

Antecedents and Consequences of Workplace Deviance: A Literature Review with Suggestions for Future Studies

Cansu TANYOLAÇ¹

Abstract

The reason for the growing interest in the topic of 'workplace deviance' is the prevalence of the deviant behavior in almost all organizations. Each year numerous organizations experience substantial financial and non-monetary costs caused by deviant behavior of their employees. Therefore, it becomes important to understand more deeply the antecedents of the workplace deviance in order to take the necessary precautions. In recent years, the literature regarding workplace deviance has been enriched by research studies examining the reasons and outcomes of employee deviant behavior. This literature review will contribute to the existing literature with its two main findings. First, there are few studies that have examined the interrelationships between the antecedents of deviant behavior. Second, despite many studies regarding the negative aspects of workplace deviance, some studies draw attention to the possible positive consequences of deviant behavior in the organization. These findings will help to develop better theoretical insights for the topic workplace deviance.

Keywords: Workplace deviance, deviant behavior, organizational behavior

JEL Classification: M12, M54

İş Yeri Sapkılığının Ardılları ve Sonuçları: Gelecek Çalışmalar İçin Öneriler İçeren Bir Literatür Taraması

Özet

İş yeri sapkılığı' konusuna duyulan ilginin giderek artmasının nedeni, hemen hemen her örgütte iş yeri sapkılığının yaygın hale gelmiş olmasıdır. Her yıl sayısız örgüt, çalışanlarının iş yeri sapkılığı davranışlarından kaynaklanan önemli maddi ve maddi olmayan maliyetlere maruz kalmaktadır. Bu yüzden, gerekli önlemlerin alınması için iş yeri sapkılığının ardıllarının derinlemesine anlaşılması önemli hale gelmektedir. Son yıllarda, iş yeri sapkılığı ile ilgili literatür, çalışanların sapkın davranışlarının nedenlerini ve sonuçlarını inceleyen araştırmalarla zenginleşmiştir. Bu literatür taraması ise, mevcut literatüre iki temel bulgusuyla katkı sağlayacaktır. Birincisi, literatürde iş yeri sapkılığının ardılları arasındaki karşılıklı ilişkileri inceleyen çok az çalışma bulunmaktadır. İkincisi, literatürde iş yeri sapkılığının olumsuz yönleri ile ilgili çok sayıda çalışma mevcut olmasına rağmen, bazı araştırmalar örgüt içerisindeki sapkın davranışın olası olumlu sonuçlarına dikkat çekmektedir. Bu bulgular, iş yeri sapkılığı konusu ile ilgili daha iyi kuramsal bilgiler geliştirmeye yardımcı olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İş yeri sapkılığı, sapkın davranış, örgütsel davranış

JEL Sınıflandırması: M12, M54

¹PhD Candidate, Hacettepe University, Department of Business Administration, cansutanyolac@hacettepe.edu.tr, orcid.org/0000-0002-0016-2304

1. Introduction

The concept ‘deviant behavior’ has been defined as “*voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both*” (Robinson and Bennett, 1995: 556). As can be understood from the definition, for a behavior to be considered deviant it must include an intentional desire of damaging the organization. Additionally, deviant behavior may or may not be legally acceptable; however, first and foremost it is contrary to the general social norms (Agwa, 2018). ‘Stealing from the company’, ‘gossiping about co-workers’, ‘taking excessive breaks’ and ‘verbal abusing’ are different forms of workplace deviance. In their study Robinson and Bennett (1995) have classified the workplace deviance into two categories and have also identified four types of deviant behavior. These categories are determined by the target to whom deviant behavior is directed. A deviant behavior can be directed at the organization or its members (Lawrence and Robinson, 2007; Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Firstly, *organizational deviance* refers to deviant behaviors that targets organization and it includes ‘vandalism’, ‘sabotage’, ‘theft’, ‘coming to work late without permission’ or ‘putting little effort into work’. Secondly, *interpersonal deviance* implies deviant acts aimed at other individuals in the organization and comprises behaviors such as ‘physical assault’, ‘making fun of others’, ‘acting rudely’ and ‘blaming co-workers’ (Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Agwa 2018; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Lawrence and Robinson, 2007). Robinson and Bennett (1997) asserted that deviant behavior may also vary from minor forms to serious forms. The potential harmfulness of deviant behavior to the organization or its members determines the severity of this behavior (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). ‘Social loafing’ and ‘unjustified absenteeism’ are examples of minor forms of deviant behavior, whereas severe forms may include ‘physical aggression’ and ‘theft’ (Lawrence and Robinson, 2007). Hereby, target and severity dimensions of workplace deviance specify four specific types of deviance as; *production deviance*, *property deviance*, *political deviance* and *personal aggression* (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). As can be understood from the examples given above, organizational deviance embodies production and property deviance where political deviance and personal aggression take part in interpersonal deviance.

