.

Predictive validity. Predictive validity on the other hand, is a subset of criterion related validity were the new scale predicts future events (Hair et al., 2006). Based on the extant literature on helping behaviour, social control and workplace deviance, the constructs of affective commitment, work engagement and job satisfaction are expected to be predicted by the newly developed scale. These constructs were chosen because the main aim of the present construct was to determine the behaviour of individual towards workplace negative deviance. The affective commitment towards the organization (Appelbaum et al., 2006; Brooks, 2002; Yildiz & Alpkan, 2015), work engagement (Ariani, 2013; Shantz et al., 2013; Sulea et al., 2012) and job satisfaction (Moorman, 1993; Mount et al., 2006; Omar et al., 2011) were factors that were researched previously in relation to deviance both positive and negative. These were

found to be affective in minimising the negative effects of deviance and enhance positive behavioural outcomes.

METHOD

Participants and Procedures. Two samples were used to test the validity of the WBTWD scale. Qualtrics Online questionnaires were used to collect the data required. The participants were contacted through personal contact in India and USA. They were requested to help in sharing the link with their employees and also were requested for contacts in other organizations. Out of the 708 total questionnaire link sent, a total of 488 questionnaire were returned and the response rate was 68.92% and 455 usable questionnaires formed Sample 5 and Sample 6. Overall, it consisted of 51.2% Indian and 48.4% USA participants. Sample 5 consisted of n=233, Indian participants full-time (76%) and part-time (24%) employees, male (51.1%) and female (48.9%) whereas, sample 6 consisted of n=222, USA participants full-time (66.7%) and part-time (33.3%) employees, male (50.5%) and female (49.5%) with an average of up to 5 years of work experience.

Measures

Affective commitment

Affective commitment to organization was assessed using the 6-item scale developed by Vandenberghe, Stinglhamber, Bentein and Delhaise (2001). Respondents were asked to rate their level of commitment on a 5-point scale (1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree; eg., I am proud to belong to this organization, I really feel that I belong in my work group etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.89 in Sample 5 and α=.95 in Sample 6.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was assessed using a 3-item scale developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh's (1983). Respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the organization on a 5-point scale (1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree; eg., I am satisfied with my job, I like working in this organization etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.89 in Sample 5 and α=.92 in Sample 6.

Work Engagement

Work engagement was assessed using the 9-item scale developed by Schaufeli et al., (2006). Respondents were asked to rate their feeling about their job on a 5-point scale (1= Never, 5= Always; eg., I am enthusiastic about my job, I feel happy when I am working intensely etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.88 in Sample 5 and α=.94 in Sample 6.

Organization Citizenship Behaviour

Organization Citizenship Behaviour was assessed using a 9-item scale developed by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994). It consisted of 3 subscales: Helping (3-items), Civic Virtue (3-items) and Sportsmanship (3-items). Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they have engaged in certain behaviour on a 5-point scale (1= Never, 5= Always; eg., I take steps to try to prevent problems with other personnel in the agency, I attend and actively participate in agency meetings, I always find fault with what the agency is doing etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.82 in Sample 5 and α=.83 in Sample 6.

Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect

Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect was assessed using the 12-item scale developed by Farrels, (1983). It consisted of 4 subscales: Exit (3-items), Voice (3-items) Loyalty (3-items)

and Neglect (3-items). Respondents were asked to rate how often they have thought about the stated behaviours in the past year on a 5-point scale (1= Never, 5= Always; eg., Deciding to quit the company, Talking to supervisor to try and make things better, Waiting patiently and hoping any problems will solve themselves, Coming in late to avoid problems etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.92 in Sample 5 and α=.93 in Sample 6.

Workplace Deviance

Workplace Deviance was assessed using the 19-item scale developed by Bennett and Robinson, (2000). The items are grouped into organizational (12 items) and interpersonal deviance (7 items) subscales. Respondents are asked to rate their own deviance behaviour on a 5-point scale (1= never, 5= always; eg., Taken property from work without permission, Neglected to follow boss's instruction, Cursed someone at work etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.96 in Sample 5 and α=.97 in Sample 6.

Constructive deviance behaviour

Constructive deviance behaviour will be assessed by Galperin's (2002). The 16-item measure of organizational, innovative and interpersonal deviance uses a 5-point scale, on which respondents rate their agreement (1= never, 5=always; e.g., Developed creative solution to problems, Bent a rule to satisfy a customer's need, Disagreed with others in your work group in order to improve the current work procedures etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.92 in Sample 5 and α=.93 in Sample 6.

Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance

Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance was measured using the newly developed scale. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they engaged in each of the behaviours during the past year since our focus is on the self-report of the individual. Participants answered the all the item using the 5-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always; eg., Wait for someone to confront the person involved in such behaviours, Confront anyone involved in such activities etc.,). The alpha coefficient α=.79 in Sample 5 and α=.77 in Sample 6.

Results

Common method bias. The same procedure from Study 1 was repeated in Study 2 to determine the common method bias. For Sample 5 (n=233), model 1 fitted the data well ($\chi2$=3293.91 (p<.05), Df= 2223, $\chi 2$/df= 1.48, CFI=.90, TLI= .90, RMSEA=.04). However, model 2, also fitted the data well ($\chi2$=3107.97 (p<.05), Df= 2154, $\chi 2$/df= 1.44, CFI=.91, TLI= .91, RMSEA=.04) and in fact, fitted a little better than model 1 $\Delta \chi2$ = (69, n=233)= 185.94, p<.05. For Sample 6 (n=222), model 1 fitted the data well ($\chi2$=3577.99 (p<.05), Df= 2223, $\chi 2$/df= 1.61, CFI=.90, TLI= .90, RMSEA=.05). However, model 2, also fitted the data well ($\chi2$=3333.88 (p<.05), Df= 2154, $\chi 2$/df= 1.55, CFI=.91, TLI= .90, RMSEA=.05) and in fact, fitted a little better than model 1 $\Delta \chi2$ = (69, n=222)= 244.12, p<.05. Thus providing no evidence for social desirability in responses.

Convergent validity. Table 3 and 4, reports the means, standard deviation and correlations between Witness behaviour workplace deviance with organizational citizenship behaviour and exit, voice, loyalty and neglect.

As can be seen from Table 3 correlations were significant in sample 5. There was a positive correlation between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance scale and organizational citizenship behaviour (r= .65, p<=.01) as expected self-serving behaviour had a moderate

correlation with sportsmanship (r=.55, p<=.01) and intervening behaviour had a high correlation with helping (r=.51, p<=.01) and civic virtue (r=.51, p<=.01). Also a significant positive high correlation was found between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance and EVLN measure (r=.57, p<-.01) as expected self-serving behaviour had a high correlation with exit (r=.47, p<=.01), neglect (r= .53, p<=.01) and loyalty (r=.56, p<=.01) and intervening behaviour had a high correlation with voice (r=.43, p<=.01).

As can be seen from Table 4 correlations were significant in sample 6. There was a positive correlation between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance scale and organizational citizenship behaviour (r= .58, p<=.01) as expected self-serving behaviour had a moderate correlation with sportsmanship (r=.30, p<=.01) and intervening behaviour had a high correlation with helping (r=.55, p<=.01) and civic virtue (r=.46, p<=.01). In addition, a significant positive high correlation was found between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance and EVLN measure (r=.60, p<-.01) as expected self-serving behaviour had a high correlation with exit (r=.39, p<=.01), neglect (r= .41, p<=.01) and loyalty (r=.59, p<=.01) and intervening behaviour had a high correlation with voice (r=.56, p<=.01).

Thus proving the convergent validity of the newly developed scale.

Discriminant validity. CFA analyses was conducted to test for discriminant validity. Table 5 and 6 shows that the Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance and constructive deviance to be distinct.

The two factor model of Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance and constructive deviance behaviour taken separately but as a correlated model fitted the data much better than a one factor model both the factors were taken together. Similarly, the second order model of Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance and destructive deviance behaviour taken separately but as a correlated model fitted the data much better than a one factor model both the factors were taken together. Thus proving the discriminant validity of the new scale in the Indian and USA Sample.

Further the factor loadings for each of the observed variables or in this case first order factors should also be considered along with the fit indices (Farrell & Rudd, 2009). Thus the new measure was also tested for Fornell and Larcker (1981) test using the average variance extracted (AVE) where a value of more than 0.5 is considered as acceptable. For both the constructs the two dimensions exceeded the recommended level (p=.59; p=.56 respectively) in Sample 5 and (p=.60; p=.59 respectively) in Sample 6.

The value of AVE should also be greater than the squared correlation of the related latent constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In sample 5, the data for model 1 met this criteria where p=.23 exceeded by the AVE (p=.59) and the data for model 2 also met this criteria where p=.19 exceeding the AVE (p=.56). In sample 6, the data for model 1 met this criteria where p=.22 exceeded by the AVE (p=.60) and the data for model 2 also met this criteria where p=.22 exceeding the AVE (p=.59).

