

Exploring the Organisational Drivers of Workplace Deviance: A Systematic Review of Recent Literature

Mohd Sufian Ruslan^{1,2}, Nor Wahiza Abdul Wahat¹, Ismi Arif Ismail¹, Suriani Ismail¹

¹Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malays, ²Registrar Office, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: wahiza@upm.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v14-i10/23191> DOI:10.6007/IJARBS/v14-i10/23191

Published Date: 11 October 2024

Abstract

This systematic literature review (SLR) explores the organisational drivers of workplace deviance, focussing on recent studies to identify key factors influencing deviant behaviours in organisational settings. Workplace deviance, encompassing both organisational and interpersonal misconduct, poses significant challenges to organisational effectiveness and employee well-being. Despite extensive research, understanding the organisational determinants of such behaviours remains fragmented. The problem is particularly pronounced in diverse sectors, where varying organisational cultures and leadership styles influence employee behaviour. This review synthesises findings from 32 peer-reviewed articles published between 2022 and 2024, using a systematic approach guided by the PRISMA Statement. The methodology involved an extensive search of scholarly articles from two reputable databases, which are Scopus and Web of Science, followed by rigorous screening and analysis of relevant studies. The finding was divided into three themes which is (1) Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance, (2) Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance, and (3) Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance. Results indicate that organisational justice, workplace environment, and leadership styles are the primary drivers of deviant behaviour. The findings suggest that addressing organisational drivers through targeted interventions can reduce workplace deviance, ultimately enhancing organisational performance and employee satisfaction. This review improves the existing literature by delivering a thorough examination of the organisational elements influencing workplace deviance and presenting insights for future research and practical implementations.

Keywords: Workplace Deviant Behaviour, Counterproductive Behaviour, Organisational Factors, Human Resource Development

Introduction

Workplace deviance, referring to activities that break organisational standards and endanger the well-being of the organisation and its personnel, has received major attention in organisational research. (Appelbaum et al., 2007; Götz et al., 2020; Rosle et al., 2023). This phenomenon includes a broad wide array of actions, spanning from minor rule-breaking to severe violations like theft or sabotage (Baur et al., 2022; Faldetta, 2020; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). While individual traits have often been cited as the primary predictors of deviant behaviours (Judge et al., 2006; Khattak et al., 2019a), there is a growing recognition that organisational factors play a important function in determining such conduct (Amin et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2018; Hashish, 2020). Understanding these organisational drivers is vital, as they can provide actionable insights for mitigating deviance and fostering a more positive work environment.

The workplace is a microcosm of broader societal dynamics, where power structures, cultural norms, and environmental conditions interact to influence behaviour (M. A. Abbasi et al., 2024; Appelbaum et al., 2007; Bell & Hughes-Jones, 2008). Organisational deviance does not occur in a vacuum; it is regularly caused by complicated relationships between employees and their work environments. Factors such as leadership styles, organisational culture, job design, and policies can either constrain or facilitate deviant behaviour. For instance, a toxic work culture, characterised by a lack of support and transparency, can exacerbate feelings of frustration and alienation among employees, leading to increased deviant acts (Cheang & Appelbaum, 2015; Rizani et al., 2022). Similarly, autocratic leadership may stifle employee autonomy, potentially prompting retaliatory deviance.

In examining the organisational drivers of workplace deviance, it is important to consider the function of ethical climate and organisational justice. An organisation's ethical climate, which encompasses the shared perceptions of what constitutes right and wrong behaviour, significantly influences employee actions (Al Halbusi et al., 2021; Aryati et al., 2018). A climate that tolerates or even implicitly encourages unethical behaviour can create an environment where deviance becomes normalised. Similarly, organisational injustice, whether related to distributive, procedural, or interactional fairness, can trigger deviant behaviour as employees seek to redress perceived wrongs (Khattak et al., 2019b, 2021; Khattak & Abukhait, 2024). The consequences of workplace deviance are extensive, impacting not just the direct victims but also the overall organisational structure. Productivity losses, increased turnover, damaged reputations, and a decline in employee morale are just a few of the potential repercussions (Qi et al., 2022; Waseem, 2016). As such, identifying and addressing the organisational drivers of deviance is not merely a theoretical exercise but an essential requirement for organisations focused on maintaining a healthy and productive work environment.

Perceived organisational support (POS) is another critical factor that influences workplace deviance. POS reflects employees' perceptions regarding the degree to which the organisation appreciates their contributions and prioritises their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). When workers feel supported and valued by their organisation, they are more inclined to demonstrate productive behaviours and a lesser likelihood to be involved in deviant acts. Fostering a strong sense of organizational support can lessen deviance and promote a more cohesive and motivated workforce by addressing feelings of neglect and disenfranchisement (Tian & Guo, 2023).

This article aims to explore the organisational factors that contribute to workplace deviance, with a focus on understanding how these drivers operate and interact within different organisational contexts. By drawing on existing literature and empirical evidence, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive framework for addressing workplace deviance by offering insights for both scholars and practitioners in fostering ethical and effective organisations.

Literature Review

Workplace deviance can be characterised as “voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556). The influence of organisational culture on workplace deviant behaviours (WDB) has been extensively studied, with findings consistently indicating that the type of organisational culture plays a vital function in either curbing or fostering deviant behaviours (Braje et al., 2020; Peterson, 2002; Shao-Ping et al., 2018). For instance, Di Stefano et al. (2019) explored the influence of various organisational culture types, as defined by the Competing Values Framework, affect WDB. They found that cultures characterised by flexibility and innovation, such as clan and adhocracy cultures were linked to decreased instances of workplace deviances. Conversely, more rigid and competitive cultures, like market and hierarchy cultures, were linked to higher levels of deviance. This suggests that fostering a culture that emphasises collaboration, flexibility, and innovation can be an effective strategy for reducing deviant behaviours within organisations.