Bennett and Robinson (2000) stated that engaging in one behavior from a family increases the likelihood of employees engaging in another behavior from that family. For this reason, understanding the origins of this behavior is becoming increasingly crucial in terms of preventing harm which deviant behavior creates in the workplace. This study aims to review the existing literature with theoretical background in detail, as well as to make some suggestions for future studies. In the first part of the paper, the antecedents of workplace deviance are explained under two sub-headings. Then, in the second part, the consequences of workplace deviance are discussed. In the next part of the paper, recommendations regarding the prevention of workplace deviance are given. Lastly, in the final part, the main findings and contribution of this literature review are emphasized and some suggestions for future studies are presented as well.

2. Antecedents of Workplace Deviance

Bennett and Robinson (2000) have identified in their studies 19 different “families” of deviant behavior causes. It is obvious that there are many variables mentioned in the studies conducted so far about the reasons of workplace deviance. For instance, in some studies antecedents of the workplace deviance were gathered under four major headings as ‘individual factors’, ‘social factors’, ‘interpersonal factors’, ‘group & role factors’, ‘organizational factors’ and ‘environmental factors’ (Harris and Ogbonna, 2002; Peterson, 2002), while another studies have grouped the causes of deviant behavior as ‘external factors’, ‘leadership factors’ and ‘unit-level factors’ (Götz et al, 2019). Generally, literature on the causes of workplace deviance has identified two basic sources of workplace deviance as situation-based and person-based factors. “Situation-based factors” are generally related with the organizational environment, while “person-based factors” are arising from the personality traits and any other specific characteristics of a person. Although it occurs on an individual level, workplace deviance cannot be attributed solely to the personality characteristics (Appelbaum et al, 2007). In other words, workplace conditions are as effective as personal variables in the emergence of deviant behavior (Appelbaum et al, 2006). Therefore, it would be more comprehensible to classify the antecedents of workplace deviance under these two sub-headings.

2.1. Situation-Based Factors

It is obvious that deviant behavior is strongly related with the integrity and *culture* plays a crucial role in designating this relationship (Kurtz, 2014). In some organizations deviant behavior can be normalized. One of the most common factors that encourage workplace deviance is *toxic organization*. This century, in which organizations seek variety of ways to survive under the conditions of advance technology and tough competition, challenges the generally accepted views of ethical behavior. Therefore, in some organizations survival is much more appreciated than conforming to organizational norms. Small working units with intensive face-to-face communication provide the basis for a toxic organization as well (Sims, 1992). Generally, honest people are expected to be loved in any organization (Appelbaum et al, 2006). However, in toxic organizations dishonesty and deceitfulness can be tolerated and even supported in the case it brings success to the company (Sims, 1992). Similarly, *ethical climate* should be considered as one of the most important factor which triggers not only the unethical behavior (Robinson and Bennett, 1995) but also workplace deviance. Studies have reported that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of ethical climate and the types of workplace deviance (Appelbaum et al, 2005). Undoubtedly, *norms* have substantial impact on the emergence of deviant behavior as well. Götz et al (2019) stated that norms set explicit and implicit standards that guide the behavior of the group members. For this reason, it becomes crucial to decide which behavior of the individual will be considered as deviant behavior. This is because even a single organization can have many dissimilar organizational levels and different normative reference groups.

“Social exchange theory” provides a framework that explains the relationship between workplace deviance and supervisory mistreatment (Thau et al, 2008). This theory suggests that when supervisors engage in abusive behavior, employees are more likely to behave improperly in order to restore the balance in their exchange relationship (Bennett and Robinson, 2000). According to ‘social exchange theory’, *organizational politics* may also lead employees to engage in deviant behavior by creating an imbalance in the exchange relationship between employee and the organization. To put it differently, when employees perceive their working environment as political, they are more likely to engage in negative behavior in order to rebalance the employment relationship (Crawford et al, 2019).