Thus both the confirmatory factor analysis and the test of average variance extracted established the discriminant validity between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance, destructive and constructive deviance behaviour.

Predictive Validity. Table 7 and 8 presents the means, standard deviation and correlations between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance, affective commitment, work engagement and job satisfaction in sample 5 and 6.

As expected the correlation between Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance revealed a positive relationship with affective commitment to organization and toward colleagues, work engagement and job satisfaction. This was because the self-serving behaviour would lead to an individual's acceptance in his team and more focused on his own performance irrespective of others while the intervening behaviour would make him more committed towards his organization as he is engaging in activities that would reduce deviance. Thus the intervening behaviour was more positively related ($p=.40$, $p= .45$, $p= .34$; $p<=.01$) than self-serving behaviour ($p=.16$, $p= .28$, $p= .12$; $p<=.01$) in sample 5 and intervening behaviour was more positively related ($p=.39$, $p= .51$, $p= .36$; $p<=.01$) than self-serving behaviour ($p=.14$, $p= .26$, $p= .18$; $p<=.01$) in sample 6.

Generalisability of the scale. A multigroup confirmatory factor analysis (MGCFA) was used to explore the generalisability of the measurement model. It is an extension of CFA where invariance of estimated parameters of a model is tested across two groups (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002) and in this case, India and USA. First a two factor second order model was estimated in which all parameters were set free across two samples (Sample 5 and 6) representing model 1 followed by model 2 in which all the factor loadings were constrained across the two groups. In model 3, the variances of the factors were fixed to be the same and in model 4 the covariances and variances of the error terms were constrained to be the same. Thus these test provide a test for measurement equivalence across two groups.

As depicted in table 9, fit indices for each and every model suggested that second order measurement model for Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance had acceptable fit in both the groups. To establish measurement invariance across two groups, the difference in RMSEA values should have a change of $\geq .010$ or $.015$ (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). The change in the RMSEA between model 1 and each of the competing models (model 2; model 3 and model 4) were all 0.01 or less thus suggesting that all models are practically equal in terms of empirical fit thus, providing an evidence for generalizability of the newly developed scale.

Implications

Theoretical. The use of theory of planned behaviour along with self and social identity as a theoretical lens in developing the measure has contributed to the theory of planned behaviour by supporting the views of Terry et al., (1999) highlighting the effect of self and social identity on the attitude-behaviour relations.

By providing a valid and reliable measure of Witness behaviour towards workplace deviance this research has added to workplace deviance literature by providing the behavioural outcome of individuals who witness deviance activities as previous research has focused on the moral wrongness an individual felt regarding a behaviour (Jessor et al., 1980). By establishing different validities, using Samples 5 and 6 study 2 extended the literature on deviance by classifying the newly developed scale within the nomological network. It was found to be closer to OCB and EVLN constructs by establishing convergent validity proving that the present scale sits closer to voluntary behaviours.

Furthermore, this research has shown links between WBTWD and individual behavioural outcomes such as affective commitment, work engagement and job satisfaction. Study 2 showed a positive relationship between self-serving and intervening behaviour with affective commitment, work engagement and job satisfaction supporting the extension of deviance literature into individual behavioural outcome. In addition, the study is the first in developing and testing a Scale in two different cultures of India and USA. Thus adding to the literature on scale development practices.

Practical. First, the research suggested that individuals who witness workplace deviance behaviours are indeed affected and would in turn involve in behaviours that are directed either towards themselves or towards the behaviour. Therefore, organizations would benefit from implementing this scale to determine the existence of these behaviours among their employees or new hires as different individuals are proved to have different reactions based on supervisor and peer influence as can be seen from the study.

Second, the results show that the newly developed scale positively affects individual work-related behavioural outcomes. The organizations may benefit from assigning employees who are self-serving as part of a group as these individuals assess their own behaviour with that of others. Whereas, individuals with high intervening behaviours would make good leaders who put the needs of others before theirs and try to resolve a behaviour thus contributing to the commitment, engagement and satisfaction of the individual.

Limitations and Future Research

The purpose of the study was to define, develop and validate a scale to measure the witness behaviour of an individual towards workplace deviance behaviour there are also some limitation that needs to be addressed.

