

[*This article was accepted on 9th September 2022]

This accepted version was deposited under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial International Licence 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0)

A multigroup SEM analysis of the antecedents and moderating influence of culture on workplace deviance behavior

Kanimozhi Narayanan¹ and Chanki Moon²

¹ Aston Business School, Aston University, UK

² Department of Psychology, School of Social Science, Leeds Beckett University, UK

WORD COUNT: 13,105 (incl. abstract, references, tables and figures; excl. supplement tables)

Cite as: Narayanan, K., & Moon, C. (2022), " A multigroup SEM analysis of the antecedents and moderating influence of culture on workplace deviance behavior", Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-06-2021-0103>

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to **Chanki Moon**, School of Social Science, Leeds Beckett University, Portland Way, Leeds, UK, LS1 3HE. Email: c.moon@leedsbeckett.ac.uk / chanki.moon@outlook.com or **Kanimozhi Narayanan**, Aston Business School, Aston University, UK, B4 7ET. Email: k.narayanan@aston.ac.uk

Ethics Statement:

This study was approved by University of Edinburgh Business School ethics teams.

Funding:

The authors received no specific funding for this work.

Conflict of Interest Statement:

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Contributions: The manuscript was drafted by KN and revised by CM. Data collection and analysis: KN. Both authors approve the final version for submission.

A multigroup SEM analysis of the antecedents and moderating influence of culture on workplace deviance behavior

Abstract

Purpose: Antecedents and outcomes of workplace deviance have been studied over the past few decades but there is still a lack of research from an organizational climate, witness and cultural point of view. Theoretical considerations for the present research are based on the social cognitive theory perspective where we expect employee's involvement in workplace destructive deviance would depend on their organizational climate perception, witness behavior and cultural orientation.

Design/methodology/approach: A total of 987 participants from India ($N=404$) and USA ($N=583$) completed an online questionnaire and multi-group structural equation modelling analysis was conducted to test the hypothesised model.

Findings: Across cultural groups higher collectivism is associated with lower engagement in workplace deviance. Furthermore, employees' higher intervening witness behavior is associated with lower destructive deviant behaviors when employees showed higher endorsement of collectivism in India (not USA). However, employees' higher self-serving witness behavior is associated with higher destructive deviant behaviors. Interestingly, employees with higher endorsement of individualism associated with organizational climate are more likely to engage in destructive deviance.

Originality/value: The main originality of this study is to further increase the understanding of the relationship between organizational climate, witness behavior (self-serving and intervening behavior) and workplace deviance (organizational and interpersonal destructive deviance) considering the role of employees' cultural orientation (Individualism vs. Collectivism).

Keywords: Workplace deviance, cultural orientation, multigroup SEM, witness behavior towards deviance, organizational climate.

Paper type: Research paper.

Introduction

Workplace deviance is defined as, “a voluntary behavior that violates organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization and its employees” (Robinson and Bennett, 1995, p. 556). It has been estimated that workplace deviance results in 20% of business failure and an annual loss of \$6-\$200 billion in US organizations (Diefendorff and Mehta, 2007; cf. Marasi *et al.*, 2018). Coffin (2003) also stated that 33% to 75% of employees engage in deviant activities like withdrawal, theft, production deviance, abusing co-workers etc., and witnessing these behaviors would lead to an increase in dissatisfaction, intention to quit and decline in individual wellbeing (Holm *et al.*, 2019) thus there is a need to understand the cause and impact of these workplace behaviors taking into account employee perceptions.

Previous research on workplace deviance has concentrated on the impact of organizational (justice, trust, culture, ethical climate, organizational stressors, task structure), work (powerlessness, stress) and individual determinants (negative affectivity, impulsivity, frustration) on destructive deviant behaviors (Abbasi *et al.*, 2020; Appelbaum *et al.*, 2005; Chirasha and Mahappa, 2012; Cullen and Sacket, 2003; Fagbohunbe *et al.*, 2012; Henle, 2005; Mackey *et al.*, 2021). However, understanding the perception of the work environment in which an individual works is an important factor that needs to be considered as it is regarded to have a significant implications for employee behaviors like satisfaction, engagement and commitment towards the job (Ahmad *et al.*, 2018). In addition, the reaction of individuals after witnessing workplace deviance and its impact on their own deviance is essential to understand because the individual might accept deviance or make it a culture of deviant behavior among their workgroup (Ferguson and Barry; 2011). Therefore, the present

study set out to understand the relationship between different determinants on workplace destructive deviance. As very few studies have concentrated on the effects of the organizational climate and no studies so far have focused on the effects of witness behavior towards workplace deviance on destructive deviance behavior, the present study will focus on these determinants that have not been researched yet, thus contributing to deviance literature from the witness' perspective.

In addition, more and more studies have been focused on Western countries, but according to the 2020's Report to the Nations report and Kroll's global fraud survey, 201920, Asian countries also have a high percentage of loss amounting to nearly \$20 billion next to the United States of America and Africa. Most of the cases examined in the reports included leak of online information, theft of digital assets, asset misappropriation, code of conduct and financial statement fraud which would fit into the umbrella term of workplace deviance behavior. For example, recent survey results showed a high number of Indian employees reporting misconduct in their organizations (EY Global Fraud Survey, 2016). Also theft, fraud, sabotage, information theft and rude behaviors were suspected to be growing in Indian workplaces (Pradhan and Pradhan, 2014).

Though it is evident that non-western countries do suffer from deviant employee activities, unfortunately, not much is known about the cross-cultural perspective as more research has focused on North America compared to non-western countries. This was further supported by Wang *et al.* (2022) who found that a search of the key word "workplace deviance" in just a single database, PsyncINFO, found that 64% (65/101) of reported research was conducted in North America or Canada. In addition, the studies focused on non-western countries have also paid less attention on the cross-cultural perspective (see Adeoti *et al.*, 2017; Farhadi *et al.*, 2012; Santos and Eger, 2014). Thus, the present study focuses on the cross-cultural perspective using a sample from the USA and India to explore whether culture

moderates the relationship between organizational climate, witness behavior and workplace deviance.

Though deviant behaviors were likely to be discouraged in collectivistic cultures since there is pressure to conform to group norms (Triandis *et al.*, 1988), the above surveys show evidence that Asian countries, including India, are also equally involved in deviance behaviors leading to economic loss. Thus, individual's behavior, despite individuals belonging to the same culture, can vary (Migliore, 2011). Therefore, the present study aims to measure cultural orientation (individualism and collectivism) at the individual level, within countries rather than just assuming individuals from these two countries are individualistic (US) or collectivistic (India).

Therefore the research question that will be addressed by the present research is:

RQ: What is the relationship of organizational and individual perception with workplace destructive deviance when individual cultural orientation acts as a moderator?

Framework and Theoretical Perspective

The present research uses social cognitive theory (SCT) (Bandura, 1977) as the theoretical lens. Social cognitive theory enhances the interaction between organizational factors and individual factors because personality of the individual influences the way in which individuals infer and react to diverse organizational situations. (Henle, 2005). SCT explains a triadic relationship where individual psychological factors, their environment and the behavior the individual engages in, are determinants that influence each other, but not simultaneously (Bandura, 2002). SCT also shows that employees might behave based on their observation of others which then leads to self-corrective judgements and improvement in self-efficacy (Bandura, 2002). The past research on deviance literature has separately examined deviance behaviors with respect to the environment of the individuals (Peterson, 2002;

Applebaum *et al.*, 2005) or their personality within the organizational culture (Judge and Cable, 1997). However, these three variables were not examined together (Bodankin and Tziner, 2009). Thus, the present study aims to fill in this gap by making use of the social cognitive theoretical lens in analysing the theoretical framework. The organizational climate is understood as an environmental factor that an individual has no control over as certain aspects of role behavior are supported by the organization (Zohar and Luria, 2004). The witness behaviour of an individual is understood as a personality variable. This stems from the self-reflective capability of the individual where employees “reflect back on their actions and perceptually determine how strongly they believe they can successfully accomplish the task in the future given the context” (Stajkovic and Luthans, 2003, p. 129). This selfreflection helps the employee in determining their involvement in workplace deviance behavior. In addition, cultural orientation is understood as an individual factor that influences deviance outcomes because a sense of personal efficacy is vital for successful functioning of an individual irrespective of it being achieved individually or as a group. Therefore, based on social cognitive theory we propose that an individual’s capability to partake in deviance behavior would be based on the self-reflective capacity of the individual.

The present study makes several contributions. First, we explore the triadic relationship between organizational climate, witness reaction to deviance, individual cultural orientation and workplace deviance from an individual level. In doing so we respond to studies that have outlined the weakness of carrying out research by considering either organizational or personality variables and never all three together (Bodankin and Tziner, 2009). Second, we make use of multigroup research methods and analyse the effect of cultural orientation of individuals in two different countries contributing to the call for more research on culture at the individual level (Tsui *et al.*, 2007). In doing so, we propose a model that could be implemented across cultures due to the extensive nature of the analysis done. In

addition, our findings have relevance for scholars and practitioners. For scholars, the triadic relationship among the different factors would prove to be useful in developing a deeper understanding of the factors that needs to be considered within organizations to curb deviance. For practitioners, the findings could reinforce the importance of considering witness reactions among employees which can potentially enhance or constrain an individual's decision to engage in workplace deviance.

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Organizational Climate and Workplace Deviance

Climate is a wide array of organizational and perceptual variables that reflect individual-organizational interactions (Howe, 1977). According to Peterson (2002), climate has the most significant effect on the behavior of the employees because it influences their attitude and behavior. Employees' perceptions of the current climate in organizations has paved the way to understand employees and their behaviors (Ahmad *et al.*, 2018; Holloway, 2012). This work environment can have significant consequences on both the organization and individual as the climate is expected to affect the employee's motivation, commitment, behavior and attitudes, which in turn predict an organization's productivity (Adenike, 2011; Berberoglu, 2018). An individual employee's perception of their work environment can lead to an assessment of organizational well-being (Kanten and Ulker, 2013). Borry (2017) suggests that when organizational climate is strict towards deviant employee behavior, then employees restrain themselves from becoming involved in such behavior. In addition, the perceived severity of sanctions for an individual's behavior from management and coworkers was found to be strongly related to an individual's involvement in counterproductive behavior (Ju *et al.*, 2019). The present study aims to determine the effect of positive organizational climate on individual and organizational destructive deviant behaviors with the

perspective that a supportive, warm and structured organizational climate would result in less destructive deviance on the part of the individual. This perspective stems from the view that a supportive environment would lead to a decrease in an individual's involvement in deviance (Appelbaum *et al.*, 2007; Biron, 2010; Kalemci *et al.*, 2019). This study focuses on only the people's experience in their organization and their involvement in deviance, taking into account their own cognitive process as a base for deciding whether or not to engage in deviance with their self-interest and well-being in mind.

Hypothesis 1. (Positive) organizational climate is negatively related to a) organizational and b) interpersonal destructive deviance behavior.

Witness Behavior towards Workplace Deviance Behavior and Workplace Deviance

Direct observation of an event will lead to individuals making their own interpretation of the activity. Porath and Erez (2009) suggested that witnessing interpersonal deviance might prime the interpretation of that deviant individual which may affect peers. According to social information-processing theory, direct observation of activity can provide cues about acceptable behavior in a work environment (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978; cf. Baur *et al.*, 2022). Over time, individuals may perceive that deviance is appropriate and even commendable thereby, leading to less resistance against those activities that are against the norms of the organization as it has become part of the organizational culture (Bandura, 2002; Ferguson and Barry, 2011; cf. Wilkerson and Meyer, 2019). Members look up to their colleagues to determine which behaviors are acceptable in order to advance in the organization (Downe *et al.*, 2016). Individual members are often known to change their behaviors to be close to their peer group's norms and attitudes (Ojala and Nesdale, 2004). Over time, this may result in members becoming similar to one another (Reitz *et al.*, 2014). Thus, this may result in a large group of individuals becoming involved in workplace

deviance in order to be accepted within their group or organization because this has become the new norm. Indeed, Vukelic and colleagues (2019) showed that employees are more likely to report that they are exposed to workplace bullying when they have a perception of their organizational climate where workplace bullying is perceived as common and acceptable behavior. Although several studies have concentrated on bystander intervention focusing on the severity of the behavior on the victim (Bennett *et al.*, 2014; Salmivalli *et al.*, 2011), the present study focuses on the witness's reaction to organizational and interpersonal deviance and its impact on destructive deviance of the individual. The effect of deviance on witnesses or observers is important since it could result in individuals having a diverse response to such behavior based on their evaluation of such deviant activities.

Self-Serving Behavior and Workplace Deviance

Witness reaction to workplace deviance is a two dimensional construct (Narayanan, 2018) consisting of *self-serving* and *intervening* behavior. Self-serving behaviors are those reactions of an individual that are of benefit to themselves after considering their own circumstances while witnessing deviant activities. Being a witness to any act of incivility may result in individuals experiencing negative affectivity as their main concern is their own self (Truss, 2005). In addition, when observing hostility being directed to others, it might have an impact on the behavioral outcomes of the individual themselves since they do not want to become another victim (Porath and Erez, 2009), resulting in frustration, stress and job dissatisfaction (Johan Hauge *et al.*, 2007; Vartia, 2001). Therefore, it is important to understand the relationship between self-serving behavior and workplace deviance as it could have a detrimental effect on individual well-being. Thus, the present study focuses on the relationship between self-serving behaviors and involvement in destructive deviance directed towards the organization and individuals from an individual cognitive perspective. Therefore, the following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypothesis 2. Self-serving behavior is positively related to a) organizational destructive and b) interpersonal deviance behavior.

Intervening Behavior and Workplace deviance

Intervening behavior is another dimension of witness behavior towards workplace deviance where the individual engages in behaviors that could stop or take action against the deviant activities. Research has determined that individuals in a group are less tolerant of deviant behaviors conducted by individuals within their group than those who are out-group because it affects the social identity of members (Marques *et al.*, 2001; Chekroun and Nugier, 2005). The group norm is an important aspect to consider when deciding to take action against deviant behavior. Some groups may oppose behaviors like whistleblowing as it can disrupt the group and violate the obligation and loyalty of the members towards that group whereas some may even oppose reporting or taking actions against a particular behavior because they benefit from engaging in or overlooking such behaviors (Spoelma *et al.*, 2021). Thus, the factors that are known to affect an individual's intent to react or report particular behavior are group characteristics, the member's characteristics and various situational characteristics (Greenberg *et al.*, 1987). Moreover, the direct knowledge of deviance by observers can determine the effect it has on them. According to Ferguson and Barry (2011), direct observation of deviance resulted in a decrease in interpersonal deviance indulgence by observers which was believed to be the experience of target's emotions by the observer and thereby an individual intends to help the victim (Banyard, 2008; Reich and Herschovis, 2015). We believe that individuals would restrain themselves from engaging in negative deviance as they are trying to curb such behaviors. Therefore, the following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypothesis 3. Intervening behavior is negatively related to a) organizational and b) interpersonal destructive deviance behavior.

Individualism and Collectivism

Individualism and collectivism are considered the major dimensions of culture that can explain similarities and differences in the behavior of individuals (Hofstede, 1980; Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1988, 1995). This dimension is often used to describe and predict differences in attitudes, values, behaviors, socialization and individual selfconcept (see Oyserman *et al.*, 2002) and it has been widely used for extensive international comparisons (Taras *et al.*, 2010). However, individuals' behaviors toward others may not be determined by culture itself because not everyone adheres to cultural values in the same way, suggesting that both individualism and collectivism exists in every society and how individuals endorse these values varies within society (Oyserman *et al.*, 2002; cf. Fatehi *et al.*, 2020). Green *et al.* (2005) suggested that individualism and collectivism should also be studied at an individual level and not only at the cross-cultural or inter-individual level. As such, individuals may selectively shape their attitude and preferences from both individual and collectivistic cognitive structures (Triandis, 1995) because individualist and collectivist attitudes are not mutually exclusive (Lampridis and Papastyliaou, 2017). Hence, individuals can have both high or low individualism and collectivism at the same time (Shulruf *et al.*, 2011). Thus, when studying cross-national convergence, it is suggested that individualism and collectivism can also be assessed at an individual level (Oyserman *et al.*, 2002). Taking into account the various approaches suggested in the existing literature, the present study will take individualism and collectivism as separate dimensions to determine behavioral outcomes both within and across cultures.

Individualism and Workplace deviance

Individualism emphasizes individual identity over group identity, thus individuals have an "I" identity over "We" (Triandis, 1995). The roots of these are found in the different perceptions of the self, considering personal interest more important than the groups, looking

out for himself and focusing on personal goal attainment. The identity of the independent self is derived only from the individual's inner attributes, which are considered to reflect the individual's essence, and varies across contexts and time and is unique to an individual (Oyserman et al., 2017). Research focusing on ethics has shown that individualists were more likely to become involved in unethical behavior (e.g., Martin, 2012; Ralston *et al.*, 2014). However, given the self-importance of individualists and their career (Otto and Dalbert, 2012) they would refrain from becoming involved in negative deviance when they feel the organizational climate to be supportive, fair and rewarding, as this would affect their own identity within the organization and personal outcomes.

Hypothesis 4. Individualism will moderate the relationship between organizational climate and destructive organizational and interpersonal deviance behavior as high individualistic orientation will strengthen the relationship while low individualistic orientation will weaken the relationship.

Individuals who give more importance to themselves would have a strong need to belong to the group (Dasgupta, 2011) and focus more on their own career than on others. Being an individualist would lead them to become involved in less destructive deviance because their own performance is important to them and they would make decisions regarding a behavior based on their own achievement without moral consideration (Khatri *et al.*, 2006). In addition, individuals could become involved in intervening behavior since the direct observation of deviance could result in a decrease in interpersonal deviance indulgence by observers as they observe the experience of the target's emotions (Ferguson and Barry, 2011; Kelly and Barsade, 2001). Individualists resist peer pressures to conform to group norms and take a stance for their own views (Pozzoli *et al.*, 2012), thus engaging in less destructive deviance. Thus, the following hypothesis is suggested:

Hypothesis 5. Individualism will moderate the relationship between i. Self-serving and ii. Intervening behavior and destructive organizational and interpersonal deviance behavior as high individualistic orientation will weaken the relationship for self-serving behavior and strengthen the relationship for intervening behavior.

Collectivism and Workplace Deviance

Various cultures are known to have various levels of collectivism (Minkov et al., 2017), suggesting that organizational members should, to a certain degree, have “We” identities to achieve organizational tasks. The individual cultural value is said to influence the expectations of an individual towards his or her job (Ismail, 2016). Collectivists are known to pay more attention to the organizational treatment of co-workers to decide how much they care about and value their contribution (Van Knippenberg *et al.*, 2015) and they base their opinion on the others close to them. Collectivistic individuals give higher priority to team interest than their personal interest (Dierdorff et al., 2011). Thus, people with high collectivistic orientation pay more attention to the needs of others than those with high individualistic orientation. Collectivists are also known to engage in more self-regulation leading to a decrease in workplace deviance (Liu *et al.*, 2009). When determining the individual views on climate perceptions, it has been found that the emphasis placed on fairness varies across cultures and the cultural value of the individual (Erdogan and Liden, 2006; Mueller and Wynn, 2000). When individuals experience more support from the organization, they may become involved in less destructive deviance, taking into account the group well-being. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 6. Collectivism will moderate the relationship between organizational climate and destructive organizational and interpersonal deviance behavior as

high collectivistic orientation will strengthen the relationship while low collectivistic orientation will weaken the relationship.

Individuals focused on the group would feel a strong need to conform to group norms (Chung and Moon, 2011) and may accept the violation of organizational norms. Their collectivistic orientation would lead them to become involved in destructive deviance where being part of the group or organization is important to them (Fock *et al.*, 2011). Individuals would also become involved in constructive deviance as their involvement in constructive deviance would benefit the team and hence their position with the team by being a team player (Vadera *et al.*, 2013). In addition, individuals who become involved in intervening behavior would place an emphasis on one's well-being (Cortina *et al.*, 2021) and being collectivists might lead them to become involved in less destructive deviance as being involved in negative deviance would bring harm to the group to which they belong.

Hypothesis 7. Collectivism will moderate the relationship between i. Self-serving and ii. Intervening behavior and destructive organizational and interpersonal deviance behavior as high collectivistic orientation will strengthen the relationship for self-serving and intervening behavior.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Methods Research Design

The study employed an explanatory, cross-sectional survey design across two different countries. Explanatory design enables the researchers to determine and explain the relationship between organizational climate, self-serving, intervening behavior and workplace deviance behavior with cultural orientation of individualism and collectivism as moderators. As per Zikmund *et al.*'s (2010) suggestion, cross-sectional data was used as it was collected

at a single moment of time. In line with the study's objective and research design, the survey method was chosen as a research strategy for planning and collecting relevant data.

Participants and Data Collection Procedure

The data was collected using Qualtrics panel survey from both India and the USA across different organizations. Qualtrics recruits participants for survey panels through invitation-only to avoid professional survey takers and self-selection of respondents. Out of the 1250 questionnaires sent, 1038 questionnaires were received yielding an 83.04% response rate. The high response rate via panel survey can be attributed to monetary rewards for participation that is known to significantly increase individual's intention to complete the survey (Brosnan *et al.*, 2021). A total of 987 usable questionnaires formed sample 1 (India=404) and 2 (the USA=583). The entirety of sample 1 and sample 2 consisted of 40.9% Indian and 59.1% US respondents. Of the 987 responses, 59.2% were men and 40.8% were women. Employee age, tenure, status, industry and gender are used as control variables as these are known to be related to deviant workplace behavior (Hollinger, 1986; Stamper and Masterson, 2002). The sample characteristics are provided in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Measures

Following the suggestions of Bennett and Robinson (2003) and Marcus and Schuler (2004), the broader terminology of deviance behavior is used in the present research as it provides leeway to theorise the factors that influence these behaviors.

Organizational Climate

The organizational climate was assessed by using Giles (2010) and Heyart's (2011) 22-item scale. It was designed to measure reward, warmth, support and commitment, structure, risk and conflict and standards reflecting on employee perception of the

organization using a 5-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree; e.g., “In this organization we set very high standards for performance”, “It is sometimes unclear who has the formal authority to make a decision”; $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.88$, $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.90$).

Witness Behavior Towards Workplace Deviance

Witness behavior towards workplace deviance (WBTWD) was measured using a scale developed by Narayanan (2018). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they engaged in each of the behaviors during the past year since our focus is on the self-reporting of the individual. Participants answered all the items using the 5-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always; e.g., “Wait for someone to confront the person involved in such behaviors”, “Confront anyone involved in such activities”). For self-serving behavior, the alpha coefficient was $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.75$ and $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.79$ whereas for intervening behavior it was $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.70$ and $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.84$.

Cultural Orientation

Individuals’ cultural orientation was measured using the 16-item scale developed by Triandis and Gelfand (1998) to measure individualism and collectivism. The respondents were asked to rate their agreement on a 5-point scale (1= strongly disagree; 5= strongly agree. e.g., “I’d rather depend on myself than others”, “If a co-worker gets a prize I would feel proud”). The collectivism scale consisted of 8 items and had an internal consistency of $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.86$, and $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.81$. The individualism scale consisted of 8 items and had an internal consistency of $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.80$ and $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.76$.

Workplace Deviance

Workplace Deviance was assessed using the 17-item scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000). The items are grouped into organizational (10 items) and interpersonal deviance (7 items) subscales. Respondents are asked to rate their own deviance behavior on a 5-point scale (1= never, 5= always; e.g., “Taken property from work without permission”,

“Neglected to follow boss’s instruction”, “Cursed someone at work”). The alpha coefficient was $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.93$ and $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.95$ for organizational deviance whereas interpersonal deviance had $\alpha_{\text{India}}=.93$ and $\alpha_{\text{USA}}=.95$.

Results

Multi-group structural equation modelling (MSEM) was conducted using AMOS version 22.0 to test the theoretically developed model (Arbuckle, 2013; Byrne, 2001). We first checked for missing values and common method variance within the datasets and then tested the hypothesised model.

Common Method Bias

Common latent factor method was used to control common method variance by directly measuring a latent factor (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). For Sample 1 ($N_{\text{India}}=404$), model 1 fitted the data well ($\chi^2=3220.64$ ($p<.05$), $Df= 1922$, $\chi^2/df= 1.68$, $CFI=.91$, $TLI= .91$, $RMSEA=.04$). However, model 2, also fitted the data well ($\chi^2=3202.81$ ($p<.05$), $Df= 1921$, $\chi^2/df= 1.67$, $CFI=.92$, $TLI= .91$, $RMSEA=.04$) and in fact, fitted a little better than model 1 $\Delta\chi^2 = (1, N=404)= 17.83$, $p<.05$ but showed only a small difference and decrease in the overall chi-square value. Now, for Sample 2 ($N_{\text{USA}}= 583$), model 1 fitted the data well ($\chi^2=3782.69$ ($p<.05$), $Df= 1922$, $\chi^2/df = 1.97$, $CFI=.92$, $TLI= .92$, $RMSEA=.04$). However, model 2, also fitted the data well ($\chi^2=3695.68$ ($p<.05$), $Df= 1921$, $\chi^2/df= 1.92$, $CFI=.93$, $TLI=.92$, $RMSEA=.04$) and in fact, fitted a little better than model 1 $\Delta\chi^2 = (1, N=583) = 87.01$, $p<.05$ but showed only a small difference and decrease in the overall chi-square value. Thus it is concluded that the method bias had no large effect on the results of the study both in Sample 1 and 2.

Factorial Equivalence of Measures

According to cross-cultural research, a measure of equivalence (measurement invariance) across groups is important and four levels of equivalence have been suggested

(Van de Vijver and Leung, 1997). A multi-group CFA using AMOS 20.0 was conducted to check the equivalence of measures used in the study across cultures (Bentler, 1990). These were conducted in two stages. First, to facilitate group comparisons, it was necessary to establish a baseline model for each group. The baseline model is one where the factor structure of the constructs used in the study is equal in two groups. The factor model structure was tested separately in the Indian and the USA samples. And those factors that affected the model fit were dropped, 9 items were deleted from the organizational climate scale (#4,8,11,12,13,15,16,19,20), 2 items from the organizational deviance scale (#10,12), and 3 items from the culture scale (#6,7,8). The remaining items were used in further analysis.

As suggested by Byrne and Campbell (1999), the χ^2 statistic, CFI (Comparative fit index) and RMSEA were used to test the fit for the samples. The final results showed that except for organizational climate, the factor analyses were consistent with the expected dimensionality for other measures. The organizational climate was taken as a unidimensional factor instead of a second order multi-dimensional factor because the unidimensional factor fit the samples much better. Schneider (2000) and Davidson (2000) suggested that the dimensions of organizational climate would differ depending on the purpose and criterion of the study. The destructive behavior, organizational climate and witness behavior towards workplace deviance, all supported a two-factor solution.

Before proceeding with the invariance analysis it was necessary to determine the fit of the data to the model specified using a baseline model. The discriminant validity of all the 7 scales: Organisational climate, self-serving behavior, intervening behavior, individualism, collectivism, destructive organizational and interpersonal deviance used in the study was analysed using confirmatory factor analysis. The summaries of the fit indices are depicted in Table 2 and 3. The first model is the null model in which all the scales are unrelated. The second model tests the model fit for all the scales by loading onto one single factor

suggesting the participants did not differentiate the scale items. Then the third model includes all scales as separate factors without correlating them, whereas the fourth model includes all scales as separate factors but correlated. Models that are low in χ^2 values and high in CFI and TLI values indicate good model fit. The fit indices of CFI, and TLI vary from 0 to 1 and the acceptable level of fit is above 0.9 or close to unity (Marsh *et al.*, 1988). For a good model fit the Chi-square ratio (χ^2 /df) below 3.0 and as high as 5.0 were suggested as acceptable (Arbuckle, 2013; Marsh and Hocevar, 1985). A good fit would also have an RMSEA value of 0.05 or less (refer to Hu and Bentler, 1999). The improvement of the model fit was tested by calculating the difference of χ^2 values in relation to degrees of freedom ($\Delta\chi^2/\Delta df$) for each model. This test indicated a significant model improvement when comparing the 7-factor uncorrelated model with the correlated model. Thus, the 7 factor correlated model showed a good model fit as the value of TLI= .93, CFI=.93 and RMSEA = .04 in the Indian Sample and the value of TLI= .92, CFI=.93 and RMSEA = .04 in the USA Sample falls under the recommended level of fit and retained for the analyses, thus supporting the baseline model of the constructs and its implementation in further analysis.

Insert Table 2 about here

Insert Table 3 about here

Second, based on the baseline model for each country, the equivalence of the measures across cultures was analysed. Invariance was tested for organizational climate, witness behavior towards workplace deviance, organizational culture, and destructive deviance. Sample 1 (India=404) and Sample 2 (the USA=583) are used for this analysis. The sample means, standard deviation and correlations are displayed in Table 4. The first step was to test whether each of the proposed constructs fits the empirical data from each group (India and the USA) called configural invariance. This was followed by analyses to test invariance

across groups, a baseline model of each construct was analysed to be the same across the two groups. Next, the constructs were tested for metric invariance in which their factor loadings were constrained to be the same, then scalar invariance in which the intercepts were constrained to be the same and finally structural invariance, constraining the factor means were conducted supporting at least partial invariance. The factor scores from the resulting invariance model were used in the final SEM analysis.

Insert Table 4 about here

Hypothesised Model Testing

The standardized scores from the resulting structural invariant models were used to test the hypothesised model. The purpose of this Multi-group SEM is to fulfil the objective of study 1) to determine if the proposed model is acceptable in India and the USA 2) to determine if individualism and collectivism moderate the relationship of climate and witness behavior towards deviance with destructive deviance and 3) to determine that irrespective of the nationality of the individual, the behavioral outcome would be the same for Indians and Americans.

The tested model consists of independent constructs of organizational climate, witness behavior towards workplace deviance, interaction terms: organizational climate \times individualism, organizational climate \times collectivism, Self-serving behavior \times individualism, Self-serving behavior \times collectivism, Intervening behavior \times individualism and Intervening \times collectivism and dependent constructs of destructive behavior (Model 1) to determine the fit of the model across the two groups. First, the main effects were constrained and tested with the baseline model where all the parameters were free and if the fit of the model was good, the moderation parameters were constrained to be equal. Following the recommendations of

Rigdon *et al.* (1998), a model in which the hypothesis parameters (interactions) are fixed to be the same across groups is tested against a model in which the parameters are free. Then a Chi-square difference test can be used along with other fit indices to determine the effects of moderation and the final model that fits the two groups. The results of the constrained and unconstrained models are present in Table 5. The results of the path co-efficient and SE values of the model in which all the parameters are constrained to be the same across India and the USA along with the unconstrained model results to determine the individual country effect are present in Table 6. Figure 1 provides the hypothesised model and the revised model after the analyses is depicted in Figure 2.

Insert Table 5 about here

Insert Table 6 about here

With respect to the Model, all parameters were unconstrained across the two groups and this formed the baseline model ($\chi^2=349.73$; $\chi^2/df =1.99$; TLI= .94; CFI=.98 and RMSEA= .03). Next, the main effects were constrained to be the same across India and the USA. The results showed a good model fit ($\chi^2=362.23$; $\chi^2/df =1.99$; TLI= .94; CFI=.98 and RMSEA= .03). Then the moderation effects were all constrained to be the same across India and the USA. The results show that there was no substantial increase in the fit of the constrained model when compared to the unconstrained model fit ($\chi^2=380.40$; $\chi^2/df =1.92$; TLI= .95; CFI=.98 and RMSEA= .03). Thus, it can be inferred that the same model with the same path coefficients was accepted as adequate for the two groups.

With regard to climate, the Indian sample showed no significant relationship of organizational climate with organizational deviance ($\beta=-.10$, $p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta=.08$, $p=n.s$) deviance. Whereas, in the US sample, it was significant with organizational deviance

($\beta=.21, p<.001$) and interpersonal deviance ($\beta=.19, p<.001$) but in the opposite pattern thus not supporting Hypothesis 1a and 1b. Self-serving behavior showed a significant relationship with organizational ($\beta_{\text{India}}=.46, p<.001; \beta_{\text{USA}}=.28, p<.001$) and interpersonal ($\beta_{\text{India}}=.43, p<.001; \beta_{\text{USA}}=.22, p<.001$) deviance in both the samples supporting Hypothesis 2a and b. Intervening behavior showed no significant relationship with organizational deviance ($\beta_{\text{India}}=-.10, p=n.s; \beta_{\text{USA}}=-.03, p=n.s$) and with interpersonal ($\beta_{\text{India}}=-.07, p=n.s; \beta_{\text{USA}}=-.03, p=n.s$) deviance in the Indian sample, providing no support for hypothesis 3a and 3b.

To determine the moderation effect of individualism and collectivism the paths from organizational climate \times individualism, organizational climate \times collectivism, Self-serving behavior \times individualism, Self-serving behavior \times collectivism, Intervening behavior \times individualism and Intervening \times collectivism to both forms of destructive deviance were all constrained to be the same across India and the USA. The results, when compared with the baseline model, showed that there was a significant difference in the overall model fit when restricting the factor loadings of the interaction paths to be same across the groups ($\Delta\chi^2=30.67, df=22, p>.05$), thus predicting the moderating effect of cultural orientation across the two groups.

In the Indian sample, there was no significant moderation of individualism between climate and destructive organizational deviance ($\beta=.13, p=n.s.$) and interpersonal deviance ($\beta=.14, p=n.s.$), showing no support for hypothesis 4. In addition, collectivism also showed no significant moderation with climate and destructive organizational ($\beta=-.05, p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta=-.12, p=n.s$) deviance showing no support for hypothesis 6. The self-serving behavior showed no significant moderation of individualism and collectivism with both organizational ($\beta_{\text{Individualism}}=-.00, p=n.s; \beta_{\text{Collectivism}}=.02, p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta_{\text{Individualism}}=.03, p=n.s; \beta_{\text{Collectivism}}=.06, p=n.s$) destructive deviance, thus not supporting Hypothesis 5.i and 7.i. The intervening behavior showed no significant moderation of

individualism with organizational ($\beta = .12, p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta = .13, p=n.s$) destructive deviance, thus not supporting hypothesis 5.ii. Collectivism moderated this relationship with organizational ($\beta = .18, p=.02$) and interpersonal ($\beta = -.17, p=.02$) deviance thus, supporting hypothesis 7.ii.

In the American sample, individualism showed a moderation of climate with organizational ($\beta=.13, p=.002$) and interpersonal ($\beta=.12, p=.003$) deviance but in the opposite direction, thus not supporting hypothesis 4. Collectivism showed no moderation of organizational climate with organizational ($\beta=-.02, p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta=-.06, p=n.s$) deviance, thus not supporting hypothesis 6. In addition, individualism and collectivism showed no moderating effect between self-serving behavior and workplace organizational ($\beta_{\text{Individualism}}=.01, p=n.s$; $\beta_{\text{Collectivism}}=.01, p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta_{\text{Individualism}}=-.02, p=n.s$; $\beta_{\text{Collectivism}}=.02, p=n.s$) deviance thus not supporting hypothesis 5.i. and 7.i. Moreover, intervening behavior showed no significant moderation of individualism and collectivism with organizational ($\beta_{\text{Individualism}}=-.05, p=n.s$; $\beta_{\text{Collectivism}}=-.02, p=n.s$) and interpersonal ($\beta_{\text{Individualism}}=-.06, p=n.s$; $\beta_{\text{Collectivism}}=-.01, p=n.s$) destructive deviance thus, not supporting hypothesis 5.ii. and 7.ii. Table 7 provides a list of hypothesis that was and not supported in India and USA.

Insert Table 7 about here

Discussion

The aim of the study was to determine the impact of organizational climate, self-serving and intervening behavior on workplace deviance when cultural orientation of an individual acts as a moderator across India and the USA. Contrary to previous research (e.g. Kanten and Ulker, 2013; Vardi, 2001; Warren, 2003), the climate was found to have a

significant positive relationship with destructive deviance. This can be attributed to the fact that when individuals experience the climate of the organization to be supportive, structured, rewarding and just, they engage in destructive deviance (cf. Kalemci *et al.*, 2019). However, the result may not be impossible to be observed. For example, a recent study found a positive association between friendship with a supervisor and workplace deviance when employees' level of work ethic is high (Ozbek, 2018), which might be indicative of the relationship between higher tolerance of workplace deviance and increased deviant behaviors (Litzky *et al.*, 2006). Thus, as most studies support, employees' close relationship with their team manager and others within the team would help them get away with negative behaviors, but it may be dependent upon how organizational culture and climate are shaped by the built relationship between employees and manager or colleague. More research is therefore required to analyse the extensive relationship between climate and destructive deviance. As expected, the findings of the present study demonstrated the positive association between self-serving behaviors and destructive deviance, indicating that employees high on self-serving behaviors would engage in more destructive deviance as their own career progression is important to them (Otto and Dalbert, 2012) and if becoming involved in deviance would promote their relationship with others in the team then they would be involved in it. Whereas individuals high on intervening behavior would engage in less destructive behavior this can be attributed to their main aim which is to do something about the norm-breaking behavior.

Consistent with the literature (Noordin *et al.*, 2002; Seibert *et al.*, 2001), a significant moderation effect of individualism was found on the relationship between organizational climate and intervening behavior across India and the USA. Contrary to our expectation, individuals high in individualism, when taken together with climate, were engaged in more destructive deviance despite its direct effect. This can be attributed to the nature of the

climate where those organizations that do not differentiate between negative behaviors would inadvertently encourage individualists to make their own rules, as they are socially independent (Murphy and Free, 2016). In addition, the present study found that employees' higher intervening witness behavior is associated with lower destructive deviant behaviors when employees showed higher endorsement of collectivism in India (not USA). That is, intervening individuals high in collectivism would engage in less destructive deviance as their acceptance of norms can be attributed to the group's behavior and perceptions where they do not want to be deemed as deviants (Marques *et al.*, 2001). Also, individuals who witness intervening behaviors would engage in less destructive behavior due to their higher collectivistic values because being a collectivist hinders individuals from becoming a "deviant" (Chung and Moon, 2011). Thus the results support the view that an individual's collectivistic orientation would have an effect on their reaction towards workplace deviant behaviors resulting in less involvement in destructive behaviors.

Finally, overall, the study empirically supported the view that individualistic individuals exist in collectivistic societies and collectivistic individuals exist in individualistic societies i.e. both the independent and interdependent self are present within the same culture consistent with previous research (Singelis, 1994; Shulruf *et al.*, 2011). The results from the constrained model for collectivistic orientation provide support that, irrespective of the nationality of the individual, the outcomes were consistent in the suggested pattern across India and the USA .

Theoretical implications

The study makes three significant contributions. First, the study aimed to test the moderation effect of individual cultural orientation between organizational climate, witness reaction to deviance, and destructive deviance behaviour. The past research on deviance literature has separately examined deviance behaviour with respect to the environment of the

individuals (Peterson, 2002; Applebaum *et al.*, 2005) or their personality within the organizational culture (Judge and Cable, 1997) but all these three variables were not examined together (Bodankin and Tziner, 2009). The present study has made use of social cognitive theory which describes the interactions between a person and their situation (Mischel, 1973). Accordingly, the response of the experience of organizational climate is taken as an organizational variable that is the result of an individual's assessment of a situation/environment at work. The individualistic and collectivistic orientation of an individual is taken as a self-construal concept as it would have varying effects on the behavioral outcomes (Taras *et al.*, 2009). In addition, the witness behavior towards workplace deviance was also included in the model addressing the self-efficacy and self-reflective rationale of the theory (Bandura, 1977). The witness behavior towards workplace deviance along with the individualistic and collectivistic orientation would result in an individual decision whether or not to engage in destructive deviance behavior, taking into account their own cultural orientation as individuals would determine their behavioral outcome based on their observation of others and how it would affect their capability to engage in certain behaviors (Bandura, 1977). The present study proved this interaction empirically, thus contributing towards the deviance literature from SCT perspective. Second, apart from adding to the deviance literature, the findings also made a methodological contribution to SEM literature by simultaneously examining the moderation effect of individualistic and collectivistic orientation of an individual between climate and witness behavior towards workplace deviance with destructive deviance behaviors. To our knowledge, this study has been the first to examine a multigroup SEM by implementing measurement invariance across two countries from a deviance perspective, thus contributing to the existing knowledge of SEM literature (see Van de Vijver and Leung, 1997). Finally, the study makes a contribution to cross-cultural literature as the study tested for individualistic and collectivistic orientations

of an individual within the same culture contributing to the call for research for more research of culture on individual level (Tsui et al., 2007). Thus, a multi-group SEM analysis determined the between group differences (between India and the USA) at an individual level and their contribution to workplace deviance.

Practical Implications

Our research findings have implications for practitioners. First, this would provide managers across the two countries with proof that improving their organizational climate would bring about a change in the behavioral outcome of their employees. They would benefit from getting feedback from their employees regarding the work environment focusing on rewards, structure and support system in the organization/groups that could decrease destructive deviance. Second, the findings also highlight another factor associated with workplace deviance, that is witness reaction to workplace deviance that can potentially enhance or constrain an individual's decision to engage in workplace deviance. The findings reinforce the importance of considering witness's reactions as this might impact on workplace deviance throughout the organization and in worst case become a culture within the organization (Ferguson and Barry, 2011). Finally, the study also provided support that individuals high in collectivism would engage less in destructive deviant behavior. Thus, organizations would benefit from individuals with high collectivism in leadership positions as they would curb destructive deviance in their teams. As teams look up to their leaders who would be role models to review those behaviors that are acceptable or not within the organization (Bedi *et al.*, 2016). Employees with high collectivism would be best as subordinates because their acceptance and involvement in certain behaviors depends on the team, as proved by this study.

Limitations and Future Research

Like every study, the present study is not without its limitations. First, the study was grounded in the social cognitive perspective and the relationships reported were consistent with predictions and theory, however, given that the study follows a cross-sectional design, future research with the longitudinal design will be better suited to address directionality of the relationships examined. Second, the data was obtained from employees at a single point in time in order to understand the individual's perception at that particular time. However, the model would benefit from examining these relationships and the change in individual's actions over a period of time. Future research would benefit from a diary study that records individuals at different time points for a period of 10 to 15 days in order to determine their change in reaction based on different situations. Third, the research focused on employee level to determine the climate perception, witness reaction and its impact on workplace deviance with culture as a moderator. However, future research should focus on a multi-level approach that could take into account both leader and follower perspectives in order to understand the difference in perspectives on climate and witness reaction. This would further the present research findings to explore and support that different individuals accept different behaviors as deviant based on different situations.

Conclusion

The research findings highlight the effect of individualistic and collectivistic orientations on the relationship of organizational climate and witness behavior towards workplace deviance with destructive deviance, thus suggesting that irrespective of the nationality, the individual difference in cultural orientation does exist and that individualists and collectivists coexist in India and the USA. Beyond its organizational implications, this research contributes to the growing awareness of workplace deviance, focusing on the identified factors, and how it could reduce destructive deviance.

Supplementary Analysis

The measurement invariance was tested simultaneously across India and the USA for organizational climate, witness behavior towards workplace deviance, and destructive deviance behavior and invariance in factor loadings present in the factor structure was determined to justify the use of the data in the multigroup SEM analysis. For this analysis, the factor loadings were constrained to be equal across cultures. The resulting probability values were examined; those that were greater than .05 in each model were held, and those that did not were re-estimated with constrained factors being released one-by-one. Smith *et al.* (2001) suggested that relaxing constraints is a function of Chi-square dependence on sample size and not evidence of non-equivalent factor loadings. Byrne (2001) suggested that the significance of $\Delta\chi^2$ between the two models must be examined to determine invariance across the groups. The results presented in the Supplementary material provided strong support for invariance in factor loadings between the Indian and US samples for organizational climate, witness behavior towards workplace deviance, destructive deviance, and cultural orientation. After that, the factor structure was equal between the groups and the hypotheses were tested (see Table S1-S4 in the supplementary document).

References

- Abbasi, A., Baradari, F., Sheghariji, H. and Shahreki, J. (2020). "Impact of Organizational Justice on Workplace Deviance with Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction in SMEs of Malaysia", *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 12 No. 17, pp. 52-63.
- Adenike, A. (2011). "Organizational Climate as a Predictor of Employee Job Satisfaction: Evidence From Covenant University", *Business intelligence journal*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 151-166.

- Adeoti, M. O., Shamsudin, F. M. and Wan, C. Y. (2017). "Effects of occupational stress and workplace spirituality on workplace deviance in academia: A conceptual paper", *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 5 No. 9, pp. 100-106.
- Ahmad, K. Z. B., Jasimuddin, S. M. and Kee, W. L. (2018). "Organizational climate and job satisfaction: Do employees' personalities matter?", *Management Decision*, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 421-440.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J. and Lay, M. (2005). "The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behavior", *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 43-55.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D. and Matousek, A. (2007). "Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions", *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 7 No. 5, pp. 586-598.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2013). *Amos version 22.0*. Chicago, IL: IBM SPSS.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning theory*. New York: General Learning.
- Bandura, A. (2002). "Social cognitive theory in cultural context", *Applied psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 269-290.
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). "Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence", *Violence and victims*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 83-97.
- Baur, J. E., Bradley, B. H. and Bonner, R. L. (2022). "Boiling frogs: Reconsidering the impact of deviance targets, severity, and frequency in teams", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 142, pp. 1026-1037.
- Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C.M. and Green, S. (2016). "A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 139 No. 3, pp.517-536.
- Bennett, R. J. and Robinson, S. L. (2000). "Development of a measure of workplace deviance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 3, pp. 349-360.

- Bennett, S., Banyard, V.L. and Garnhart, L. (2014). "To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp.476-496.
- Bennett, R. and Robinson, S. (2003). "The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research", Greenberg, J (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum, pp. 247-281.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990), "Comparative fit indexes in structural models", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 107 No. 2, pp. 238-246.
- Berberoglu, A. (2018). "Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: empirical evidence from public hospitals", *BMC Health Services Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Biron, M. (2010). "Negative reciprocity and the association between perceived organizational ethical values and organizational deviance", *Human relations*, Vol. 63 No. 6, pp. 875-897.
- Bodankin, M. and Tziner, A. (2009). "Constructive deviance, destructive deviance and personality: how do they interrelate", *Amfiteatru Economic Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 26, pp. 549-564.
- Borry, E. L. (2017). "Ethical climate and rule bending: How organizational norms contribute to unintended rule consequences", *Public Administration*, Vol. 95 No. 1, pp. 78-96.
- Brosnan, K., Kemperman, A., and Dolnicar, S. (2021). "Maximizing participation from online survey panel members", *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 63 No. 4, pp. 416-435.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. London: Erlbaum.
- Byrne, B. M. and Campbell, T. L. (1999). "Cross-cultural comparisons and the presumption of equivalent measurement and theoretical structure: A look beneath the surface",

- Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 555-574.
- Chekroun, P. and Nugier, A. (2005). "I'm ashamed because of you, so please, don't do that!": Reactions to deviance as a protection against a threat to social image", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 479-488.
- Chirasha, V. and Mahapa, M. (2012). "An analysis of the causes and impact of deviant behavior in the workplace. The case of secretaries in state universities", *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, Vol. 3 No. 5, pp. 415-421.
- Chung, Y.W. and Moon, H.K. (2011). "The moderating effects of collectivistic orientation on psychological ownership and constructive deviant behavior", *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 6 No. 12, pp.65-78.
- Coffin, B. (2003). "Breaking the silence on white collar crime", *Risk Management*, Vol. 50 No. 9, pp. 8-10.
- Cortina, L.M., Sandy Hershcovis, M. and Clancy, K.B. (2021). "The embodiment of insult: a theory of biobehavioral response to workplace incivility", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 738-763.
- Cullen, M. J. and Sackett, P. R. (2003). "Personality and counterproductive work behavior", Barrick, M. and Ryan A. M. (Eds.), *Personality and Work*. Jossey-Bass, pp. 150-182.
- Davidson, M. C. G. (2000). *Organisational climate and its influence on performance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland.
- Dasgupta, N. (2011). "Ingroup experts and peers as social vaccines who inoculate the selfconcept: The stereotype inoculation model", *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp.231-246.
- Dierdorff, E. C., Bell, S. T., and Belohlav, J. A. (2011). "The power of "we": Effects of psychological collectivism on team performance over time", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 96 No. 2, pp. 247–262.

- Diefendorff, J. M. and Mehta, K. (2007). “The relations of motivational traits with workplace deviance”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92 No. 4, pp. 967-977.
- Downe, J., Cowell, R. and Morgan, K. (2016). “What determines ethical behavior in public organizations: is it rules or leadership?”, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 76 No. 6, pp. 898-909.
- Erdogan, B. and Liden, R. C. (2006). “Collectivism as a moderator of responses to organizational justice: implications for leader-member exchange and ingratiation”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
- EY Global Fraud Survey (2016). *Corporate misconduct: Individual consequences*. London: EY 14th Global Fraud Survey, pp. 1-47.
- Fagbohunbe, B. O., Akinbode, G. A. and Ayodeji, F. (2012). “Organizational determinants of workplace deviant behaviors: An empirical analysis in Nigeria”, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 7 No. 5, pp. 207-221.
- Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R. and Shahrazad, W. W. (2012), “Agreeableness and conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behavior in workplace”, *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 8 No. 9, pp. 1-7.
- Fatehi, K., Priestley, J. L. and Taasobshirazi, G. (2020). “The expanded view of individualism and collectivism: One, two, or four dimensions?”, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 7–24.
- Ferguson, M. and Barry, B. (2011). “I know what you did: The effects of interpersonal deviance on bystanders”, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 80-94.
- Fock, H., Chiang, F., Au, K.Y. and Hui, M.K. (2011). “The moderating effect of collectivistic orientation in psychological empowerment and job satisfaction relationship”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp.319-328.

- Giles, P., (2010). *The Impact of Adult Degree-Completion Programs on the Organizational Climate of Christian Colleges and Universities*, Doctoral Thesis, Walden University. Minnesota
- Green, E. G., Deschamps, J. C. and Paez, D. (2005). "Variation of individualism and collectivism within and between 20 countries: A typological analysis", *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 321-339.
- Greenberger, D. B., Miceli, M. P. and Cohen, D. J. (1987). "Oppositionists and group norms: The reciprocal influence of whistle-blowers and co-workers", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 6 No. 7, pp. 527-542.
- Henle, C. A. (2005). "Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 247-263.
- Heyart, B. (2011). *The Role of Organizational Climate and Culture in Service Encounters*, Doctoral Thesis, Wayne State University.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). "Culture and organizations", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 15-41.
- Hollinger, R. C. (1986). "Acts against the workplace: Social bonding and employee deviance", *Deviant Behavior*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 53-75.
- Holloway, J. B. (2012). "Leadership behavior and organizational climate: An empirical study in a non-profit organization", *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 9-35.
- Holm, K., Torkelson, E. and Bäckström, M. (2019). "Exploring links between witnessed and instigated workplace incivility", *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 160-175.
- Howe, J. G. (1977). "Group climate: An exploratory analysis of construct validity", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 106-125.

- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
- Ismail, M. (2016). "Cultural Values and Career Goal of Gen-X and Gen-Y: A Conceptual Framework", *Global Business & Management Research*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 1-18.
- Johan Hauge, L., Skogstad, A. and Einarsen, S. (2007). "Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study", *Work & Stress*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 220-242.
- Judge, T. A. and Cable, D. M. (1997). "Applicant Personality, Organizational Culture, and Organization Attraction", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 359-395.
- Ju, D., Xu, M., Qin, X. and Spector, P. (2019). "A multilevel study of abusive supervision, norms, and personal control on counterproductive work behavior: A theory of planned behavior approach", *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 163-178.
- Kalemci, R. A., Kalemci-Tuzun, I. and Ozkan-Canbolat, E. (2019). "Employee deviant behavior: role of culture and organizational relevant support", *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 126-141.
- Kanten, P. and Ulker, F. E. (2013). "The effect of organizational climate on counterproductive behaviors: an empirical study on the employees of manufacturing enterprises", *The Macrotheme Review*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 144-160.
- Kelly, J. R. and Barsade, S. G. (2001). "Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 86 No. 1, pp. 99-130.
- Khatri, N., Tsang, E. W. and Begley, T. M. (2006). "Cronyism: A cross-cultural analysis", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 61-75.

- Lampridis, E. and Papastylianou, D. (2017). "Prosocial behavioural tendencies and orientation towards individualism–collectivism of Greek young adults", *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp.268-282.
- Litzky, B. E., Eddleston, K. A. and Kidder, D. L. (2006). "The good, the bad, and the misguided: How managers inadvertently encourage deviant behaviors", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 91–103
- Liu, W., Steve Chi, S. C., Friedman, R. and Tsai, M. H. (2009). "Explaining incivility in the workplace: The effects of personality and culture", *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 164-184.
- Mackey, J. D., McAllister, C. P., Ellen III, B. P. and Carson, J. E. (2021). "A meta-analysis of interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 597-622.
- Markus, H. R. and Kitayama, S. (1991). "Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 98 No. 2, pp. 224-253.
- Marcus, B. and Schuler, H. (2004). "Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: a general perspective", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 4, pp. 647-660.
- Marques, J., Abrams, D. and Serôdio, R.G. (2001). "Being better by being right: subjective group dynamics and derogation of in-group deviants when generic norms are undermined", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp.436-447.
- Marasi, S., Bennett, R.J. and Budden, H. (2018). "The structure of an organization: Does it influence workplace deviance and Its' dimensions? And to what extent?", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp.8-27.
- Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., and McDonald, R. P. (1988). "Goodness-of-fit indices in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.

103 No. 3, pp. 391-410.

Marsh, H. W. and Hocevar, D. (1985). "Application of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First-and higher order factor models and their invariance across groups", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 97 No. 3, pp. 562-582.

Martin, D. E. (2012). "Culture and unethical conduct: Understanding the impact of individualism and collectivism on actual plagiarism", *Management Learning*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 261-273.

Migliore, L. A. (2011). "Relation between big five personality traits and Hofstede's cultural dimensions: Samples from the USA and India", *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 38-54.

Minkov, M., Dutt, P., Schachner, M., Morales, O., Sanchez, C., Jandosova, J., Khassenbekov, Y. and Mudd, B. (2017). "A revision of Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimension: A new national index from a 56-country study", *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 386-404.

Mischel, W. (1973). "Toward a Cognitive Social Learning Reconceptualization of Personality", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 80 No. 4, pp. 252-283.

Mueller, C. W. and Wynn, T. (2000). "The degree to which justice is valued in the workplace", *Social Justice Research*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 1-24.

Murphy, P.R. and Free, C. (2016). "Broadening the fraud triangle: Instrumental climate and fraud", *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, Vol. 28 No.1, pp.41-56.

Narayanan (2018). "Workplace Destructive and Constructive Deviance Behaviour in India and the USA: Scale Development, Validation, Theoretical Model Development and Testing", *Unpublished doctoral Dissertation*, University of Edinburgh, UK.

Noordin, F., Williams, T. and Zimmer, C. (2002). "Career commitment in collectivist and individualist cultures: A comparative study", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 35-54.

- Ojala, K. and Nesdale, D. (2004). "Bullying and social identity: The effects of group norms and distinctiveness threat on attitudes towards bullying", *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 19-35.
- Otto, K. and Dalbert, C. (2012). "Individual differences in job-related relocation readiness: The impact of personality dispositions and social orientations", *Career Development International*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 168-186.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M. and Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). "Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 128 No. 1, pp. 3-72.
- Oyserman, D., Lewis Jr, N.A., Yan, V.X., Fisher, O., O'Donnell, S.C. and Horowitz, E. (2017). "An identity-based motivation framework for self-regulation", *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 28 No. 2-3, pp.139-147.
- Ozbek, M. F. (2018). "Do we need friendship in the workplace? The theory of workplace friendship and employee outcomes: The role of work ethics", *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, Vol. 58, pp. 53-176.
- Peterson, D. K. (2002). "Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 47-61.
- Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). "Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, 879-903.
- Porath, C. L. and Erez, A. (2009). "Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 109 No. 1, pp. 29-44.
- Pozzoli, T., Ang, R.P. and Gini, G. (2012). "Bystanders' reactions to bullying: A crosscultural analysis of personal correlates among Italian and Singaporean students", *Social Development*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp.686-703.

- Pradhan. S. and Pradhan. R. K. (2014). “Transformational Leadership and Deviant Workplace Behaviors: The Moderating role of Organizational Justice”, paper presented at the First Asia-Pacific Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Social Sciences AP14 Singapore Conference. 1-3 August, ISBN: 978-1-941505-15-1
- Ralston, D. A., Egri, C. P., Furrer, O., Kuo, M. H., Li, Y., Wangenheim, F., ... and Weber, M. (2014). “Societal-level versus individual-level predictions of ethical behavior: A 48society study of collectivism and individualism”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 122 No. 2, pp. 283-306.
- Reich, T. C. and Hershcovis, M. S. (2015), “Observing workplace incivility”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 100 No. 1, pp. 203-215.
- Reitz, A.K., Zimmermann, J., Hutteman, R., Specht, J. and Neyer, F.J. (2014). “How peers make a difference: The role of peer groups and peer relationships in personality development”, *European Journal of Personality*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp.279-288.
- Rigdon, E. E., Schumacker, R. E. and Wothke, W. (1998). A comparative review interaction and nonlinear modeling. In: G. A. Marcoulides & R. E. Schumacker (Eds.) *Advanced Structural Equation Modeling Issues and Techniques* (pp 1-16). Mahwah, NJ, US.
- Robinson, S. L. and Bennett, R. J. (1995). “A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 555-572.
- Salancik, G. R. and Pfeffer, J. (1978). “A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 224-253.
- Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M. and Poskiparta, E. (2011). “Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms”, *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 668-676.

- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L. and Crant, J. M. (2001). "What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success" *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 54 No. 4, pp. 845-874.
- Santos, A. and Eger, A. (2014). "Gender differences and predictors of workplace deviance behavior: the role of job stress, job satisfaction and personality on interpersonal and organisational deviance", *International Journal of Management Practice*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 19-38.
- Schneider, B. (2000). "The psychological life of organizations", Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderon, C. P. M. and Peterson, M. F. (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 17–21.
- Shulruf, B., Alesi, M., Ciochină, L., Faria, L., Hattie, J., Hong, F., Pepi, A.M. and Watkins, D. (2011), "Measuring collectivism and individualism in the third millennium. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal", Vol 39 No. 2, pp.173-187.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994), "The measurement of independent and interdependent selfconstruals", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 580-591.
- Smith, D. B., Hanges, P. J. and Dickson, M. W. (2001), "Personnel selection and the fivefactor model: Reexamining the effects of applicant's frame of reference", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 2, pp. 304-315.
- Spoelma, T.M., Chawla, N. and Ellis, A.P. (2021). "If you can't join 'em, report 'em: A model of ostracism and whistleblowing in teams", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 173 No. 2, pp.345-363.
- Stajkovic, A., & Luthans, F. (2003). Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy: Implications for motivation theory and practice. In L. W. Porter, G. A. Bigley, & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior* (7th ed., pp. 126 – 140). New York, NY: McGrawHill Irwin.

- Stamper, C. L. and Masterson, S. S. (2002), "Insider or outsider? How employee perceptions of insider status affect their work behavior", *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 875-894.
- Taras, V., Roney, J. and Steel, P. (2009). "Half a century of measuring culture: Review of approaches, challenges, and limitations based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 357-373.
- Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L. and Steel, P. (2010). "Examining the impact of Culture's consequences: a three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 95 No. 3, pp. 405-439.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview press. Boulder, Colorado.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M. and Lucca, N. (1988). "Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 323-338.
- Triandis, H. C. and Gelfand, M. J. (1998). "Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 118-128.
- Truss, L. (2005). *Talk to the hand: The utter bloody rudeness of the world today, or six good reasons to stay home and bolt the door*. Gotham Books, New York.
- Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S. and Ou, A. Y. (2007), "Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 426-478.
- Vadera, A.K., Pratt, M.G. and Mishra, P. (2013). "Constructive deviance in organizations:

- Integrating and moving forward. *Journal of management*”, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp.1221-1276.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and Data Analysis for Cross-Cultural Research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Van Knippenberg, D., Van Prooijen, J. W. and Sleebos, E. (2015). “Beyond social exchange: Collectivism’s moderating role in the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior”, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 152-160.
- Vartia, M. A. (2001). “Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and observers of bullying”, *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, & Health*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 63–69.
- Vukelic, M., Cizmiz, S. and Petrovic, I. B. (2019). “Acceptance of workplace bullying behaviors and job satisfaction: Moderated mediation analysis with coping self-efficacy and exposure to bullying”, *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 122 No. 5, pp. 1883-1906.
- Wang, Q., Lin, M. H., Narayan, A., Burns, G. N. and Bowling, N. A. (2022). “A crosscultural examination of the relationships between job attitudes and workplace deviance”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 249-272.
- Warren, D. E. (2003). “Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations”, *Academy of management Review*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 622-632.
- Wilkerson, J. M. and Meyer, J. C. (2019). “On observers’ conjunctive attributions and blame for workplace mistreatment”, *Organization Management Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp.111-122.
- Zikmund, W.G., Babin, B.J., Carr, J.C. and Griffin, M. (2010). “*Business Research Methods*”, 8th ed., Cengage Learning, Mason, HO
- Zohar, D., & Luria, G. (2004). “Climate as a social-cognitive construction of supervisory safety practices: scripts as proxy of behavior patterns”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 2, pp. 322-333.

Table 1*Sample Characteristics of Sample 1 and Sample 2*

Sample Characteristics	India	USA
Gender		
Male	51.0%	48.7%
Female	49.0%	51.3%
Age <25		
yrs or younger	37.1%	23.5%
26-35	40.3%	25.7%
36-45	14.1%	19.7%
46-55	4.0%	23.5%
>56 yrs or above	4.0%	7.5%
Job level Non-		
supervisor position	26.5%	51.1%
First line supervisor or manager or team leader	23.0%	18.0%
Mid-level manager	24.3%	16.8%
Senior manger	20.8%	9.6%
Above senior manager	5.4%	4.5%
Work Experience Upto		
5 years	59.7%	57.5%
6-10 years	24.8%	24.0%
11 years or more	15.6%	18.5%
Employment status		
Permanent	69.1%	92.1%
Temporary	30.9%	7.9%
Full-Time	69.8%	78.9%
Part-Time	30.2%	21.1%
Education Qualification High		
School	11.4%	35.5%
Bachelor's degree	50.0%	44.8%
Master's degree	37.4%	16.0%
PhD or MD	1.2%	3.8%

Table 2

Fit Indices of CFA for all Study Scales in Sample 1(India)

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Null model	11700.61	1275	9.18	.00	.00	.14
One factor model ^a	6658.61	1224	5.44	.46	.48	.11
7-factor model (Uncorrelated) ^b	2933.87	1179	2.49	.82	.83	.06
7-factor model (Correlated) ^c	1862.44	1156	1.61	.93	.93	.04

Note. N= 404; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation

^aDifference null-model and one-factor model: $\Delta\chi^2(df) = 5042.00 (51); p < .001$

^bDifference one-factor model and 7-factor model (uncorrelated): $\Delta\chi^2(df) = 3724.74 (45); p < .001$ ^cDifference 7-factor model (uncorrelated) and 7-factor model (correlated): $\Delta\chi^2(df) = 1071.43 (23); p < .001$

Table 3

Fit Indices of CFA for all Study Scales in Sample 2(the USA)

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Null model	18886.93	1275	14.81	.00	.00	.15
One factor model	10061.27	1224	8.22	.48	.50	.11
7-factor model (Uncorrelated model)	3580.79	1179	3.04	.85	.86	.06
7-factor model (Correlated model)	2412.82	1156	2.09	.92	.93	.04

Note. N= 583; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation

^aDifference null-model and one-factor model: $\Delta\chi^2(df) = 8825.66 (51); p < .001$

^bDifference one-factor model and 7-factor model (uncorrelated): $\Delta\chi^2(df) = 6480.48 (45); p < .001$

^cDifference 7-factor model (uncorrelated) and 7-factor model (correlated): $\Delta\chi^2(df) = 1167.97 (23); p < .001$

Table 4*Correlations, Means, Standard Deviation and Cronbach's Alpha among study variables separately for each sample*

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
		<i>α</i>	—														
1. Industry	—																
2. Employment Status1		—	.12*	—													
			(.25**)														
3. Employment Status2		—	.12*	.61**	—												
			(.12**)	(.46**)													
4. Gender	—	.04	-.18**	-.21**	—												
			(.17*)	(.11**)	(.03)												
5. Age	—	.01	-.21**	-.31**	.09	—											
			(-.09*)	(-.05)	(-.04)	(-.02)											
6. Educational Qualification	—		-.06	-.43**	-.39**	.28**	.29**	—									
			(-.06)	(-.06)	(-.03)	(-.08)	(.01)										
7. Job level	—	-.14**	-.39**	-.51**	.18**	.30**	.45**	—									
			(-.15**)	(-.20**)	(-.10*)	(-.23**)	(.09*)	(.27**)									
8. Work Experience	—		-.03	-.27**	-.29**	.12*	.55**	.26**	.41**	—							
			(.01)	(.11**)	(.05)	(.06)	(.55**)	(-.03)	(-.10*)								
9. Self-serving	.75		-.04	-.05	-.11**	-.09	-.00	.02	.07	-.07	—						
			(.70)	(-.03)	(.02)	(.03)	(-.03)	(.12*)	(.09*)	(.00)	(.12**)						
10. Intervening	.79		-.10*	-.11*	-.20**	-.05	.09	.11*	.24**	.15**	.48**	—					
			(.84)	(-.07)	(-.01)	(.03)	(-.05)	(.08*)	(.17*)	(.36**)	(-.00)	(.19**)					
11. Climate	.88	-.18*	-.23**	-.25**	.14**	.10*	.18**	.29**	.14**	.21**	.39**	—					
			(.90)	(-.11*)	(.02)	(-.03)	(-.04**)	(.17**)	(.05)	(.22**)	(.11**)	(.13**)	(.32**)				
12. Organizational Deviance			.93	-.08	.03	-.06	-.10*	-.14**	-.10*	-.01	-.13**	.39**	-.18**	-.06	—		
			(.95)	(-.15**)	(-.04)	(-.02)	(-.19**)	(.18**)	(.11**)	(.24**)	(.16**)	(.38**)	(-.24**)	(-.16**)			
13. Interpersonal Deviance			.93	-.05	.04	-.04	-.13**	-.09	-.07	-.04	-.13*	.32**	-.14**	-.01	.85**	—	
			(.95)	(-.16**)	(-.04)	(.01)	(-.20**)	(.11**)	(.08)	(.19**)	(.10*)	(.32**)	(-.25**)	(-.08**)	(.83**)		
14. Individualistic Culture			.80	-.06	-.13**	-.25**	.15**	.18**	.16**	.24**	.12*	.23**	.28**	.29**	-.03**	-.08*	—
			(.76)	(-.07)	(-.03)	(-.10*)	(-.02)	(.01)	(-.06)	(-.03)	(-.01)	(.20**)	(.03)	(-.07)	(-.07*)	(-.07*)	

15. Collectivistic Culture	.86	-.01	-.07	-.15**	.08	.17**	.11*	.25**	.20**	.18**	.40**	.47**	-.10*	-.11*	.54**	—	(.81)	(-.06)	(.01)	(-.02)	(.07)	(-.02)	(-.03)	(.06)	(-.04)	(.06)	
<i>M</i> _{India}	—	6.09	1.30	1.31	1.49	1.99	2.28	2.56	1.56	3.19	3.38**	3.39**	1.88*	1.75*	4.18**	—	4.19										
(<i>SD</i>)	3.51	0.46	0.46	0.50	1.04	0.68	1.23	0.75	0.99	0.84	0.57	0.93	0.97	0.69	0.60	<i>M</i> _{USA}	—	8.16									
		1.21	1.08	1.51	2.66	1.88	1.98	1.61	2.77	3.01	3.57	1.49	1.40	3.97	3.95												
(<i>SD</i>)		3.89	0.41	0.27	0.50	1.27	0.80	1.21	0.78	0.83	0.86	0.68	0.72	0.76	0.61	0.51											

Note. Correlations between variables for Sample 1 (India, N = 404) and Sample 2 (USA, N = 583). Cronbach's Alpha (α) and Correlations for Sample 2 (USA) are presented in parenthesis.
 * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; Pearson correlation, two-tailed

Table**5***Model Testing*

Model	χ^2	df	p-value	χ^2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
M1: Modified measurement model	256.18	102		2.51	.96	.97	.06
India							
M2: Modified measurement model	329.06	102		3.23	.97	.98	.06
USA							
M3: Configural invariance model	585.25	204		2.87	.97	.97	.04
M4: Metric invariance model	654.19	221		2.96	.96	.97	.05
Δ M4 versus M3	68.94	17	.00		-.01	.00	.01
M5: Modified metric – released param = DDID1,DDID4,DDOD9	634.52	218		2.91	.97	.97	.04
Δ M5 versus M3	49.27	14	.00		.00	.00	.00
M6: scalar invariance model	818.85	235		3.48	.95	.96	.05
Δ M6 versus M5	184.33	17	.00		-.02	-.01	.01
M7: Modified scalar – released param = DDID1,DDID4,DDID5,DDOD2,D DOD3,DDOD6,DDOD11	675.18	228		2.96	.97	.97	.04
Δ M7 versus M5	40.66	10	.00		.00	.00	.00
M8: Structural invariance	675.06	227		2.97	.96	.97	.05
Δ M8 versus M7	.12	1	.73		-.01	.00	.01

Note. OC = Organizational climate, S = Self-serving behavior, I = Intervening behavior, DDOD = Organizational destructive deviance, DDID = Interpersonal destructive deviance. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit ratio, df = degree of freedom, χ^2/df = chi-square/degree of freedom, TLI = Tucker Lewis Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit index, RMSEA = Root mean square error approximation.

6*Path Coefficients for India and the USA with Destructive Deviance*

Path	Constrained model		India		USA	
	B (S.E)	β	B (S.E)	β	B (S.E)	β
Individualism → DDOD	-.01 (.03)	-.01	-.13 (.08)	-.12	.05 (.04)	.05
Individualism → DDID	-.01 (.03)	-.01	-.14 (.08)	-.13	.05 (.04)	.05
Collectivism → DDOD	-.13*** (.03)	-.13	-.12 (.08)	-.12	-.09* (.04)	-.10
Collectivism → DDID	-.14*** (.03)	-.14	-.11 (.08)	-.11	-.12*** (.04)	-.12

Table

OC → DDOD	.12*** (.03)	.10	-.12 (.09)	-.10	.20*** (.04)	.21
OC → DDID	.14*** (.04)	.12	-.09 (.09)	-.08	.17*** (.04)	.19
OC × Individualism→ DDOD	.08* (.03)	.09	.12 (.11)	.13	.12* (.04)	.13
OC × Individualism→ DDID	.08* (.04)	.08	.13 (.11)	.14	.12** (.04)	.12
OC × Collectivism→ DDOD	-.03 (.03)	-.03	-.05 (.10)	-.05	-.02 (.04)	-.02
OC × Collectivism→ DDID	-.08* (.03)	-.07	-.12 (.1)	-.12	-.05 (.04)	-.06
S→ DDOD	.33*** (.04)	.28	.56*** (.09)	.46	.29*** (.04)	.28
S→ DDID	.29*** (.04)	.24	.52*** (.09)	.43	.24*** (.04)	.22
S × Individualism→ DDOD	.02 (.03)	.02	-.00 (.10)	-.00	.01 (.04)	.01
S × Individualism→ DDID	.00 (.03)	.00	-.03 (.10)	-.03	-.02 (.04)	-.02
S × Collectivism→ DDOD	.02 (.03)	.02	.02 (.10)	.02	.01 (.04)	.01
S × Collectivism→ DDID	.01 (.03)	.01	.05 (.10)	.06	.02 (.04)	.02
I→ DDOD	-.06 (.04)	-.05	-.13 (.07)	-.10	-.04 (.04)	-.03
I→ DDID	-.04 (.04)	-.03	-.10 (.07)	-.07	-.03 (.05)	-.03
I× Individualism→ DDOD	-.02 (.03)	-.02	.11 (.07)	.12	-.05 (.04)	-.05
I× Individualism→ DDID	-.01 (.03)	-.02	.12 (.07)	.13	-.06 (.04)	-.06
I× Collectivism→ DDOD	-.03 (.03)	-.03	-.16* (.07)	-.18	-.01 (.04)	-.02
I× Collectivism→ DDID	-.03 (.03)	-.03	-.16* (.07)	-.17	-.01 (.04)	-.01

Note. OC = Organizational climate, S = Self-serving behavior, I = Intervening behavior, DDOD = Organizational destructive deviance, DDID = Interpersonal destructive deviance. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

7

Summary of Results

	List of Hypothesis	Indian Sample	USA Sample
H1a	OC → DDOD	Not Supported	Not supported
H1b	OC → DDID	Not supported	Not supported
H4	OC × Individualism→ DDOD	Not supported	Not supported

Table

	OC × Individualism→ DDID	Not supported	Not supported
H6	OC × Collectivism→ DDOD	Not supported	Not supported
	OC × Collectivism→ DDID	Not supported	Not supported
H2a	S→ DDOD	Supported	Supported
H2b	S→ DDID	Supported	Supported
H5.i.	S × Individualism→ DDOD	Not supported	Not supported
	S × Individualism→ DDID	Not supported	Not supported
H7.i.	S × Collectivism→ DDOD	Not supported	Not supported
	S × Collectivism→ DDID	Not supported	Not supported
H3a	I→ DDOD	Not Supported	Not Supported
H3b	I→ DDID	Not Supported	Not Supported
H5.ii	I × Individualism→ DDOD	Not supported	Not supported
	I × Individualism→ DDID	Not supported	Not supported
H7.ii.	I × Collectivism→ DDOD	Supported	Not supported
	I × Collectivism→ DDID	Supported	Not supported

Note. OC = Organizational climate, S = Self-serving behavior, I = Intervening behavior, DDOD = Organizational destructive deviance, DDID = Interpersonal destructive deviance.

Figure 1

Hypothesised Model





Figure 2

Revised Structural Model 1



Note. a = Organizational climate × individualism → Organizational destructive deviance, b = Organizational climate × individualism → Interpersonal destructive deviance c = Intervening behavior × collectivism → Organizational destructive deviance, d = Intervening behavior × collectivism → Interpersonal deviance. The unstandardized and standardized output (underlined) are shown in the figure and the results of the USA Samples are highlighted in italics. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Supplementary Materials

Table S1

Model fit for organizational climate measurement model and invariance testing.

Model	χ^2	df	p-value	χ^2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
M1: Modified measurement model India	82.63	38		2.17	.95	.97	.05
M2: Modified measurement model USA	95.65	38		2.52	.97	.98	.05
M3: Configural invariance model	178.28	76		2.35	.96	.98	.04
M4: Metric invariance model	218.36	88		2.48	.96	.97	.04
Δ M4 versus M3	40.08	12	.00		.00	-.01	.00
M5: Modified metric – released param = warmth2	200.28	87		2.30	.96	.98	.04
Δ M5 versus M3	22	11	.02		.00	.00	.00
M6: scalar invariance model	374.45	99		3.78	.93	.94	.05
Δ M6 versus M5	174.17	12	.00		-.03	-.04	.01
M7: Modified scalar – released param = OCR3, OCRIS3, OCRIS4, OCR2	256.54	95		2.70	.96	.98	.04
Δ M7 versus M5	56.26	8	.00		.00	.00	.00
M8: Structural invariance	256.37	94		2.73	.95	.97	.04
Δ M8 versus M7	.17	1	.68		-.01	-.01	.00

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit ratio, df = degree of freedom, χ^2/df = chi-square/degree of freedom, TLI = Tucker-Lewis Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit index, RMSEA = Root mean square error approximation. OCR = organizational climate reward, OCRIS = organizational climate risk and conflict

Table S2*Model fit for witness behavior construct measurement model and invariance testing.*

Model	χ^2	df	p-value	χ^2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
M1: Modified measurement model India	23.51	18		1.31	.99	.99	.03
M2: Modified measurement model USA	57.63	18		3.20	.95	.97	.06
M3: Configural invariance model	81.14	36		2.25	.96	.98	.03
M4: Metric invariance model	125.49	45		2.79	.95	.97	.04
Δ M4 versus M3	44.35	9	.00		-.01	-.01	.01
M5: Modified metric – released param = SB1, SB3	88.37	43		2.06	.96	.98	.03
Δ M5 versus M3	7.23	7	.41		.00	.00	.00
M6: scalar invariance model	276.22	52		5.31	.87	.91	.07
Δ M6 versus M5	187.85	9	.00		-.09	-.07	.04
M7: Modified scalar – released param = IB4,SB3,IB1,IB2, IB6	132.62	47		2.82	.95	.97	.04
Δ M7 versus M5	44.25	4	.00		-.01	-.01	.01
M8: Structural invariance	132.21	46		2.87	.95	.97	.04
Δ M8 versus M7	.41	1	.52		.00	.00	.00

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit ratio, df = degree of freedom, χ^2/df = chi-square/degree of freedom, TLI = Tucker-Lewis Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit index, RMSEA = Root mean square error approximation. SB = Self-serving behavior, IB = Intervening behavior

Table S3*Model fit for culture construct measurement model and invariance testing.*

Model	χ^2	df	p-value	χ^2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
-------	----------	----	---------	-------------	-----	-----	-------

M1: Modified measurement model	101.07	53		1.91	.96	.98	.05
India							
M2: Modified measurement model	178.86	53		3.38	.91	.94	.06
USA							
M3: Configural invariance model	279.92	106		2.64	.94	.96	.04
M4: Metric invariance model	329.85	119		2.77	.93	.95	.05
Δ M4 versus M3	49.93	13	.00		-.01	-.01	.01
	307.64	115		2.68	.94	.96	.04
M5: Modified metric – released param = CC3,CC4, CI2,CI5							
Δ M5 versus M3	27.72	9	.00		.00	.00	.00
M6: scalar invariance model	523.09	128		4.09	.88	.91	.06
Δ M6 versus M5	215.45	128	.00		-.06	-.05	.02
M7: Modified scalar – released param = CC1,CC3,CC5,CC6,CC8,CI1,CI4, CI5	322.44	120		2.69	.94	.96	.04
Δ M7 versus M5	14.80	5	.01		.00	.00	.00
M8: Structural invariance	451.59	127		3.56	.92	.90	.05
Δ M8 versus M7	129.15	7	.00		-.02	-.06	.01

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit ratio, df = degree of freedom, χ^2/df = chi-square/degree of freedom, TLI = Tucker-Lewis Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit index, RMSEA = Root mean square error approximation. CC = culture collectivism, CI = culture individualism

Table S4

Model fit for destructive deviance construct measurement model and invariance testing.

Model	χ^2	df	p-value	χ^2/df	GFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
-------	----------	----	---------	-------------	-----	-----	-----	-------

	M1: OC, S, I,	349.731	176	.00	1.99	.97	.94	.98	.03
1	DDOD, DDID								
	with interactions								
	M2. Constraining for climate, S, I	362.23	182	.00	1.99	.97	.94	.98	.03
	Δ M2 versus M1	12.50	6	.05		.00	.00	.00	.00
		380.40	198	.00	1.92	.97	.95	.98	.03
	M3. Constraining for climate, S, I, individualism and collectivism moderators								
	Δ M3 versus M1	30.67	22	.10		.00	-.01	.00	.00

Note. χ^2 = chi square goodness of fit ratio, df = degree of freedom, χ^2/df = chi-square/degree of freedom, TLI = Tucker-Lewis Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit index, RMSEA = Root mean square error approximation. DDOD = destructive organizational deviance, DDID = destructive interpersonal deviance

Culture and Workplace deviance behavior