Another factor that has initiates workplace deviance is *operational environment* of the firm. According to Baucus and Near (1991) and Appelbaum et al (2006), larger firms that operate in a dynamic environment with greater resources pave the way for engaging in illegal behavior. Moreover, employees working part-time and having low-paying positions are more prone to deviant behavior (Baucus and Near, 1991). *Job characteristics* like serving alcohol, handling guns, employee’s contact with the public, supervising others, carrying out security functions also play a large role in conducting deviant behavior (Appelbaum et al, 2005). *Job design* and *control systems* have also significant impact on the occurrence of workplace deviance. Some jobs are designed in a way that employees may take advantage of or misuse organizational resources. Likewise, certain jobs involve operations such as home delivery of food services which cash transactions cannot be directly monitored (Weitz and Vardi, 2007). Components of *organizational structure*, especially ‘centralization’ and ‘formalization’, may lead employees to deviant behavior as well (Marasi et al, 2018). In addition to all these organizational factors, *job stressors* (i.e. workload), *lack of control over the work environment*, *weak sanctions for rule violations*, *normlessness*, *organizational changes* such as “downsizing” can also be accounted for workplace deviance (Agwa, 2018; Appelbaum et al, 2005; Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Appelbaum et al, 2006). It is clear that a stressful work environment is more likely to lead employees to behave improperly.

In addition to the events taking place at the organizational level, attitude and behavior of the managers can also affect the workplace deviance. *Actual behavior of top management* affects ethical climate of the organization significantly (Appelbaum, 2005). Recognizedly, the best way to promote a behavior is to set an example for that behavior. Therefore, deviant behavior can be attributed to the *lack of a moral leader and role model* (Appelbaum et al, 2006; Appelbaum et al, 2007). A well-known example is Bernie Ebbers, the former CEO of WorldCom. Although Ebbers' managerial skills helped the company to succeed, the lack of moral leadership led to the collapse of the company (Trevino and Brown, 2005). If leaders do not behave ethically and there is no manager in the organization who communicates explicitly and frequently about the code of ethics, the occurrence of deviant behavior will be increased. It is possible to say that the absence of an ethical and open climate that dominates the organization makes employees more likely to behave unethically. In addition, whether or not the leader's behavior is rewarded,

increases the likelihood that employees will imitate their behavior (Appelbaum et al, 2007).

Abusive supervision is another factor related to managers' attitudes and behaviors that leads to workplace deviance. Abusive supervision has also detrimental effect on individual's basic psychological needs in a way that fosters employees to engage in deviant behavior. Valle et al (2019) stated that employees with abusive supervisors are more likely to engage in moral disengagement and thereafter in organizational deviance. Besides, this relationship is found stronger when the leader-member exchange is high. Also in the study of Thau et al (2008) a positive relationship is found between abusive supervision and organizational deviance. Another important finding is that this relationship was stronger when authoritarian management style was low. As it is understood, *management and leadership style* have a significant impact on the occurrence of deviant behavior within the organization. In line with 'social learning theory', deviant behavior of employees may more sensitive to negative behaviors of their leaders (Qi et al, 2020). Erkutlu (2017) revealed in his study that 'benevolent leadership' is more likely to decrease deviant behavior of employees. The reason is that, satisfaction and trust between the leader and employees increases when the leaders use benevolent leadership. This finding is also suggested by 'social exchange theory'. Similarly, in their study Zheng et al (2020) found out that there is a negative relationship between 'authoritarian leadership' and employee deviance under certain conditions. In other words, when the leader is authoritarian rather than benevolence, followers feel high resource dependency on their leader, subsequently authoritarian leadership deter deviant behavior of employees. On the other hand, many other studies have shown that authoritarian leadership leads employees to deviant behavior at workplaces (Qi et al, 2020). This is because authoritarian leadership style is perceived as restrictive and domineering by employees. The important point here is that what kind of leadership will prevent workplace deviance can vary depending on the situation. In addition to the management and leadership style, *organizational control and power* can also foster workplace deviance within the organization. Although these variables can be considered to restrain deviant behavior, they can also be a trigger for the emergence of the deviant behavior as well (Lawrence and Robinson, 2007).

Perceptions of the employees regarding the work environment play a substantial role in triggering deviant behavior as well. *Job satisfaction* is a significant variable which is strongly related to the likelihood of an employee engaging in deviant or unethical behavior. That is, when job satisfaction increases then the possibility of ethical rule violation decreases. It is also possible that an employee with a high level of job satisfaction has a high level of commitment to the organization as well. Such employees are sensitive to obey the rules laid down at work. In the study of Lee and Allen (2002) *job affect* and *job cognition* are found to be related with the deviant behavior as well. In another study, Xiao et al (2018) stated that job insecurity was related with the both organizational and interpersonal deviance. Moreover, Galperin and Burke (2006) found out that *workaholism* contributes to deviant deviance.

Organizational justice is also a significant predictor of workplace deviance. If a wrong behavior is punished in the organization, other employees realize that there is a fair punishment system. On the contrary, if a wrong behavior is rewarded, injustice is felt among the employees. In their study Syaebani and Sobri (2011) have found that organizational justice perception have a significant impact on the occurrence of the deviant behavior. Also “equity theory” asserts that employees perceive inequity in case they experience dissimilar outputs in response to same inputs compared to others. Consequently, they want to restore their sense of inequity either by action or by cognitive adaptations (Appelbaum et al, 2006; Lee and Allen, 2002; De Schrijver et al, 2010). When employees perceive injustice in the organization, they think they are right about violating organizational norms (Appelbaum et al, 2006). As a result, employees tend to engage in deviant behavior (Agwa, 2018). Appelbaum et al (2005) have found that procedural injustice and interactional injustice are negatively related with both interpersonal and organizational deviance. On the other hand, they found no correlation between distributive injustice and any type of deviant behavior.

According to “social bonding theory”, if ties to the social order are strong then social controls are strengthened. As a result, individuals’ motives are constrained and they will less likely to behave in a deviant way (Galperin and Burke, 2006). When viewed from the aspect of this theory, *organizational commitment* can influence workplace deviance behavior by affecting the ethical climate of the company (Appelbaum et al, 2005). As organizational commitment decreases, it can be said that employees are less motivated to behave properly and ethically. In contrast, when employees are loyal to their jobs and passionate about their workplace, they are most likely to engage in ethical behavior. However, this is not always the case. Appelbaum et al (2006) pointed out the presence of the studies which have results in the opposite direction.

Organizational frustration arising from the stressful work environment or from any other causes can also become a job stressor by affecting the physical and mental health of employees (Appelbaum et al, 2006; Bennett and Robinson, 2000). Also, discrepancies between current and ideal state can create frustration for employees (Lawrence and Robinson, 2007). Therefore, when employees feel frustration about their company, they are more likely to react in a deviant way. On the contrary, in the presence of *organizational citizenship behavior* - when employees care about their work and feel ready to give discretionary effort for the sake of their companies - it can be said that workplace deviance will be diminished (Bennett and Robinson, 2000; Appelbaum et al, 2007). In other words, organizational citizenship behavior enables organizations to run efficiently by spreading conscientiousness and courtesy (Appelbaum et al, 2006). Studies have indicated that when organizational citizenship behavior within the organization increases, both interpersonal and organizational deviance decrease. On the contrary, exceptional cases are investigated by some of the studies. For instance, Fox et al (2012) found out that organizational citizenship behavior and deviant behavior may relate positively. Therefore, it becomes important to make clear that under what circumstances

organizational citizenship behavior and deviant behavior will relate negatively or positively with each other.

According to “social learning theory”, a *deviant role model* in a community may influence others in terms of misbehaving (Appelbaum et al, 2006). It is clear that employees’ perceptions about their leaders affect their behaviors and attitudes substantially (Erkutlu and Chafra, 2013). Also “social information-processing theory” asserts that individuals adapt their behavior depending upon consequences that are observed but not experienced directly (Vardi and Weitz, 2016). It means that *group behavior* in the workplace has a significant impact on employees in terms of triggering the deviant behavior. First, individuals within the group affect both others and are influenced by others (Appelbaum et al, 2005). That is, they can model each other's good and bad behavior. Second, even if employees do not believe that they are doing the right things, they can behave like them to be accepted by others. Appelbaum et al (2006) stated that people who generally interact with each other, such as friends and peers, are tend to participate in deviant behavior because of the ‘need for acceptance’. In summary, when employees perceive unfavourableness in their current situation at work, they are more likely to violate norms and engage in workplace deviance (Colbert et al, 2004). Also it should not be forgotten that due to the time and context limitations in terms of the type of deviant behavior that employees may engage, the deviance may take place in a distinct way based on the constraints of a specific situation (Bennett and Robinson, 2000).