Source of information: The data for Study 1 was collected through one-to-one interview and the quantitative data for both the studies were collected from employees to determine their own behavioural outcomes thus leading to the presence of common method bias. This was acknowledge in the research by taking into account both procedure (Podsakoff et al. 2003) and empirical assessments (Malhotra, Kim, & Patil 2006). Procedurally, respondents were assured of their anonymity, they were also said that there are no right or wrong answers and that they should answer as honestly as possible, the scale items within a measure were also randomly ordered to avoid response sets and a pilot was conducted to assess the clarity and ambiguity (Podsakoff et al. 2003). The CMB was also tested analytically by including a common factor that allowed the indicators of other constructs to load on this latent factor as well as their hypothesized constructs

Scale generalisability: The newly developed scale was tested and validated to support the generalisability of the scale in India and USA. But, the scale was tested in both the countries in English and the translation approach has not been tested in the present study where it is validated in different cultures by translating the scale so that the etic and emic issues if at all present in the scale could be identified (Farh et al., 2006).

However all these limitations were compensated in the present research through methodological strengths.

As the present research is the first to develop a 2-factor scale to assess the witness behaviour towards workplace in India and USA but future research would benefit from the following suggestions:

Causes and consequences. This research examined the predictive validity of the newly developed scale, but more research is required in determining the causes of self-serving and intervening behaviour to understand the construct better.

Witness behaviour literature. Though not a new concept in classroom context, the witness perspective towards workplace deviance behaviour is new within the organizational context and in deviance literature (Porath & Erez, 2009). Future research is required to extend the present construct in other areas of organization behaviour like leadership where a leader behaviour while witness employee deviance could be measured. Also, other theoretical lenses

should be used to determine the effect of deviance on witnesses. These perceptions could also be extended to extra role and other voluntary behaviours that would contribute to organizational well-being thus opening a new area of witness behaviour in deviance literature.

Conclusion

This paper discussed the importance of witness behaviour towards workplace deviance within the organizational context and presents evidence for the existence and validity of the construct. Although scholars have argued for the importance of witness perspective within classroom context and recently within organizational context (Porath & Erez, 2009) this has not been tested yet. We believe that the development and validation of this WBTWD scale represents an importance step forward in expanding the literature thus contributing to employee behavioural outcomes.

References

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2006). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes.* Routledge.

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. J. Kuhl, & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg: Springer.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Englewood Cloffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviours: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society, 7*(5), 586-598.

Appelbaum, S. H., Shapiro, B. T. (2006). Diagnosis and remedies for deviant workplace behaviours. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 9*(2), 14-20.

Ariani, D. W. (2013). The relationship between employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Business Administration, 4*(2), 46-56.

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British journal of social psychology*, 40(4), 471-499.

Bandura, A. 1973. *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. 1977. Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological review, 84*(2), 191-215.

Barriga, A. Q., & Gibbs, J. C. (1996). Measuring cognitive distortion in antisocial youth: Development and preliminary validation of the "How I Think" questionnaire. *Aggressive Behaviour, 22*(5), 333-343.

Becker, T. E., & Bennett, R. J. (2007). Employee attachment and deviance in organizations.. In Langan-Fox, J., Cooper, C. L., & Klimoski, R. J. (Eds). *Research Companion to the Dysfunctional Workplace: Management Challenges and Symptoms* (pp. 136-151). Northampton, USA.

Bennett, R. J., Aquino, K., Reed II, A., & Thau, S. (2005). The Normative Nature of Employee Deviance and the Impact of Moral Identity. In Fox. S., & Spector, P. (Eds). *Counterproductive Work Behaviour: Investigations of Actors and Targets.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 107-125

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(3), 349.

Bommer, W. H., Miles, E. W., & Grover, S. L. (2003). Does one good turn deserve another? Coworker influences on employee citizenship. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 24*(2), 181-196.

Bond. R & Smith P. B. (1996). Culture and conformity: a meta-analysis of studies using Asch's (1952b, 1956) line judgment task. *Psychological Bulletin. 119*(1), 111–137

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brooks, G. (2002). Knowledge-based structures and organisational commitment. *Management Decision,* 40(6), 566-573.

Brown, R. (1988). *Group processes: Dynamics within and between groups*. Basil Blackwell.

Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(4), 583-616.

Bukowski, W. M., Sippola, L., Hoza, B., & Newcomb, A. F. (2000). Pages from a sociometric notebook: An analysis of nomination and rating scale measures of acceptance, rejection, and social preference. *New directions for child and adolescent development, 2000*(88), 11-26.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices*, (pp.71-138). Wiley, New York: USA.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait–multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56(2)*, 81–103.

Chakrabarti, D. (2013). The Investigation of Helping Behaviour in the Virtual World. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University: USA

Charng, H. W., Piliavin, J. A., & Callero, P. L. (1988). Role identity and reasoned action in the prediction of repeated behaviour. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51*(4), 303-317.