In addition to organisational culture, leadership styles significantly impact deviant behaviour within organisations. Valle et al (2019), found that abusive supervision increases deviant behaviour, especially when combined with high leader-member exchange (LMX), where moral disengagement mediates this effect. Employees with close ties to abusive leaders may rationalise their deviant actions, highlighting how toxic leadership fosters environments conducive to deviance. Xu et al. (2024), investigated despotic leadership and perceived organisational politics in sports organisations, revealing that these factors contribute to workplace incivility, emotional exhaustion, and poor person-organisation fit, leading to health issues for employees. These studies underscore the role of toxic leadership in exacerbating deviant behaviours by creating justifications for such actions. Additionally, Gümüştas & Karataş Gümüştas (2023) examined how abusive supervision impacts organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), finding that burnout mediates this relationship. Their moderated mediation model showed that a strong organisational identity can worsen the effects of abusive supervision, making employees more susceptible to burnout and less inclined to participate in positive behaviours. This highlights the necessity of addressing abusive supervision and fostering a healthy organisational culture, as even a strong organisational identity can have adverse effects under toxic leadership.

The connection between corporate social irresponsibility (CSI) and workplace deviance is a critical area of investigation, particularly in understanding how broader organisational practices influence employee behaviour. M. A. Abbasi et al. (2024) found that by using anger as a mediator, both internal and external CSI significantly influence organisational deviance behaviour (OWDB) among Generation Z and Y employees. Rooted in attribution theory, their study suggests that when organisations engage in socially irresponsible practices, it leads to deviant behaviour among employees, with generational differences in how such deviance is

expressed. These findings imply that ethical lapses at the corporate level can trickle down to individual behaviours, thereby increasing the likelihood of deviance within the organisation.

On the other hand, interpersonal justice, which concerns fairness and respect in personal interactions, was found to mitigate organisational deviance. This indicates that although perceived unfairness in organisational processes can provoke deviance, fostering respectful interpersonal relationships can help mitigate such behaviours. Building upon this, in the healthcare sector, organisational justice also plays a pivotal role in influencing deviant behaviours. Kakemam et al. (2021) conducted research on Iranian nurses, finding a notable unfavourable correlation between perceived organisational justice and WDB. Nurses who perceived higher levels of fairness in their organisation had a lower tendency to be involved with deviant behaviours. This outcome highlights the importance of promoting fairness and transparency in organisational practices, particularly in high-stress environments like healthcare, to prevent deviant behaviours that could compromise the quality of care.

The body of research emphasises the intricate relationship between organisational factors in driving workplace deviance. To effectively mitigate such behaviours, organisations must adopt an all-rounder approach that addresses these aspects of the work environment. By promoting fairness, preventing abusive supervision, and fostering a positive organisational culture, organisations can reduce the incidence of workplace deviance and establish a more efficient and harmonious workplace atmosphere.

Methodology

This section describes the essential procedures carried out to develop the systematic literature review (SLR) that is in line with the specified research questions and objectives. A SLR specifies a methodical framework for performing a comprehensive examination in a structured, clear, and reproducible way (Higgins et al., 2011). This SLR analysis conforms with PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses), which was introduced by Page et al. (2021). Authors are guided by PRISMA in creating a systematic and a thorough SLR while ensuring the quality of the selected articles. Guided by PRISMA, this SLR is structured around four main principal steps: defining the research question, employing systematic search strategies, evaluating article quality, and extracting and analysing data.

Defining The Research Question

The first step in the SLR involves in formulating the research question (RQ). Defining the RQs is the primary task during the planning phase and represents the most essential component of any SLR, as it influences and guides the entire review approach. (Kitchenham, 2007). In a SLR, RQs play a vital role as they establish the foundation and guide the whole review process. They define the scope and focus of the SLR, facilitating the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of the studies, and ensuring that the review remains relevant and closely aligned with the topic under investigation. For this, the author has utilised the PICo mnemonic. Employing the PICo framework aids in structuring research questions in a clear and systematic manner by deconstructing the study's key elements into its three components. This method ensures that the research remains focused, and the questions are precisely formulated, facilitating the search for relevant literature or the design of a study. Developed by (Lockwood et al., 2015), the PICo mnemonic stands for Population (P), Interest (I), and Context (Co). In this SLR, P corresponds to employees, I corresponds to organisational factors contributing to workplace

deviance, and Co corresponds to organisational contexts. Following this PICO framework, consequently, the RQ formulated for this study is: *What are the key organisational factors that drive workplace deviance among employees, and how do these factors interact in organisational contexts?*

Systematic Search Strategies

The next step required for this SLR is systematic search strategies. It comprises of three primary processes: Identification, Screening, and Eligibility. By using these techniques, the authors were able to thoroughly identify and synthesise the research, leading to a well-organised and clear SLR.

Table 1

The Search Strings

Scopus	TITLE-ABS-KEY (("workplace devian*" OR "organizational devian*" OR "counterproductive work behaviour*" OR "workplace misbehaviour") AND ("organizational factor*" OR "organizational culture" OR "organizational climate" OR "work environment" OR "organizational justice" OR "organizational fairness" OR "organizational support")) AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR , 2022) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR , 2023) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR , 2024)) AND (LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , "ar")) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE , "English")) AND (LIMIT-TO (SRCTYPE , "j")) AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBSTAGE , "final"))
	Date of Access: August 2024
Web of Science (WoS)	(("workplace devian*" OR "organizational devian*" OR "counterproductive work behaviour*" OR "workplace misbehaviour") AND ("organizational factor*" OR "organizational culture" OR "organizational climate" OR "work environment" OR "organizational justice" OR "organizational fairness" OR "organizational support")) (Topic) and 2024 or 2023 or 2022 (Publication Years) and Article (Document Types) and English (Languages) Publications
	Date of Access: August 2024

Identification

Identification involves identifying appropriate keywords for the search of relevant articles. Based on the established research questions, the author selected three relevant keywords, namely *workplace deviant behaviour*, *counterproductive behaviour* and *organisational factors*. Following this, the author sought synonyms, comparable terms, and variations of the chosen keywords to increase the likelihood of obtaining more articles for review. This effort was done through searches in online thesaurus, reviews of databases, references to keywords from previous studies, and expert opinions. These keyword combinations were utilised with search functions, including field codes, phrase searching, Boolean operators, truncation, and wildcards, across two databases: Scopus and Web of Science (WoS).