2.2. Person-Based Factors

As mentioned before, person-based factors depend on the individual's personality, emotions and other specific characteristics regardless of the situation and environmental factors. It would not be wrong to say that *personality traits* are at the top of the person-based factors (Guay et al, 2016). Studies have shown that *Big 5 personality traits* and *dark triad personality traits* can affect the occurrence of workplace deviance (Baharom et al, 2017). Guay et al (2016) stated that the traits ‘conscientiousness’ and ‘agreeableness’ are closely related with both interpersonal and organizational deviance. Their study has shown that low levels of conscientiousness and agreeableness induce low levels of organizational commitment and employees with low levels of organizational commitment are more prone to engage in deviant behavior. Studies have also concluded that traits such as *machiavellianism* are related with both interpersonal and organizational deviance (Appelbaum et al, 2005). Since a machievallist individual who believes that “the ends justify the means” will not hesitate to exhibit bad behavior to achieve her/his purpose. According to Galperin (2012) machiavellianism is an important variable for the prediction of “constructive deviance” as well. In their study Xiao et al (2018) found out that employees with higher levels of *locus of control* are less likely to engage in deviant behavior. Additionally, personality characteristics like *neuroticism, feelings of anger, low conscientiousness, lack of control, frustration and dissatisfaction* are variables that associated with the workplace deviance (Bennett et al, 2018).

Other important person-based factors which trigger workplace deviance are *moods*, *emotions* and *affects*. According to “Affective Events Theory” (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) workplace events result in either positive or negative affective states, in turn, attitudes and behaviors of employees are shaped (Restubog et al, 2013). Therefore, *negative affectivity*, which expresses the individual's degree of experiencing negative emotions such as anger and hostility, has a direct effect on the individual's workplace deviance behavior. Studies have shown that people with high negative affectivity levels are more likely to encounter negative moods independent of any other specific stimulus (Appelbaum et al, 2006).

Some of the *demographic characteristics* like *gender*, *tenure*, *education* and *age* have an effect on deviant behavior as well. First, men are more likely to exhibit aggressive behavior in contrast with women (Chernyak et al, 2018; Appelbaum et al, 2005). Chernyak et al (2018) also expressed that these differences of gender on workplace deviance can be caused by psychological factors such as stress-relating problems, low levels of self-esteem, lack of confidence etc. Additionally, as the tenure, education level and age of the employees decrease, the likelihood of employees engaging in deviant behavior increases (Appelbaum et al, 2005). In other words, employees who are young and new to the job are more likely to commit production and property deviance (Baucus and Near, 1991; Appelbaum et al, 2005). On the contrary, older and tenured employees are tend to more committed to their work and motivated to act properly and ethically. In some of the studies both situation-based and person-based factors were analyzed as antecedents of workplace deviance. For instance, Colbert et al (2004) demonstrated the interactive effects of personality and perception of the work situation on the deviant behavior in their study. To conclude, managers should bear tremendous responsibility in terms of detecting the antecedents of the deviant behavior in the workplace and endeavor to minimize them.

3. Consequences of Workplace Deviance

First of all, different kinds of deviant behavior result in variety of negative consequences (Appelbaum et al, 2007). Regardless of whether the deviant behavior includes vandalism, sexual harassment, rumor spreading etc., it is obvious that workplace deviance can create many negative impacts on both organization itself and employees in the organization (Appelbaum et al, 2006). Many studies have shown that all these negative impacts may damage the overall well-being of the company and incline a decrease in the performance (Dunlop and Lee, 2004; Harris and Ogbonna, 2002). Bennett et al (2018) asserted that the costs of workplace deviance could be grouped into three categories such as *monetary costs*, *mental (emotional) costs* and *societal costs*. Among these, one of the most frequently mentioned negative result in literature is the *financial cost* experienced by organizations. Many organizations continue to lose millions of dollars stemming from employee theft and sabotage (Agwa, 2018; Appelbaum et al, 2007). Dunlop and Lee (2004) and Hussain et al (2014) point out that organizations have also some hidden costs arising from the fact that the company does not operate at maximum efficiency in the presence of deviant behavior.

In addition to the financial impacts of workplace deviance there are many other severe outcomes in terms of employees like *stress-related problems, decreased productivity, lost work time, low morale and performance, high turnover rates and forced to quit* (Appelbaum et al. 2006, Agwa 2018, Appelbaum et al, 2007). Considering all these negative effects of workplace deviance to the organization, it becomes crucial for managers to determine the variables that cause workplace deviance in detail.

4. Recommendations on Preventing Workplace Deviance

In order to prevent deviant behavior in the workplace, firstly *a clear philosophy and mission statement* should be formulated throughout the company. However, this precaution alone is not enough, it should be monitored by the managers either. At the same time managers should *encourage their employees* to act in an ethical way. Other precautions for deviant behavior are *paying attention to subcultures, reviewing norms and creating ethical core values in the workplace* (Appelbaum et al, 2007).

It is easy to guide the behavior of employees when managers can understand different values held in the subcultures (Appelbaum et al, 2005). Creating ethical core values is crucial for the company in terms of sustaining “subjectivity” as well. Bowles and Gelfand (2010) claim that evaluation of norm-violating behavior is not subjective because according to the sociological literature, deviant behavior of the lower-status employees will be criticized more harshly than the higher-status employees. Therefore, internalizing an ethical guideline throughout company will help managers carry out sound judgments. Another important point is that managers should put themselves into their employees’ shoes in order to understand the background of the deviant behavior from the perspective of the perpetrator. It helps managers to perceive lower moral violation as well as to make attributions to external factors rather than internal factors (Fiori et al, 2016). Managers should also not forget the assumptions of “social labeling theory”. According to the ‘social labeling theory’, if a person is labeled as a deviant by a group then this person is considered deviant. Therefore, deviance is not required to be associated with a specific kind of behavior; it can be only a “perception” (Hussain et al, 2014).

Presence of a toxic handler can aid to the organization in terms of dealing with the toxic environment (Appelbaum et al, 2005). *Frequent background checks and detailed screening in HR department* can be useful when recruiting new employees (Appelbaum et al, 2007; Bennett and Marasi, 2016). On the other hand, if positive deviant behavior dominates in an organization such as *whistle blowing* that detects illegal behavior, it should be supported (Appelbaum et al, 2007). Another point of view is that noticeable deviant behavior such as theft and sabotage can be considered as a signal so that the company take precaution (Bennett and Marasi, 2016). Of course, there are multiple techniques and number of ways to deter and reduce the workplace deviance in the organization; however, it should not be forgotten that all these methods come at price. For this reason, managers should conduct a detailed cost-benefit analysis while they are trying to minimize the workplace deviance (Bennett and Marasi, 2016).

Lastly, *formal sanction systems* can deter the workplace deviance, however managers should also pay attention to the existence of social sanctions in the organization that support unethical behavior. In his study Warren (2019) found that even undetected and minor social sanctions among employees may induce the permanence of the workplace deviance. On the other side, managers should be aware of the some functional outcomes of the workplace deviance as well (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). For example, making a phone call during work time in order to make sure a family member's well-being may increase the overall performance of an employee (Bennett and Marasi, 2016).

5. Conclusion and Suggestions for Future Studies

This literature review has two main findings which will contribute to existing literature by developing better theoretical insights for the topic workplace deviance. First, there are many different studies which focused on the definition, measurement, reasons and the outcomes of the deviant behavior. Among these studies, there are miscellaneous findings that have addressed the antecedents and consequences of workplace deviance. As stated previously, there are various reasons that increase the likelihood of deviant behavior of employees and these factors are interrelated with each other. Besides, the above-mentioned factors can directly or indirectly affect the workplace deviance. In literature, however, there are few studies that have examined the combined effect of both situation-based and person-based factors on the emergence of the workplace deviance. Despite extensive body of research on workplace deviance, more studies are needed to investigate the interrelationships between the antecedents of deviant behavior. Considering that the antecedents of workplace deviance are interrelated with each other, it will be more useful to conduct such comprehensive studies. Also, it is important to make a clear distinction between interpersonal and organizational deviance as they may have different kinds of antecedents. Second, there are many studies regarding the negative aspects of workplace deviance, however some studies also address the possible positive consequences of deviant behavior in the organization. For this reason, more research with different perspectives should be conducted that highlight the potential positive outcomes of workplace deviance. If these positive results can be determined in future studies, it will be easier for managers to deal with deviant behavior and this behavior may even be an opportunity in terms of improving overall performance and well-being of the organization.

References

- Agwa, A. M. F. (2018), *Workplace Deviance Behaviors*, In: Leadership, IntechOpen, London.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J., Lay, M. (2005), "The Relationship of Ethical Climate to Deviant Workplace Behaviour", *Corporate Governance*, 5(4): 43-55.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., Matousek, A. (2007), "Positive and Negative Deviant Workplace Behaviors: Causes, Impacts, and Solutions", *Corporate Governance*, 7(5): 586-598.

Appelbaum, S. H., Shapiro, B. T., Molson, J. (2006). "Diagnosis and Remedies for Deviant Workplace Behaviors", *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 9(2): 14-20.

Baharom, M. N., Sharfuddin, M. D. K. B., Iqbal, J. (2017), "A Systematic Review on the Deviant Workplace Behavior", *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 5(3): 1-8.

Baucus, M. S., Near, J. P. (1991), "Can Illegal Corporate Behavior be Predicted? An Event History Analysis", *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(1): 9-36.

Bennett R., Marasi S. (2016), *Workplace Deviance*, In: Encyclopedia of Mental Health, Academic Press, Waltham, MA.

Bennett, R. J., Robinson, S. L. (2000), "Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3): 349.

Bennett, R. J., Marasi, S., Locklear, L. (2018), *Workplace Deviance*, In: Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management, Oxford University Press, USA.

Bowles, H. R., Gelfand, M. (2010), "Status and the Evaluation of Workplace Deviance", *Psychological Science*, 21(1): 49-54.

Chernyak-Hai, L., Kim, S. K., Tziner, A. (2018), "Gender Profiles of Workplace Individual and Organizational Deviance", *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 34(1): 46-55.

Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., Barrick, M. R. (2004), "Interactive Effects of Personality and Perceptions of the Work Situation on Workplace Deviance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4): 599-609.

Crawford, W. S., Lamarre, E., Kacmar, K. M., Harris, K. J. (2019), "Organizational Politics and Deviance: Exploring the Role of Political Skill", *Human Performance*, 32(2): 92-106.

De Schrijver, A., Delbeke, K., Maesschalck, J., Pleysier, S. (2010), "Fairness Perceptions and Organizational Misbehavior: An Empirical Study", *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(6): 691-703.

Dunlop, P. D., Lee, K. (2004), "Workplace Deviance, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Business Unit Performance: The Bad Apples Do Spoil the Whole Barrel", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(1): 67-80.

Erkutlu, H. V. (2017), "Benevolent Leadership and Interpersonal Deviant Behaviors in Higher Education", *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 33(1): 107-124.

Erkutlu, H., Chafra, J. (2013), "Effects of Trust and Psychological Contract Violation on Authentic Leadership and Organizational Deviance", *Management Research Review*, 36(9): 828-848.

Fiori, M., Krings, F., Kleinlogel, E., Reich, T. (2016), "Whose Side Are You On? Exploring The Role of Perspective Taking on Third-Party's Reactions to Workplace Deviance", *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 38(6): 318-336.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., Kessler, S. R. (2012), "The Deviant Citizen: Measuring Potential Positive Relations Between Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(1): 199-220.

Galperin, B. L. (2012), "Exploring the Nomological Network of Workplace Deviance: Developing and Validating a Measure of Constructive Deviance", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(12): 2988-3025.

Galperin, B. L., Burke, R. J. (2006), "Uncovering the Relationship Between Workaholism and Workplace Destructive and Constructive Deviance: An Exploratory Study", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(2): 331-347.

Götz, M., Bollmann, G., O'Boyle, E. H. (2019), "Contextual Undertow of Workplace Deviance by and within Units: A Systematic Review", *Small Group Research*, 50(1): 39-80.

Guay, R. P., Choi, D., Oh, I. S., Mitchell, M. S., Mount, M. K., Shin, K. H. (2016), "Why People Harm the Organization and its Members: Relationships among Personality, Organizational Commitment, and Workplace Deviance", *Human Performance*, 29(1): 1-15.

Harris, L. C., Ogbonna, E. (2002), "Exploring Service Sabotage: The Antecedents, Types and Consequences of Frontline, Deviant, Antiservice Behaviors", *Journal of Service Research*, 4(3): 163-183.

Hussain, I., Sia, S. K., Mishra, P. K. (2014), "Workplace Deviance and the Menace of Some Antecedents: A Review of Extant Literature", *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 5(7): 13-20.

Kurtz, R. S. (2014), "Organizational Deviance, Integrity, and Regulation: The 2008 MT Tintomara Spill", *Public Integrity*, 17(1): 75-89.

Lawrence, T. B., Robinson, S. L. (2007), "Ain't Misbehavin: Workplace Deviance as Organizational Resistance", *Journal of Management*, 33(3): 378-394.

Lee, K., Allen, N. J. (2002), "Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 131-142.

Marasi, S., Bennett, R. J., Budden, H. (2018), "The Structure of an Organization: Does It Influence Workplace Deviance and Its' Dimensions? And to What Extent?", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 30(1): 8-28.

Peterson, D. K. (2002), "Deviant Workplace Behavior and the Organization's Ethical Climate", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1): 47-61.

- Qi, L., Liu, B., Mao, K. (2020), "Spare the Rod and Spoil the Child? A Study on Employee Workplace Deviant Behavior", *Nankai Business Review International*, 11(1): 1-22.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Zagencyk, T. J., Bordia, P., Tang, R. L. (2013), "When Employees Behave Badly: The Roles of Contract Importance and Workplace Familism in Predicting Negative Reactions to Psychological Contract Breach", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(3): 673-686.
- Robinson, S. L., Bennett, R. J. (1995), "A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study", *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2): 555-572.
- Robinson, S. L., Bennett, R. J. (1997), *Workplace Deviance: Its Definition, its Manifestations, and its Causes*, In: *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Elsevier Science, JAI Press, Greenwich.
- Sims, R. R. (1992), "The Challenge of Ethical Behavior in Organizations", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(7): 505-513.
- Syaebani, M. I., Sobri, R. R. (2011), "Relationship between Organizational Justice Perception and Engagement in Deviant Workplace Behavior", *The South East Asian Journal of Management*, 5(1): 37-50.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R. J., Mitchell, M. S., Marrs, M. B. (2008), "How Management Style Moderates the Relationship between Abusive Supervision and Workplace Deviance: An Uncertainty Management Theory Perspective", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1): 79-92.
- Treviño, L. K., Brown, M. E. (2005), *The Role of Leaders in Influencing Unethical Behavior in the Workplace*, In: *Managing Organizational Deviance*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Valle, M., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., Harting, T. (2019), "Abusive Supervision, Leader-Member Exchange, and Moral Disengagement: A Moderated-Mediation Model of Organizational Deviance", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 159(3): 299-312.
- Vardi, Y., Weitz, E. (2016), *Misbehavior in Organizations: A Dynamic Approach*, Routledge, New York.
- Warren, D. E. (2019), "The Persistence of Organizational Deviance: When Informal Sanctioning Systems Undermine Formal Sanctioning Systems", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 29(1): 55-84.
- Weiss, H. M., Cropanzano, R. (1996), *Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of the Structure, Causes and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work*, In: *Research in Organization Behavior: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, Greenwich.

Weitz, E., Vardi, Y. (2007), *Understanding and managing misbehavior in organizations*, In: 21st Century Management: A Reference Handbook, SAGE Publications, London.

Xiao, Z., Wu, D., Liao, Z. (2018), "Job Insecurity and Workplace Deviance: The Moderating Role of Locus of Control", *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(10): 1673-1686.

Zheng, Y., Huang, X., Graham, L., Redman, T., Hu, S. (2020), "Deterrence Effects: The Role of Authoritarian Leadership in Controlling Employee Workplace Deviance", *Management and Organization Review*, 1-28.