Chekroun, P., & Brauer, M. (2002). The bystander effect and social control behaviour: The effect of the presence of others on people's reactions to norm violations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*(6), 853-867.

Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9(2)*, 233-55.

Chirkov, V., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: a self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 84*(1), 97.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *20(1)*, 37-46.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: incidence and impact. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *6*(1), 64-80.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281- 302.

Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 8*(4), 377-383.

Degoey, P. 2000. Contagious justice: Exploring the social construction of justice in organizations. In Staw B. M. & Sutton R. (Eds.,), *Research in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 22, pp.51–102). New York: JAI.

DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dietz, J., Robinson, S. L., Folger, R., Baron, R. A., & Schulz, M. (2003). The impact of community violence and an organization's procedural justice climate on workplace aggression. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(3), 317-326.

Dineen, B. R., Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2006). Supervisory guidance and behavioural integrity: relationships with employee citizenship and deviant behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(3), 622.

Donovan, J. E., Jessor, R., & Costa, F. M. (1999). Adolescent problem drinking: stability of psychosocial and behavioural correlates across a generation. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *60*(3), 352-361.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). The psychology of attitudes. Fort Worth, Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Eichhorn, B. R. (2014). *Common Method Variance Techniques*. Cleveland State University, Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management. Cleveland, OH: SAS Institute Inc.

Farh, J. L., Cannella, A. A., & Lee, C. (2006). Approaches to Scale Development in Chinese Management Research. *Management and Organization Review, 2*(3), 301-318. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2006.00055.x

Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal, 26*(4), 596-607.

Ferguson, M., & Barry, B. (2010). I know what you did: The effects of interpersonal deviance on bystanders. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*(1), 80-94.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human relations*,*7*(2), 117-140.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behaviour: The reasoned action approach.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18(1)*, 39-50.

Fredricks, S., Ramsey, M., & Hornett, A. (2010). Kinship and bystander effect: The role of others in ethical decisions. *Journal of Religion and Business Ethics*, *2*(1), 1-22.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Johnson, G. (1982). Race of victim, nonresponsive bystanders, and helping behaviour. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *117*(1), 69-77.

Galperin, B. L. (2002). *Determinants of deviance in the workplace: an empirical examination in Canada and Mexico.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Montreal: Concordia University.

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., & Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science, 332(6033),* 1100–1104.

Godin, G., & Kok, G. (1996). The theory of planned behaviour: a review of its applications to health-related behaviours. *American journal of health promotion, 11*(2), 87-98.

Greenberg, J. (1997). A social influence model of employee theft: Beyond the fraud triangle. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 6, pp. 29–52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Greenberger, D. B., Miceli, M. P., & Cohen, D. J. (1987). Oppositionists and group norms: The reciprocal influence of whistle-blowers and co-workers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *6*(7), 527-542.

Griffin, R. W. (1983). Objective and social sources of information in task redesign: A field experiment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *28*(2), 184-200.

Hansen, Å. M., Hogh, A., Persson, R., Karlson, B., Garde, A. H., & Ørbæk, P. (2006). Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 60*(1), 63-72.

Hair, J.F., Jr, Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.

Hart, T. C., & Miethe, T. D. (2008). Exploring bystander presence and intervention in nonfatal violent victimization: When does helping really help?. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(5), 637-651.

Hawdon, J. E. (2005). *Drugs and alcohol consumption as functions of social structure: A cross-culturals Sociology*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 31*(1), 24–44.

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development in the study of behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management, 21*(5), 967-988.

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A Brief Tutorial on the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(1), 104-121.

Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states* (Vol. 25). Harvard university press.

Hogan, R., & Emler, N. P. (1981). Retributive justice. In Lerner, M. J. & Lerner, S. C. (Eds.), *The Justice Motive in social behaviour: Adapting to times of scarcity and change* (pp. 125-143). Springer.

Holland, P. W. (1985). Statistics and causal inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 81*(2), 945 – 960.

Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls of employee deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *23*(3), 333-343.

Hung, T.K., Chi, N.W. and Lu, W.L. (2009). Exploring the relationships between perceived coworker loafing and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating role of a revenge motive. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24*(3), 257-270.

Jessor, R., Chase, J. A., & Donovan, J. E. (1980). Psychosocial correlates of marijuana use and problem drinking in a national sample of adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health, 70*(6), 604-613.

Jessor, R., Graves, T. D., & Hanson, R. C. (1968). *Society, Personality, and Deviant Behaviour: A Study of a Tri-Ethnic Community*. Oxford: England.

Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L. (1977). *Problem behaviour and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Jessor, R., Van Den Bos, J., Vanderryn, J., Costa, F. M., and Turbin, M. S. (1995). Protective factors in adolescent problem behaviour: Moderator effects and developmental change. *Developmental psychology, 31*(6), 923-933.

Jetten, J., & Hornsey, M. J. (2014). Deviance and dissent in groups. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 461-485.

Kemper, T. D. (1966). *Representative roles and the legitimization of deviance.* Social Problems, 13(3), 288–298.

Lewicki, R. J., Poland, T., Minton, J. W., & Sheppard, B. H. (1997). *Dishonesty as deviance: A typology of workplace dishonesty and contributing factors.* Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Liau, A. K., Barriga, A. Q., and Gibbs, J. C. (1998). Relations between self-serving cognitive distortions and overt vs. covert antisocial behaviour in adolescents. *Aggressive Behaviour, 24*(5), 335-346

Lin, C. S., & Chen, C. F. (2011). *Application of Theory of Planned Behaviour on the study of workplace dishonesty.* In International Conference on Economics and Business, Manila.

Low, K. S., Radhakrishnan, P., Schneider, K. T., & Rounds, J. (2007). The experiences of bystanders of workplace ethnic harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *37*(10), 2261-2297.

Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., & Patil, A. (2006). Common method variance in IS research: A comparison of alternative approaches and a reanalysis of past research. *Management science, 52*(12), 1865-1883.

Marcoux, B. C., & Shope, J. T. (1997). Application of the theory of planned behaviour to adolescent use and misuse of alcohol. *Health Education Research, 12*(3), 323-331.

Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology, 65*(2), 325-357.

Milam, A. C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(1), 58–69.

Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1159.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Human relations*, *46*(6), 759-776.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviours: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel psychology, 59*(3), 591-622.

Norman, P., Conner, M., & Bell, R. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour and smoking cessation. *Health psychology, 18*(1), 89-94.

Ojala, K., & Nesdale, D. (2004). Bullying and social identity: The effects of group norms and distinctiveness threat on attitudes towards bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 22*(1), 19-35.

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of management review, 21*(1), 225-253.

Omar, F., Halim, F., Zainah, A., & Farhadi, H. (2011). Stress and job satisfaction as antecedents of workplace deviant behaviour. *Deviant Behaviour*, *16*, 46-51.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. Human Relations, *54*(11), 1387–1419.

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2004). On incivility, its impact, and directions for future research. In R. W. Griffin & A. M. O'Leary-Kelly (Eds.), *The dark side of organizational behaviour* (pp. 403-425). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). An examination of the psychometric properties and nomological validity of some revised and reduced substitutes for leadership scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 702.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology, 88*(5), 879-903.

Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 109*(1), 29–44.

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2010). The cost of bad behaviour. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(1), 64–71.

Rayner, C., & Keashly, L. (2005). Bullying at work: A perspective from Britain and North America. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (2005), *Counterproductive work behaviour: investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 271–296). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ridenour, T. A., Caldwell, L. L., Coatsworth, J. D., & Gold, M. A. (2011). Directionality Between Tolerance of Deviance and Deviant Behaviour is Age-Moderated in Chronically Stressed Youth. *Journal of child and adolescent substance abuse*, *20(*2), pp. 184-204.

Ries, F., Hein, V., Pihu, M., & Armenta, J. M. S. (2012). Self-identity as a component of the Theory of Planned Behaviour in predicting physical activity. *European Physical Education Review, 18*(3), 322-334.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, *38*(2), 555-572.

Robinson. S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behaviour of employees. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(6), 658-672.

Robinson, S. L., Wang, W., & Kiewitz, C. (2014). Coworkers behaving badly: The impact of coworker deviant behaviour upon individual employees. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour, 1*(1), 123-143.

Rothwell, V. L. (2009). *The Relationship between Attitudes toward Deviance and Deviant Behaviour: The Influence of Science, Individualism, Social Bonds and Deviant Peers* Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Rothwell, V., & Hawdon, J. E. (2008). Science, individualism, and attitudes toward deviance: The influence of modernization and rationalization. *Deviant Behaviour, 29*(3), 253-274.

Rousseau, D. M., & Greller, M. M. (1994). Human resource practices: Administrative contract makers. *Human Resource Management, 33*(3), 385-401.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative science quarterly, 23*(2), 224-253.

Salmivalli, C., Kaukianinen, A., & Voeten, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*(3), 465-487.

Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., Voeten, M., & Sinisammal, M. (2004). Targeting the group as a whole: The Finnish anti-bullying intervention. In P.K. Smith, D. Pepler & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 251–275). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schat, A., Desmarais, S., & Kelloway, E. (2005). *Effects of Organizational tolerance on the incidence and consequences of workplace aggression.* Paper presented at the National Academy of Management Meetings, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and psychological measurement, 66*(4), 701-716.

Shantz, A., Alfes, K., Truss, C., & Soane, E. (2013). The role of employee engagement in the relationship between job design and task performance, citizenship and deviant behaviours. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *24*(13), 2608-2627.

Sparks, P., & Shepherd, R. (1992). Self-identity and the theory of planned behaviour: Assesing the role of identification with" green consumerism". *Social psychology quarterly, 55*(4), 388-399.

Sulea, C., Virga, D., Maricutoiu, L. P., Schaufeli, W., Zaborila Dumitru, C., & Sava, F. A. (2012). Work engagement as mediator between job characteristics and positive and negative extra-role behaviours. *Career Development International*, *17*(3), 188-207.

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1939. *Principles of Criminology*. Philadelphia:Lippincott.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp.33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190.

Tepper, B. J., Car, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 156-167.

Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: Self-identity, social identity and group norms. *The British Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(3), 225–244.

Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (2000). Attitude-behaviour relations: Social identity and group membership. In D. J. Terry & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Attitudes, behaviour, and social context: The role of norms and group membership*. Mahwah, NJ/London: Erlbaum.

Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Poortvliet, P. M. (2007a). Self-defeating behaviours in organizations: The relationship between thwarted belonging and interpersonal work behaviours. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 840-847.

Thau, S., Crossley, C., Bennett, R. J., & Sczesny, S. (2007b). The relationship between trust, attachment, and antisocial work behaviours. *Human Relations*, *60*(8), 1155-1179.

Theodorakis, Y. (1994). Planned behaviour, attitude strength, role identity, and the prediction of exercise behaviour. *The Sport Psychologist, 8*(2), 149-165.

Thorbjørnsen, H., Pedersen, P. E., & Nysveen, H. (2007). "This is who I am": Identity expressiveness and the theory of planned behaviour. *Psychology & Marketing, 24*(9), 763-785.

Treviño, L. K., & Brown, M. E. (2005). The role of leaders in influencing unethical behaviour in the workplace. *Managing organizational deviance*, 69-87.

Vandenberg, R., & Lance, C. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organization Research Methods, 3(1)*, 4-70.

Vandenberghe, C., Stinglhamber, F., Bentein, K., & Delhaise, T. (2001). An examination of the cross-cultural validity of a multidimensional model of commitment in Europe. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 32*(3), 322-347.

Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004). *Misbehaviour in organizations: Theory, research, and management.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vartia, M. A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and observers of bullying. *Scandanavian Journal of Work, Environment, & Health, 27*(1), 63–69.

Welbourne, J. L., Gangadharan, A., & Sariol, A. M. (2015). Ethnicity and cultural values as predictors of the occurrence and impact of experienced workplace incivility. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 20*(2), 205.

Wheeler, J., and Caggiula, A. R. 1966. The contagion of aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2*(1), 1–10.

Wilkerson, J. M., Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. D. (2008). A test of coworkers' influence on organizational cynicism, badmouthing, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(9), 2273-2292.

Yildiz, B., Alpkan, L., Ates, H., & Sezen, B. (2015). Determinants of constructive deviance: the mediator role of psychological ownership. *International Business Research, 8*(4), 107-121.

Table 1-Scale descriptive statistics, loadings and reliability (Sample 2)

Items	Mean	S.D.	Factor loadings	Alpha if item deleted
1.Concentrate on my work ignoring other's activities.	3.36	1.34	.67	.83
2.Also, involve in those activities if they conform to group norms just to be part of the team.	3.06	1.42	.70	.82
3.Think about my career before I confront anyone about his/her involvement in certain behaviours.	3.28	1.36	.87	.84
4.Wait for someone to confront the person involved in such behaviours.	3.02	1.30	.80	.83
5.Decide how to deal with the problem and make sure to do it.	3.87	1.07	.82	.83
6.Encourage the people affected to report to their supervisors about it.	3.62	1.23	.78	.83
7.Intervene if the organizational output or my deliverable is impacted.	3.36	1.32	.71	.82
8.Confront anyone involved in such activities.	3.33	1.23	.86	.82
9.Get help from the management	3.54	1.21	.64	.83