Scopus and WoS were chosen as the primary databases due to their numerous advantages, such as advanced search capabilities, extensive coverage across multidisciplinary fields, and a broader, more comprehensive range of content (Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2020). All relevant terms were identified, leading to the creation of search strings specifically for Scopus and WoS databases (see Table 1). This preliminary phase of the systematic review resulted in the retrieval of 651 publications from the two databases, all of which were relevant to the study topic.

Table 2

The Selection Criterion

Criterion	Inclusion	Exclusion
Language	English	Non-English
Timeline	2022 – 2024	< 2022
Literature type	Journal (Article)	Conference, Review, Book,
Publication Stage	Final	In Press

Screening

The next phase in systematic search strategies is the screening step, wherein several inclusion criteria was developed by the author. In this screening process, potentially relevant research items are evaluated to ensure they match the predefined research question. It involves in selecting studies that concentrate on the organisational factors of workplace deviant behaviour. Further reviews were made using distinct inclusion and exclusion criteria (See Table 2). These criteria included the publication year (selecting articles published from 2022 to 2024), the type of publication (choosing only journal articles), and the language (restricting to English only). Consequently, 513 publications were removed from the screening procedure, resulting in 138 papers to be examined for duplications. Upon inspection, 35 papers were discarded resulting in 103 publications to progressed to the eligibility step.

Eligibility

This is the third procedure referred to as eligibility. In this process the author carefully re-evaluates all the 103 articles selected in the screening process. The articles need to be examined and ensured they fulfilled all the inclusion criteria and must also be consistent with the research objectives. Based on this process, 71 articles were excluded due to having titles that were not sufficiently relevant, being outside the field, abstracts that did not align with the objectives of the study, and no access to the complete content of the articles. As a result, a total of 32 articles were finalised for the next stage which is the quality assessment (see Figure 1).




Figure. 1. Flow Diagram of The Proposed Searching Study (Moher et al., 2009)

Quality Assessment of Articles

The quality assessment of articles was conducted to ensure that the method and evaluation of the articles chosen were done appropriately. This selection process was done according to the criteria established by Abouzahra et al. (2020). The criteria outlined by Abouzahra et al. (2020) consist of six key criteria in the determining the quality of the articles. For each of the questions, three response options were provided: Yes (1 mark), Partly (0.5 marks), and No (no marks). Only articles scoring marks of 3.0 or higher were accepted in the SLR (Abouzahra et al., 2020). The questions are as follows below:

QA1. Is the purpose of the study clearly stated?

QA2. Is the relevance and usefulness of the work clearly presented?

QA3. Is the study methodology clearly defined?

QA4. Are the concepts of the approach well-articulated?

QA5. Is the work compared and evaluated against similar studies?

QA6. Are the limitations of the work clearly mentioned?

This assessment required the authors to evaluate the articles based on the questions. All authors performed the quality assessment separately, first by reviewing all selected publications and subsequently discussing their quality. From this process, the authors decided that a total of 32 articles met the minimum required score and were advanced to the data extraction and analysis stage.

Data Extraction and Analysis

This review examined data from quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method studies. Reviews that integrate multiple research design offer a wider range of viewpoints, opinions, and solutions (Hong et al., 2018). Finding important key topics and subtopics was the aim of this in-depth analysis. This integrative analysis was utilised as part of its assessment methodologies to look at and combine different research designs. All the articles underwent thematic analysis due to the suitability and adaptability of thematic synthesis of data derived from various study designs (Flemming et al., 2019).

At this stage, the authors carefully analysed all the 32 publications focusing on the result and discussion section by extracting assertions or content relevant to the research question. Once the extraction data was completed, the authors and the co-authors collaborated in developing the themes based on the similarities and correlations among the previously discovered data. If there were any conceptual differences, the authors discussed to achieve mutual consent. The next step would be validating the themes by experts in the organisational development and qualitative analysis. In the expert review phase, each theme was assessed to determine the domain validity. Changes have been executed at the author's discretion in accordance with the advice of expert's opinion and input. Based on this process, the author managed to produce three major themes that relate to the identified research question.

Results and Findings

From the 32 articles selected using the search technique above, the author managed to develop three major themes through thematic analysis method. The three main themes that the articles were categorised under are: Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance (12 articles), Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance (12 articles), and Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance (8 articles). The articles that were found to address multiple themes, were coded accordingly. Table 3 provides an overview of the summarised themes.

Table 3

The Research Article Findings Are Based On The Proposed Search Criterion

No	Authors	Title	Journal	Scopus	WoS	Remarks
1	Sharif et al. (2022)	A dark side of land revenue management and counterproductive work behaviour: does organizational injustice add fuel to fire?	Journal of Public Procurement	/	/	Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
2	Azila-Gbettor et al. (2023)	Antecedents of psychological ownership among family hotel employees	Journal of Family Business Management	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
3	Pariyanti et al. (2022)	Workplace deviant behaviour among employees of Islamic-based universities in Lampung: the moderating role of Islamic workplace spirituality	Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education	/		Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
4	Sobhan et al. (2022)	Quality of human resources in waqf institution: Counterproductive study on Muhammadiyah charity business	Quality - Access to Success	/	/	Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance
5	Kim et al. (2022)	"Does a good firm diminish the bad behaviour of its employees?": The sequential mediation effect of organizational trust and organizational commitment, and the moderation effect of work overload	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health	/		Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance

6	Abas et al. (2024)	Examining the socio-psychological dynamics of interpersonal and organizational deviances: the moderating influence of interpersonal justice and perceived organizational support	Leadership and Organization Development Journal	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
7	Huang et al. (2023)	The influence of perceived organizational exploitation on frontline hospitality employees' workplace deviance: an organizational justice perspective	International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
8	Yasir & Jan (2023)	Servant leadership in relation to organizational justice and workplace deviance in public hospitals	Leadership in Health Services	/	/	Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
9	To & Huang (2022)	Effects of equity, perceived organizational support and job satisfaction on organizational commitment in Macao's gaming industry	Management Decision	/	/	Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance
10	Nemțeanu et al. (2022)	Predicting job satisfaction and work engagement behaviour in the COVID-19 pandemic: A	E a M: Ekonomie a Management	/	/	Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance

		conservation of resources theory approach				
11	Mehmood et al. (2023)	A moderated mediation model of counterproductive work behaviour, organisational justice, organisational embeddedness and psychological ownership	Personnel Review	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
12	Al-Romeedy & Ozbek (2022)	The effect of authentic leadership on counterproductive work behaviours in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents: Workplace incivility as a mediator	African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure	/		Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance
13	Narayanan & Moon (2023)	A multigroup SEM analysis of the antecedents and moderating influence of culture on workplace deviance behaviour	Cross Cultural and Strategic Management	/	/	Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance
14	Elliethey et al. (2024)	Work ethics and its relationship with workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behaviours among nurses: A structural equation model	BMC Nursing	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
15	Zahid Nauman (2024)	Does workplace incivility spur deviant behaviours: Roles of interpersonal	Personnel Review	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance

		conflict and organizational climate				
16	Hung et al. (2022)	Impact of organizational culture on individual work performance with national culture of cross-strait enterprises as a moderator	Sustainability (Switzerland)	/	/	Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance
17	Tufan et al. (2023)	The mediating effect of organizational justice perception on the relationship between ethical leadership and workplace deviant behaviours	Sustainability (Switzerland)	/	/	Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
18	Fein et al. (2023)	Perceptions of ethical climate and organizational justice as antecedents to employee performance: The mediating role of employees' attributions of leader effectiveness	European Management Journal	/		Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
19	Ifeanyichukwu et al. (2022)	Organisational justice and workplace deviance behaviour among bank workers in Nigeria: The role of perceived organisational support as a moderator	Journal of Psychology in Africa	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
20	Moez et al. (2024)	Relationship between workplace	BMC Nursing	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of

		spirituality with organization-based self-esteem and workplace deviant behaviours among Iranian nurses				Workplace Deviance
21	Meng et al. (2024)	The effect of perceived organizational justice on workplace deviant behaviour of new nurses: the role of emotional labor and psychological capital	BMC Nursing	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
22	A. Abbasi et al. (2022)	Can organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour reduce workplace deviance?	Intangible Capital	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
23	Abdullah & AL-Abrow (2023)	Predicting positive and negative behaviours at the workplace: Insights from multi-faceted perceptions and attitudes	Global Business and Organizational Excellence	/		Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
24	Deng et al. (2023)	The increase of counterproductive work behaviour from organizational and individual level due to workplace conflict: A sequential moderated mediation model	International Journal of Conflict Management	/		Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance
25	Maqbool et al. (2024)	Abusive supervisor triggers counterproductive work behaviours	Leadership and Organization	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of

		in nursing staff: role of psychological contract breach and Islamic work ethics	Development Journal			Workplace Deviance
26	Adugna et al. (2022)	The relation between organizational justice and counter-productive work behaviour among health care professionals in Jimma zone public health institutions	Journal of Healthcare Leadership	/	/	Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
27	Obalade & Mtembu (2023)	Effect of organisational justice on workplace deviance in Nigerian public universities	Acta Commercii	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
28	Opatha & Takahashi (2024)	Does social and organizational support moderate emotional intelligence training effectiveness?	Behavioural Sciences	/	/	Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance
29	Fernández-del-Río et al. (2022)	Dark Tetrad and workplace deviance: Investigating the moderating role of organizational justice perceptions	Frontiers in Psychology	/	/	Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
30	Alagarsamy et al. (2024)	Fear of COVID-19, workplace phobia, workplace deviance and perceived organizational support: A	Stress and Health	/	/	Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance

		moderated mediation model				
31	Giamos et al. (2023)	Work motivation in three-way interaction with organizational justice across four different managerial positions	Journal of Advances in Management Research	/		Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance
32	Jahanzeb et al. (2023)	Workplace ostracism and organizational deviance: A self-regulatory perspective	Journal of Social Psychology	/		Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance

Organisational Justice and Workplace Deviance

The connection involving organisational justice and workplace deviance has garnered considerable attention in recent research, particularly in the public sector organisations settings. Organisational justice, encompassing procedural, distributive, and interactional dimensions, plays a pivotal role in shaping employee behaviours, including deviant actions. Multiple studies suggest that perceptions of fairness within the workplace can either mitigate or exacerbate deviant behaviours, depending on the prevailing organisational environment and individual characteristics. Research by Sharif et al (2022), highlights that dark personality traits (DPT) in top management significantly contribute to WDB's among employees, particularly when organisational justice is perceived as lacking. The study found that while DPT such as Machiavellianism and narcissism negatively impact organisational justice (procedural, interactional, and distributive), the absence of fair treatment further intensifies deviant behaviours among employees. This suggests a critical need for top management to foster an environment of fairness to counteract the negative influences of DPT on workplace behaviour.

Similarly, Huang et al (2023), studied the influence of perceived organisational exploitation on workplace deviance among frontline hospitality personnel. Their findings indicate that perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice mediate the association between perceived exploitation and both organisational and interpersonal deviance. The study also introduced justice sensitivity as a moderating factor, revealing that employees with higher justice sensitivity are more inclined to be involved in deviant behaviours when they perceive injustice. This underscores the importance of maintaining fair and transparent practices in organisational settings to minimise the risk of deviance. Yasir & Jan (2023) investigated the influence of servant leadership in enhancing organisational justice and reducing workplace deviance in public healthcare facilities. Their study demonstrated that servant leadership positively influences organisational justice, which in turn reduces deviant behaviours among nurses. The mediation effect of organisational justice between servant leadership and workplace deviance suggests that leadership styles that promote fairness and support can be instrumental in curbing negative workplace behaviours. This is particularly relevant in high-

stress environments like healthcare, where the well-being of both staff and patients can be significantly impacted by workplace dynamics.

Further supporting these findings, Mehmood et al. (2023), proposed that organisational embeddedness serves as a mediator between organisational justice and WDB, while psychological ownership functions as a moderating factor in this relationship. Their study in a law enforcement context disclosed that workers who feel embedded within their organisation and perceive a sense of ownership are less common to be involved with deviant behaviours, particularly when they also perceive organisational justice. This highlights the intricate interaction between individual perceptions and organisational factors in shaping workplace behaviour. In a different context, Tufan et al. (2023), examined the role of organisational justice as a mediator between ethical leadership and workplace deviance relation among customs officers. The study found that ethical leadership indirectly reduces workplace deviance by enhancing perceptions of organisational justice. This suggests that leadership practices that emphasise ethics and fairness can effectively diminish deviant behaviours, reinforcing the critical role of organisational justice as a mediating factor. Adugna et al. (2022) and Obalade & Mtembu (2023), provided further evidence on the importance of distributive and interpersonal justice in reducing deviant behaviours in healthcare and educational settings, respectively. Both studies found that perceptions of fairness in resource distribution and interpersonal interactions are significant predictors of reduced workplace deviance, emphasising the need for organisational policies that promote equity and fairness.

Psychological and Social Dynamics of Workplace Deviance

Psychological and social dynamics have been identified as amongst factors that may contribute to WDB. Several studies have identified key organisational and individual factors contributing to such behaviours, with a focus on psychological ownership, workplace spirituality, and perceived organisational justice. The role of workplace ostracism and interpersonal justice in influencing deviant behaviours is significant. For instance, Elliethey et al. (2024) highlight that workplace ostracism negatively correlates with work ethics among nurses, leading to an increase in WDB. Similarly, Abas et al (2024), found that abusive supervision and workplace ostracism contribute to interpersonal and organisational deviation. Emotional exhaustion and work-family conflict further intensify these effects. These findings suggest that creating an inclusive work environment that discourages ostracism and promotes interpersonal justice can mitigate deviant behaviours. Both studies emphasise that ostracism and perceived injustice within an organisation can foster a toxic working environment, thereby increasing the probability of deviant behaviours among workers.

The relationship between workplace spirituality and deviant behaviours has also been studied, particularly in religious contexts. Pariyanti et al (2022), found that Islamic Workplace Spirituality (IWS that Islamic Workplace Spirituality (IWS) moderates the link between organisational justice, job satisfaction, and WDB. This moderation suggests that fostering a spiritually enriched work environment can reduce deviant behaviours by enhancing employees' ethical conduct and job satisfaction. Moez et al (2024), further support this notion by demonstrating that workplace spirituality positively correlates with organisation-based self-esteem, which in turn inversely relates to deviant behaviours. Another significant theme is the effect of organisational climate and perceived organisational support (POS) on deviant

behaviours. Zahid & Nauman (2024), found that a positive organisational climate can attenuate the negative effect of workplace incivility on deviant behaviours by reducing interpersonal conflicts. Deng et al (2023), support this by demonstrating that a supportive organisational climate can mitigate the impact of workplace conflict on WDB. These studies suggest that organisations should focus on improving their climate and support systems to reduce the incidence of WDB.

Furthermore, the mediating effects of work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion on the connection between abusive supervision and deviant behaviours have been explored. As an example, research by Alagarsamy et al (2024), demonstrates that the threat of COVID-19 exacerbates workplace phobia and deviance, but POS can mitigate these effects. This emphasises the importance of offering organisational support during crises to prevent deviant behaviours. Additionally, Maqbool et al (2024), found that psychological contract breach mediated the association between abusive supervision and WDBs, with Islamic work ethics serving as a buffer. This suggests that addressing psychological contracts and ethical considerations in the workplace can mitigate the effects of abusive supervision on deviant behaviours.

Leadership and Organisational Behaviour on Workplace Deviance

Leadership can be considered one of the main factors amongst the organisational factors that contribute to the prevalence of WDB within organisations. One key factor is the influence of leadership and organisational climate in influencing worker behaviour. Sobhan et al (2022), explored the influence of organisational climate on WDB, highlighting that low comprehension levels of regulatory material within the Muhammadiyah Waqf Institution. It led to limited productivity and deviant behaviour, driven by dispositional and situational factors, with emotional intelligence and climate playing crucial roles. Similarly, Al-Romeedy & Ozbek (2022) demonstrated that authentic leadership plays a critical role in mitigating workplace incivility, which in turn reduces WDBs. The study demonstrated that workplace incivility acts as a mediator, suggesting that leadership styles directly influence the prevalence of negative workplace behaviours through the organisational climate.

Kim et al (2022), investigated the link between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and WDB, proposing that CSR initiatives decrease WDB by enhancing organisational trust and commitment. This relationship was negatively moderated by work overload, suggesting that while CSR initiatives can reduce WDB, excessive workload can undermine this effect. To & Huang (2022) further investigated this by focusing on equity and perceived organisational support within Macao's gaming industry. They found that perceived organisational support and job satisfaction were significant predictors of organisational commitment, which negatively influenced WDB. These studies collectively underscore the importance of perceived organisational support and fairness in reducing WDB, highlighting the need for organisations to foster a supportive environment to minimise deviant behaviours.

The COVID-19 pandemic has also introduced an additional dynamic in understanding the drivers of WDB. Nemţeanu et al (2022), studied the effect of job insecurity and stress induced by the pandemic on WDB. Their findings suggest that job satisfaction and engagement, driven by effective internal communication, reward systems, and the capitalisation of employee skills, can mitigate the negative effects of the pandemic on workers behaviour. This aligns

with Hung et al (2022), who found that organisational culture significantly impacts individual work performance and WDB. Specifically, a clan culture, which emphasises collaboration and support, was found to reduce WDB, while an adhocracy culture, which fosters innovation and flexibility, had the opposite effect. Cultural orientation and national culture further influence the relationship between organisational factors and WDB. Narayanan & Moon (2023), conducted cross-cultural research comparing the USA and India, finding that collectivist cultures, like that of India, tend to exhibit lower levels of WDB when employees perceive a positive organisational climate. Conversely, in individualistic cultures like the United States, organisational climate had a less significant impact on reducing WDB. This study emphasises strategies used in reducing WDB must be tailored to the cultural context.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study emphasises the crucial function of organizational justice in influencing workplace deviance. This justice, covering distributive, procedural, and interactional dimensions, is impacted by the organizational setting and individual traits, and can either reduce or amplify deviant behaviours. Negative traits in leadership, such as Machiavellianism and narcissism, can worsen perceptions of fairness, increasing deviance, thus underscoring the need for a fair work environment. Furthermore, perceptions of exploitation, particularly among frontline workers, correlate with higher deviance, with both distributive and procedural justice as central mediators. Leadership styles, including servant and ethical leadership, are pivotal in fostering organizational justice and curbing deviance, particularly in demanding environments like healthcare. Employees' strong attachment and sense of ownership within the organization also help lessen deviant behaviours, indicating that deep organizational ties and perceived fairness are key. These insights affirm the necessity for organizational policies that emphasize equity, supported by effective leadership, to maintain a just and minimal-deviance workplace.

Psychological and social factors critically influence deviant behaviours in organizations. Key contributors include workplace ostracism, interpersonal injustice, emotional exhaustion, abusive supervision, and work-family conflict. An inclusive and fair work environment is crucial for mitigating these negative behaviours. Workplace spirituality, particularly in religious contexts, moderated the association between organizational justice, job satisfaction, and deviance, promoting ethical conduct and reducing deviance. Similarly, a positive organizational climate and robust organizational support play vital roles in diminishing the effects of workplace incivility and conflicts and can buffer the impacts of crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Addressing psychological contract breaches and incorporating ethical considerations are also effective in lessening the impact of abusive supervision. A comprehensive approach that includes both psychological and organizational elements is essential for effectively managing and reducing deviant behaviours. Promoting an environment characterized by inclusivity, spirituality, justice, and support is fundamental to enhancing both the ethical standards and productivity of the workplace.

Leadership style and organizational climate significantly influence employee conduct and productivity, with emotional intelligence and understanding of regulations playing key roles. Authentic leadership is crucial for mitigating workplace incivility, a mediator of WDB, by positively impacting organizational climate. Both organizational support and perceived fairness are vital in reducing WDB, with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives

boosting trust and commitment, although their effectiveness can be compromised by excessive workloads. Additionally, strong organizational support and job satisfaction promote commitment, further diminishing WDB and underscoring the significance of a supportive and equitable work environment. The COVID-19 pandemic has introduced additional challenges like increased job insecurity and stress, which can be alleviated through effective communication, robust reward systems, and optimal utilization of skills. Organizational culture also influences WDB; supportive and collaborative cultures tend to lower WDB, while those focusing on innovation may inadvertently increase it. Cultural orientation plays a crucial role, with collectivist cultures generally exhibiting lower WDB levels compared to individualistic ones. Hence, WDB reduction strategies must be culturally contextualized to be effective.

In conclusion, this review has successfully synthesized three main organisational factors related to WDB from recent articles, which are organisational justice, work environment, and leadership style. Therefore, a comprehensive approach integrating psychological, social, and organisational elements is necessary for addressing WDB effectively. One of the many approaches can be done is through Human Resource Development (HRD) initiatives by implementing strategies such as leadership development, fair appraisal systems, and employee engagement initiatives, which directly target and reduce deviant behaviours caused by organizational factors (Malik & Malik, 2024). Practically, organizations should focus on fairness, supportive leadership, and a positive climate to reduce deviance. Future research should explore how these factors interact across different cultural contexts and how cultural predispositions influence the effectiveness of interventions aimed at reducing WDB.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia for financing the study leave through the Hadiah Latihan Persekutuan (HLP), which facilitated the creation of this article.

References

- Abas, B., Bukhari, S., Farrukh, M., & Iqbal, S. (2024). Examining the socio-psychological dynamics of interpersonal and organizational deviances: The moderating influence of interpersonal justice and perceived organizational support. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 45(6), 935–953. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2023-0350>
- Abbasi, A., Wan Ismail, W. K., Baradari, F., Zureigat, Q., & Abdullah, F. Z. (2022). Can organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior reduce workplace deviance? *Intangible Capital*, 18(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.1816>
- Abbasi, M. A., Amran, A., & Sahar, N. E. (2024). Assessing the impact of corporate environmental irresponsibility on workplace deviant behavior of generation Z and millennials: a multigroup analysis. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 40(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-05-2022-0099>
- Abdullah, H. O., & AL-Abrow, H. (2023). Predicting positive and negative behaviors at the workplace: Insights from multi-faceted perceptions and attitudes. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 42(4), 63–80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22179>
- Abouzahra, A., Sabraoui, A., & Afdel, K. (2020). Model composition in Model Driven Engineering: A systematic literature review. In *Information and Software Technology* (Vol. 125). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2020.106316>

- Adugna, K., Birhanu, B., Kebede, A., Abraham, G., Asefa, Y., Gezahign, M., Gunja, G., & Gelana, B. (2022). The relation between organizational justice and counter-productive work behaviour among health care professionals in Jimma zone public health institutions. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership, Volume 14*, 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S365129>
- Al Halbusi, H., Williams, K. A., Ramayah, T., Aldieri, L., & Vinci, C. P. (2021). Linking ethical leadership and ethical climate to employees' ethical behavior: the moderating role of person–organization fit. *Personnel Review, 50*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2019-0522>
- Alagarsamy, S., Mehroliya, S., & Mathew, J. (2024). Fear of COVID-19, workplace phobia, workplace deviance and perceived organizational support: A moderated mediation model. *Stress and Health, 40*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3289>
- Al-Romeedy, B. S., & Ozbek, O. (2022). The effect of authentic leadership on counterproductive work behaviours in Egyptian and Turkish travel agents: Workplace incivility as a mediator. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 11*(2), 409–425. <https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720.233>
- Amin, S., Adriani, Z., Khaeruddin, & Habibi, A. (2020). DATASET for validation the relationship between workplace spirituality, organizational commitment, and workplace deviance. *Data in Brief, 31*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.105872>
- Appelbaum, S. H., Iaconi, G. D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: Causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance, 7*(5), 586–598. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700710827176>
- Aryati, A. S., Sudiro, A., Hadiwidjaja, D., & Noermijati, N. (2018). The influence of ethical leadership to deviant workplace behavior mediated by ethical climate and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Law and Management, 60*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-03-2017-0053>
- Azila-Gbettor, E. M., Blomme, R. J., Honyenuga, B. Q., & Kil, A. (2023). Antecedents of psychological ownership among family hotel employees. *Journal of Family Business Management, 13*(4), 1049–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFBM-06-2022-0079>
- Baur, J. E., Bradley, B. H., & Bonner, R. L. (2022). Boiling frogs: Reconsidering the impact of deviance targets, severity, and frequency in teams. *Journal of Business Research, 142*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.01.035>
- Bell, C. M., & Hughes-Jones, J. (2008). Power, self-regulation and the moralization of behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9635-6>
- Braje, I. N., Aleksić, A., & Jelavić, S. R. (2020). Blame it on individual or organization environment: What predicts workplace deviance more? *Social Sciences, 9*(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/SOCSCI9060099>
- Cheang, H. S., & Appelbaum, S. H. (2015). Corporate psychopathy: Deviant workplace behaviour and toxic leaders – Part one. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 47*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2013-0086>
- Chen, C. T., Hu, H. H. S., & King, B. (2018). Shaping the organizational citizenship behavior or workplace deviance: Key determining factors in the hospitality workforce. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 35*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.01.003>
- Deng, J., Hao, X., & Yang, T. (2023). The increase of counterproductive work behaviour from organizational and individual level due to workplace conflict: A sequential moderated

- mediation model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 34(2), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCM-04-2022-0079>
- Di Stefano, G., Scrima, F., & Parry, E. (2019). The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(17), 2482–2503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1326393>
- Eisenberger, Robert., Huntington, Robin., Hutchison, Steven., & Sowa, Debpra. (1986). Perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- Elliethey, N. S., Aly Abou Hashish, E., & Ahmed Mohamed Elbassal, N. (2024). Work ethics and its relationship with workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behaviours among nurses: A structural equation model. *BMC Nursing*, 23(1), 126. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01785-4>
- Faldetta, G. (2020). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance: the role of negative reciprocity. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2020-2062>
- Fein, E. C., Tziner, A., & Vasiliu, C. (2023). Perceptions of ethical climate and organizational justice as antecedents to employee performance: The mediating role of employees' attributions of leader effectiveness. *European Management Journal*, 41(1), 114–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2021.11.003>
- Fernández-del-Río, E., Castro, Á., & Ramos-Villagrasa, P. J. (2022). Dark tetrad and workplace deviance: Investigating the moderating role of organizational justice perceptions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.968283>
- Flemming, K., Booth, A., Garside, R., Tunçalp, Ö., & Noyes, J. (2019). Qualitative evidence synthesis for complex interventions and guideline development: clarification of the purpose, designs and relevant methods. *BMJ Global Health*, 4(Suppl 1). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000882>
- Giamos, D., Shkoler, O., Tziner, A., Vasiliu, C., & Shertzer, Y. (2023). Work motivation in three-way interaction with organizational justice across four different managerial positions. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 20(3), 513–538. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-09-2022-0195>
- Götz, M., Donzallaz, M., & Jonas, K. (2020). Leader–Member Exchange Fosters Beneficial and Prevents Detrimental Workplace Behavior: Organizational Identification as the Linking Pin. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01788>
- Gümüştas, C., & Karataş Gümüştas, N. (2023). Abusive supervision and organizational citizenship behavior: Moderated mediation model of burnout and organizational identity. *Central European Business Review*, 12(4), 135–159. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.336>
- Gusenbauer, M., & Haddaway, N. R. (2020). Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378>
- Hashish, E. A. A. (2020). Nurses' perception of organizational justice and its relationship to their workplace deviance. *Nursing Ethics*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733019834978>
- Higgins, J. P. T., Altman, D. G., Gøtzsche, P. C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A. D., Savović, J., Schulz, K. F., Weeks, L., & Sterne, J. A. C. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ (Online)*, 343(7829). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d5928>

- Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M. P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O’Cathain, A., Rousseau, M. C., Vedel, I., & Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for Information*, 34(4). <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221>
- Huang, X., Ye, Y., Wang, Z., Liu, X., & Lyu, Y. (2023). The influence of perceived organizational exploitation on frontline hospitality employees’ workplace deviance: An organizational justice perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(12), 4137–4157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2022-0786>
- Hung, Y.-C., Su, T.-C., & Lou, K.-R. (2022). Impact of organizational culture on individual work performance with national culture of cross-strait enterprises as a moderator. *Sustainability*, 14(11), 6897. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116897>
- Ifeanyichukwu, E. C., Obinna, I. O., Omeje, O., Okonkwo, E., Ikechukwu, A., & Okoro, C. M. (2022). Organisational justice and workplace deviance behaviour among bank workers in Nigeria: The role of perceived organisational support as a moderator. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 32(6), 569–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2022.2121463>
- Jahanzeb, S., Giles, J., & Mushtaq, R. (2023). Workplace ostracism and organizational deviance: A self-regulatory perspective. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 163(5), 698–715. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2023.2185499>
- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (Vol. 91, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.126>
- Kakemam, E., Torkzadeh, L., Rouzbahani, M., Zahedi, H., & Chegini, Z. (2021). The relationship between workplace deviant behaviors and organizational justice among nurses: A cross-sectional survey. *Nursing Forum*, 56(4), 889–896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nuf.12636>
- Khattak, M. N., & Abukhait, R. (2024). Impact of perceived organizational injustice on deviant behaviors: moderating impact of self-control. *Current Psychology*, 43(12), 10862–10870. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05160-5>
- Khattak, M. N., Khan, M. B., Fatima, T., & Shah, S. Z. A. (2019a). The underlying mechanism between perceived organizational injustice and deviant workplace behaviors: Moderating role of personality traits. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.05.001>
- Khattak, M. N., Khan, M. B., Fatima, T., & Shah, S. Z. A. (2019b). The underlying mechanism between perceived organizational injustice and deviant workplace behaviors: Moderating role of personality traits. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.05.001>
- Khattak, M. N., Zolin, R., & Muhammad, N. (2021). The combined effect of perceived organizational injustice and perceived politics on deviant behaviors. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCM-12-2019-0220>
- Kim, B.-J., Jung, S.-Y., & Jung, J. (2022). “Does a good firm diminish the bad behaviour of its employees?”: The sequential mediation effect of organizational trust and organizational commitment, and the moderation effect of work overload. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(11), 6666. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19116666>

- Kitchenham, B. (2007). Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering. *Technical Report, Ver. 2.3 EBSE Technical Report. EBSE*.
- Lockwood, C., Munn, Z., & Porritt, K. (2015). Qualitative research synthesis: Methodological guidance for systematic reviewers utilizing meta-aggregation. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare, 13*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000062>
- Malik, P., & Malik, P. (2024). Mitigating destructive deviance in organisations: Assessing the role of perceived HRM practices and perceived organisational support. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 32*(7), 1242–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-02-2023-3622>
- Maqbool, M., Lyu, B., Ullah, S., Khan, M. T., Abeden, A. Z. ul, & Kukreti, M. (2024). Abusive supervisor triggers counterproductive work behaviors in nursing staff: Role of psychological contract breach and Islamic work ethics. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 45*(3), 461–477. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2023-0295>
- Mehmood, S. A., Malik, A. R., Nadarajah, D., & Saood Akhtar, M. (2023). A moderated mediation model of counterproductive work behaviour, organisational justice, organisational embeddedness and psychological ownership. *Personnel Review, 52*(1), 183–199. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-05-2021-0330>
- Meng, R., Jiang, Z., Su, Y., Lu, G., & Chen, C. (2024). The effect of perceived organizational justice on workplace deviant behavior of new nurses: the role of emotional labor and psychological capital. *BMC Nursing, 23*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01937-6>
- Moez, B. S., Sadeghi, A., Tapak, L., & Purfarzad, Z. (2024). Relationship between workplace spirituality with organization-based self-esteem and workplace deviant behaviors among Iranian nurses. *BMC Nursing, 23*(1), 262. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01908-x>
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., Antes, G., Atkins, D., Barbour, V., Barrowman, N., Berlin, J. A., Clark, J., Clarke, M., Cook, D., D'Amico, R., Deeks, J. J., Devereaux, P. J., Dickersin, K., Egger, M., Ernst, E., Gøtzsche, P. C., ... Tugwell, P. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. In *PLoS Medicine* (Vol. 6, Issue 7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- Narayanan, K., & Moon, C. (2023). A multigroup SEM analysis of the antecedents and moderating influence of culture on workplace deviance behavior. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 30*(2), 169–196. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-06-2021-0103>
- Nemțeanu, M.-S., Dinu, V., Pop, R.-A., & Dabija, D.-C. (2022). Predicting job satisfaction and work engagement behaviour in the COVID-19 pandemic: A conservation of resources theory approach. *E+M Economie a Management, 25*(2), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2022-2-002>
- Obalade, G. O., & Mtembu, V. (2023). Effect of organisational justice on workplace deviance in Nigerian public universities. *Acta Commercii, 23*(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ac.v23i1.1091>
- Opatha, I. M., & Takahashi, Y. (2024). Does social and organizational support moderate emotional intelligence training effectiveness? *Behavioral Sciences, 14*(4), 276. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14040276>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S.,

- ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. In *The BMJ* (Vol. 372). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Pariyanti, E., Rosid, A., & Adawiyah, W. R. (2022). Workplace deviant behavior among employees of Islamic-based universities in Lampung: The moderating role of Islamic workplace spirituality. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(4), 1567–1591. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-03-2021-0089>
- Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 47–61.
- Qi, L., Chaudhary, N. I., Yao, K., Mirza, F., & Khalid, R. (2022). The moderating role of transformational leadership on the relationship between deviant workplace behaviors and employee turnover intentions in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252783639>
- Rizani, M., Kurniaty, K., Widyanti, R., Shaddiq, S., & Yahya, M. Y. D. (2022). Effect of the toxic leadership on organizational performance with workplace deviant behavior of employees as mediation. *Strategic Management Business Journal*, 2(01), 26–38. <https://doi.org/10.55751/smbj.v2i01.28>
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256693>
- Rosle, N. A., Yusof, F., & Abdul Halim, N. H. (2023). Exploring the relationship between employee engagement and workplace deviance in educational institutions. *Advanced International Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and SMEs*, 5(18). <https://doi.org/10.35631/aijbes.518012>
- Shao-Ping, W., Miao-Sheng, C., & Mou-Jian, L. (2018). Key factors affecting deviant workplace behavior. *African Journal of Business Management*, 12(10), 258–266. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ajbm2018.8491>
- Sharif, S., Lodhi, R. N., Jain, V., & Sharma, P. (2022). A dark side of land revenue management and counterproductive work behavior: Does organizational injustice add fuel to fire? *Journal of Public Procurement*, 22(4), 265–288. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-10-2021-0062>
- Sobhan, Setiawan, P., Kholidah, Ritonga, R., & Hasibuan, K. (2022). Quality of human resources in waqf institution: Counterproductive study on Muhammadiyah charity business. *Quality - Access to Success*, 23(187), 222–231. <https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/23.187.28>
- Tian, X., & Guo, Y. (2023). The Effect of Deviant Workplace Behavior on Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Shame and Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(7), 561. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13070561>
- To, W. M., & Huang, G. (2022). Effects of equity, perceived organizational support and job satisfaction on organizational commitment in Macao's gaming industry. *Management Decision*, 60(9), 2433–2454. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-11-2021-1447>
- Tufan, C., Namal, M. K., Arpat, B., Yesil, Y., & Mert, I. S. (2023). The mediating effect of organizational justice perception on the relationship between ethical leadership and workplace deviant behaviors. *Sustainability*, 15(2), 1342. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021342>
- Valle, M., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., & Harting, T. (2019). Abusive supervision, leader-member exchange, and moral disengagement: A moderated-mediation model of

- organizational deviance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 159(3), 299–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2018.1466776>
- Waseem, M. (2016). Deviant workplace behaviors in organizations in Pakistan. *The Lahore Journal of Business*, 4(2), 93–104.
<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:168165578>
- Xu, X., Sarfraz, M., & Nasrullah, U. (2024). Health hazards in sports: Exploring the influence of despotic leadership and perceived organizational politics on well-being. *Heliyon*, 10(7).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29136>
- Yasir, M., & Jan, A. (2023). Servant leadership in relation to organizational justice and workplace deviance in public hospitals. *Leadership in Health Services*, 36(2), 164–185.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/LHS-05-2022-0050>
- Zahid, A., & Nauman, S. (2024). Does workplace incivility spur deviant behaviors: Roles of interpersonal conflict and organizational climate. *Personnel Review*, 53(1), 247–265.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2022-0058>