TABLE 2-Scale descriptive statistics, loadings and reliability (Sample 3)

Items	Mean	S.D.	Factor loadings	Alpha if item deleted
1.Concentrate on my work ignoring other's activities.	3.19	1.02	.80	.79
2.Also, involve in those activities if they conform to group norms just to be part of the team.	2.09	1.17	.57	.78
3.Think about my career before I confront anyone about his/her involvement in certain behaviours.	2.98	1.29	.70	.78
4.Wait for someone to confront the person involved in such behaviours.	2.76	1.09	.84	.78
5.Decide how to deal with the problem and make sure to do it.	3.09	1.03	.77	.76
6.Encourage the people affected to report to their supervisors about it.	3.05	1.13	.79	.75
7.Intervene if the organizational output or my deliverable is impacted.	2.93	1.20	.79	.75
8.Confront anyone involved in such activities.	2.71	1.12	.86	.75
9.Get help from the management	2.97	1.10	.76	.76

TABLE 3- Mean, standard deviations, correlations and reliability estimates of Sample 5

Scales	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1. Overall Witness Behaviour scale	3.43	.72	(.79)		
2. Organizational citizenship behaviour	3.30	.75	.65**	(.82)	
3. EVLN scale	2.65	.98	.57**	.58**	(.91)

Reliability estimates are indicated in parenthesis; **p≤ .01

TABLE 4- Mean, standard deviations, correlations and reliability estimates of Sample 6

Scales	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1. Overall witness behaviour scale	3.12	.68	(.77)		
2. Organizational citizenship behaviour	3.14	.69	.58**	(.83)	
3. EVLN scale	2.15	.90	.60**	.55**	(.93)

Reliability estimates are indicated in parenthesis; **p≤ .01

TABLE 5- Fit indices of Confirmatory factor analysis for testing discriminant validity of the new scale in Sample 5.

Model	χ^2	Df	χ^2/df	CFI	IFI	TLI	RMSEA
1. Model 1 Witness beahvior Vs. Constructive deviance							
One factor model	1233.80**	230	5.36	.61	.61	.57	.14
Two factor model	461.51**	226	2.04	.91	.91	.90	.06
2. Model 2 Witness beahvior Vs. destructive deviance							
One factor model	1142.53**	299	3.82	.78	.78	.76	.11
Two factor model	496.11**	295	1.68	.95	.95	.94	.05

n=233, **p<=.001; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; IFI=Incremental Fit Index; TLI= Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA= Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation.

TABLE 6-Fit indices of Confirmatory factor analysis for testing discriminant validity of the new scale in Sample 6.

Model	χ2	Df	χ 2/df	CFI	IFI	TLI	RMSEA
1. Model 1 Witness beahvior Vs. Constructive deviance							
One factor model	1660.53**	230	7.22	.53	.54	.49	.17
Two factor model	523.06**	226	2.32	.90	.90	.90	.07
2. Model 2 Witness beahvior Vs. destructive deviance							
One factor model	1823.42**	299	6.10	.64	.65	.61	.15
Two factor model	660.97**	295	2.24	.91	.92	.91	.07

n=222, **p<=.001; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; IFI=Incremental Fit Index; TLI= Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA= Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation.

TABLE 7-Mean, standard deviations, correlations and reliability estimates of Sample 5

Scales	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1.Overall Witness beahvior scale	3.43	.72	(.79)			
1. Affective commitment	4.04	.69	.34**	(.90)		
2.Work engagement	3.82	.81	.42**	.54**	(.88)	
3.Job satisfaction	4.00	.80	.28**	.78**	.48**	(.89)

TABLE 8-Mean, standard deviations, correlations and reliability estimates of Sample 6

Scales	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1.Overall Witness beahvior scale	3.13	.68	(.77)			
2.Affective commitment	3.88	.93	.36**	(.95)		
3.Work engagement	3.36	.97	.52**	.60**	(.94)	
4.Job satisfaction	3.83	.97	.36**	.89**	.63**	(.91)

TABLE 9-Fit indices for Multigroup analysis

Model	χ2	Df	χ 2/df	CFI	IFI	TLI	RMSEA
Model 1	82.65**	36	2.30	.96	.97	.93	.05
Model 2	94.22**	43	2.24	.96	.96	.93	.05
Model 3	111.28**	54	2.21	.95	.95	.94	.05
Model 4	125.35**	63	2.59	.95	.95	.94	.06

**p<=.001; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; IFI=Incremental Fit Index; TLI= Tucker- Lewis Index; RMSEA= Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation.