Article

Creating Sustainable Work Environments by Developing Cultures that Diminish Deviance

Ana Aleksić *, Ivana Načinović Braje and **Sanda Rašić Jelavić**

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Zagreb, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia; inacinovic@efzg.hr (I.N.B.); srasic@efzg.hr (S.R.J.)

* Correspondence: aaleksic@efzg.hr; Tel.: +385-1-238-3237

check for updates

Abstract: Sustainable work environment creation seeks the development of a healthy environment that diminishes all forms of deviant organizational and interpersonal workplace behavior. This paper explores the role of organizational culture and values of organizational culture that help to create a sustainable work environment where the presence of deviant workplace behavior is least present. Using Cameron and Quinn's Competing Values Framework and FOCUS questionnaires as the grounds for the taxonomy of organizational culture and Robinson and Bennett typology of deviant workplace behavior, this paper analyzed the effects of different organizational cultures and their dominant values on the level of occurrence of different forms of deviant workplace behavior. Empirical analysis was done on a sample of 251 employees, belonging to 11 organizations. The research results imply that an emphasis on market and hierarchy culture can be related with occurrence of deviant behaviors. Emphasizing market culture value "job clarity" can reduce deviant behavior, unlike an emphasis on market culture value "efficiency" that could increase the level of deviant behavior. The research results are compared with previous similar studies and discussed in terms of creating a sustainable work environment.

Keywords: work environment; deviant workplace behavior; organizational culture; values

1. Introduction

Beside smart and efficient use of natural and technological resources, sustainability seeks positive, regenerative environments for employees [1] with human resources development at all levels [2]. Scholars and business experts urge for development of more sustainable organizational and work environments that promote employee wellbeing, long term productivity, a meaningful purpose, as well as work-life balance [1,3].

Still, in practice many employees face a toxic working environment that includes an array of harmful working conditions [1] where deviance has been extensively present and encouraged [4]. Deviant behavior presents different forms of employee behavior that harm the legitimate interests of the organization [5], endangering not just the organization, but also its members. It encompasses all activities of physical and verbal violence and intimidation at work. As a consequence, it not only results in poor health and individual safety, but it can have various effects on different job and non-job related social psychological outcomes [6], leading further to high organizational costs and negative impacts on the wider organizational environment.

Review of the existing literature, e.g., [2,7], provides various indicators of a healthy and sustainable work environment. Among them many are related and dependent upon organizational context, including organizational culture. Organizational culture, encompassing a system of shared organizational values, norms and beliefs, conveys a sense of identity for organizational members, facilitates the generation of commitment to something greater than self, enhances social system stability

and serves as a sense-making device that shapes employee behavior [8]. In that sense, it lays out the foundation and shape of the working environment. Among the organization-related determinants, scholars have also emphasized its role in influencing deviant workplace behavior. Organizational norms and values are brought through organizational culture, so there is no reason to doubt that organizational culture and deviant employee behavior will be interconnected [9]. Still it remains unclear what type of organizational culture and cultural values, as building blocks of culture, can create a deviance-free working environment. Although complex in nature, as it is comprised of shared attitudes, norms, beliefs and behaviors, every organizational culture has a set of dominant values that guide and shape individual behavior.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to uncover some of the connections between types of organizational culture and frequency of different deviant workplace behaviors, in order to develop those cultural values that create deviance free and sustainable work environment. Theoretical implications have been tested through an empirical research using Cameron and Quinn's Competing Values Framework (CVF) [10] as a taxonomy of organizational culture and Robinson and Bennett [11] typology of deviant workplace behavior.

CVF has been chosen to explore the connection, as it is one of the dominant and most comprehensive models for the assessment of organizational culture complexity [12,13] and as opposed to other models, provides a descriptive analysis of culture content and allows for comparisons. According to dimensions of internal or external focus and stability or flexibility structure, four distinct dominant types of culture (i.e., clan, adhocracy, hierarchy and market) can be identified [10]. Clan culture's internal focus and flexibility results in a collaborative culture whose values are similar to those of an extended family. Its competing culture is market culture (external orientation and stability) that emphasizes competitiveness, results and achieving objectives. Adhocracy culture (external orientation and flexibility) promotes innovation and entrepreneurship. Hierarchy culture (internal orientation and stability) is characterized by predictability, routines and hierarchical control. Each of the dominant culture types has idiosyncratic elements and set of dominant values that might have diverse effects on individual members' behavior, including emergence of deviance. As such, targeted analyses of corporate culture are necessary to provide deeper understanding if diverse dominant cultural values may lead to different levels of individual and organizational deviant behavior.

Previous empirical research indicates corporate culture to have an important role and connection with different forms of deviant workplace behavior e.g., [14]. Still, this research is scarce, mostly referring to some aspects of organizational culture, such as climate, e.g., [15,16], and specific forms of deviance such as bullying e.g., [17]. In order to test more clearly the connection among organizational culture in general and occurrence of deviant behavior in organizations we state our first hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *There is a connection between organizational culture and deviant workplace behaviors.*

In terms of identifying selected values that act as antecedents of deviant behavior and with regard to characteristics of culture that promote deviance, for instance, Zheng et al. [18] found that in Machiavellian corporate culture that included dimension of low trust, control and status orientation employees exhibit counterproductive work behavior. Kalemci et al. [19] found power distance and paternalistic cultural orientation interrelates with deviant behavior. Previous empirical research that orients on CVF cultural types, as Fulmore [20], finds hierarchy culture to encourage and clan culture to discourage ethical behavior, while results of Di Stefano et al. [21] show lowest level of deviance to be in adhocracy and clan cultures. In order to test if diverse dominant cultural values according to CVF cultural types may lead to different levels of individual and organizational deviant behavior, and based on previous research regarding connection of CVF cultural types and deviant behavior, we state the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2 (H2). *Values attributed to clan culture will be negatively related to level of deviant workplace behavior.*

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *Values attributed to adhocracy culture will be negatively related to level of deviant workplace behavior.*

Hypothesis 4 (H4). *Values attributed to hierarchy culture will be positively related to level of deviant workplace behavior.*

Hypothesis 5 (H5). *Values attributed to market culture will be positively related to level of deviant workplace behavior.*

2. Deviant Workplace Behavior and Its Antecedents

Deviant workplace behavior, also known as counterproductive work behavior [22], abusive work behavior [23], dysfunctional behavior [24], or workplace aggression [25] refers to a wide range of "negative", intentional behaviors that violate institutionalized norms and thus endanger the welfare of an individual or organizations [26]. They include behaviors such as physical and verbal violence and aggression, theft, abusive supervision, withholding effort or information [27], to name just a few. Their presence in organizational settings for years has been a pervasive problem, as of significant economic and social costs connected with deviance at work [28] harming not just employees and organizations but also customers [29].

The literature offers different classifications of deviant behavior. For instance, Gruys and Sackett [30] created a typology with as many as 11 dimensions, while Spector et al. [31] propose five dimensions. Still, the most common used is a two-dimensional model developed by Robinson and Bennett [11]. Using the concept of deviance as a behavior that violates accepted organizational norms, they created a typology of deviant workplace behaviors using multidimensional scaling techniques. According to their model deviant workplace behaviors can vary along two dimensions: minor versus serious and interpersonal versus organizational, depending if the behavior is targeting individuals or organization. On the basis of these two dimensions, it is possible to create four distinct categories of employee deviance: on organizational level (1) production deviance which includes behaviors such as leaving early, intentionally working slowly; (2) property deviance, which includes sabotage, stealing, taking bribes; and on individual level (3) political deviance, which includes showing favoritism, gossiping, blaming coworkers; (4) personal aggression, which includes sexual harassment, verbal abuse, coworker theft, and endangering coworkers.

Many scholars who study workplace deviance have focused on analyzing the possible antecedents of negative workplace deviance e.g., [32–34]. While some stress the importance of aspects related to individual level behavior e.g., [35], others emphasize aspects related to organizational context and situation [36].

Marcus and Scholer [37] provided and empirically tested a general framework of workplace deviance based on a multiple approach, where all predictor variables showed at least moderately strong correlates to deviant workplace behavior. The authors presented antecedents of negative workplace deviance within four quadrants: triggers (situation-motivation), opportunity (situation-control), internal control (individual-control), propensity (individual-motivation). Triggers of deviant workplace behavior could be external events or internal perceptions of that event that stimulate workplace deviance such as perceived injustice, inequity, job dissatisfaction, stress, pressure, frustration, anger, reprimand, demotion, termination, etc. Opportunity is created by the situation or perception of that situation that allows or enables workplace deviance actions—it is determined by job autonomy, organizational policy, procedures, industry, macroeconomic variables etc. Internal control refers to personal characteristics that prevent individual from negative workplace deviance based on self-control, emotional stability, conscientiousness, agreeableness, self-esteem, mental health, general trust, positive ethic attitudes etc. Propensity is conceptualized as personal difference that motivates individual towards negative

workplace deviance by making its outcome more attractive and desired. These personal characteristics include individual traits as the need for excitement and/or power, aggressiveness, etc.

However, in general, most workplace deviance research has typically focused on individual predispositions to deviant behavior, such as personality traits, e.g., [38–40], individual mental health [41], attitudes [42] and the likes, while less emphasis has been placed on organization- or work-related factors.

An organization provides an arena in which employees spend their working life, so organization-related factors have an important role in shaping employees' behaviors. Van Fleet and Griffin [24] perceive organization-related factors as catalysts for dysfunctional events. Among the organization-related determinants, scholars have emphasized the important role of organizational culture in influencing workplace deviance behavior. Among others, organizational culture has a direct effect on morale, commitment and job satisfaction—variables that can act as triggers of workplace deviance [43]. Despite that, a literature review reveals there has not been much empirical research on this topic [21].

3. Importance of Organizational Culture for Diminishing Deviance

Organizational culture is described as a universal routine referring to the core and fundamentals of the organization; hence, such culture forms the realism of the organization that reflects on experience of working, employee interpersonal interactions and anticipated actions or behaviors [44] and decisions. Influencing on worker behavior, organizational culture serves to reinforce the benefits of unified goals and shared responsibility [17]. Organizational culture, according to O'Reilly and Chatman [45], is a social control mechanism that defines appropriate attitudes and behaviors for organizational members. It defines the context in which the relations among employees develop and operate and thus is seen as a social motivation and control system [46].

An individual's behavior in a social environment is guided by the displays of behavior from others within their environment and based on information about values, norms, expectations, and behavior outcomes [47]. Schein [48] noted that organizational culture identifies what things members of the organization should pay attention to, how they react emotionally, and what actions they should take. Hence, strong organizational cultures can support and acknowledge positive, as well as negative behaviors [17]. There are examples of organizational culture that support aggressive behaviors as a practical method of motivating employees, so, incivility and rude behavior may emerge if disrespectful behaviors persist [49].

To control deviant workplace behavior, it is useful to provide a favorable workplace environment with an adequate value framework. Successful companies develop their employees and promote values of equity, autonomy, self-reliance, and self-management [50]. Oladapo and Banks [51] emphasize that a safe workplace should be focused on a culture providing a safe and healthy environment, respecting the following factors: improving the work organization and working environment; promoting active participation; encouraging personal development; promoting overall health awareness. Based on their empirical study, Boye and Jones [52] concluded that organizational values, such as caring and empathy, fair remuneration, interpersonal cooperation, honesty, and ethics had the potential to lower levels of stealing. A warm relationship environment, perceived support, employees' sense of commitment to the organization and organizational standards reduce the level of counterproductive behaviors among employees [53]. Many scholars have also emphasized that creating the code of ethics is crucial to develop a culture of organizational integrity and to encourage ethical behavior e.g., [49].

Van Fleet and Griffin [24] emphasize that organizational cultures can vary in their functionality regarding how they contribute or undermine organizational performance, stressing dysfunctional culture as the one that constraints or limits individual capabilities and encourages and rewards mediocre performance.

As mentioned, previous empirical research has provided support for influence of corporate culture on deviant workplace behavior e.g., [14–17], although mostly analyzing organizational climate aspect of culture. Research has also indicated that cultural types can boost or discourage deviant

behavior [20,21]: hierarchy culture to encourage [20] while adhocracy and clan culture to discourage deviant behavior [20,21].

4. Empirical Research

4.1. Methodology of Research

4.1.1. Participants and Procedure

In order to test the relationship between the type of organizational culture and different forms of deviant behavior, a research model and questionnaire were developed. Research was done in the period from September 2018 to March 2019 on a sample of 251 participants that were recruited from 11 Croatian organizations in different sectors. When selecting participants for the study, a nonprobability sampling technique was used. Participants were recruited through a snowball sampling technique via researchers' personal and professional contacts. This method is often used in social research, and especially in studies that relate to a more delicate issues [54], such as the study of deviant behavior. Respondents were sent a link to an on line version of the questionnaire, with additional information on the study and its purpose. Each of the participants could assess the questionnaire once, and anonymity of respondents was secured.

As regard to sample characteristics 64.5% respondents were female, with average age 40.6 years (SD = 10.3) and average 16.3 years of working experience (SD = 10.1). In the sample 94.4% of all respondents had some form of university degree (bachelor or master level). With respect to the organizations respondents came from, 57.8% of respondents were employed by large organizations, 25.9% by medium and 16.3% by small organizations. Organizations mostly had public (68.9%) or private ownership (23.5%) and some mixed ownership structures.

4.1.2. Instruments

A self-reported anonymous questionnaire was used as a research instrument. It was designed based on previously developed measurement scales referring to organizational culture and deviant workplace behavior. The questionnaire consisted of three parts where first part of the questionnaire measured perceptions of existing organizational culture, second part was designed to assess the presence of deviant workplace behaviors, while the third part included questions regarding respondents' demographics (age, gender, educational level, years of work experience) as well as organizational characteristics (size, ownership, and industry sector).

Deviant workplace behavior was assessed with the 19-item scale developed by Bennett and Robinson [11], measuring organizational and interpersonal deviant behavior. The scale consisted of two subscales, with first measuring interpersonal deviant behavior (seven items, statement sample: "Made fun of someone at work?") and second measuring organizational deviance (12 items, statement sample: "Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses?"). Respondents were asked to indicate how often they have behaved in a way described by the statement using the scale from 1 to 7 (1—never, 2—once a year, 3—twice a year, 4—several times a year, 5—monthly, 6—weekly, and 7—daily). Based on these two subscales it was possible to compute a general score of deviant workplace behavior.

Organizational culture was measured with FOCUS questionnaire [55], developed as internationally applicable instrument for measuring organizational culture based on CVF [10]. A 16-item Croatian version of this questionnaire was developed and validated by Sušanj [56]. Items measure respondents' perceptions of their organizational environments, with each item relating to one of the main values and accents of the four competing values. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that a certain behavior is typical in their organization (sample item "Compliance to rules") by using the scale from 1 to 5 (1—not at all, 5—a lot).

Items measuring organizational culture were developed in Croatian language. All of the other questionnaire items that were originally in English language, were translated into Croatian, and back-translated into English by language experts in order to ensure its accuracy, and afterword tested for their internal consistency.

4.1.3. Type of Analysis

Data collected were analyzed using statistical software package IBM SPSS 18.0, using several statistical methods. In addition to descriptive statistics, reliability data analysis was first conducted.

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were computed to test the internal consistency of the measurement items. We use the cut off value of 0.70 [57]. For all study variables reliability coefficients were higher than the selected value thus indicating internal consistency of the scale's items. Individual coefficients were as follows: interpersonal deviant behavior 0.73, organizational deviance 0.82, clan culture 0.90, adhocracy culture 0.84, market culture 0.88 and hierarchy culture 0.88.

Further on, correlation and regression analysis have been used to test and determine the relationship between the study variables.

4.2. Research Results

Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations for the two forms of deviant work behavior according to respondents' socio-demographic information and organizational attributes are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for deviant workplace behavior.

Variable		Organizational Deviance (OD)	Interpersonal Deviance (ID)
		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Gender	Male (n = 89)	1.6798 (0.63339)	1.4281 (0.54714)
	Female (n = 162)	1.4539 (0.50229)	1.3635 (0.50947)
Age	30 or under (n = 36)	1.6412 (0.64636)	1.3810 (0.53343)
	31–50 (n = 161)	1.5447 (0.54512)	1.4045 (0.53934)
	51 or older (n = 42)	1.3750 (0.43565)	1.2687 (0.37092)
Level of education	Non-degree (n = 14)	1.6310 (0.56208)	1.4286 (0.54326)
	Bachelor degree (n = 165)	1.5364 (0.57531)	1.3983 (0.55682)
	Master or PhD degree (n = 72)	1.5096(0.53459)	1.3510 (0.43683)
Firm size	Small (n = 41)	1.6728 (0.72944)	1.3275 (0.47621)
	Medium (n = 65)	1.4821 (0.47996)	1.4879 (0.63431)
	Large (n = 145)	1.5180 (0.53895)	1.3575 (0.47593)
Majority ownership	Public or majority public (n = 178)	1.4373 (0.48958)	1.3355 (0.48693)
	Private or majority private (n = 73)	1.7698 (0.65306)	0.5105 (0.58711)
TOTAL (n = 251)		1.5340 (0.56162)	1.3864 (0.52296)

Deviance levels: 1 = never; 7 = daily. Source: Authors' work.

The results indicate that respondents exhibited low deviance towards the organization ($\bar{x}$ = 1.53), as well toward others in the organization ($\bar{x}$ = 1.39). As the employee age group increased, the average level of organizational deviance decreased. Male respondents showed slightly higher organizational ($\bar{x}$ = 1.68) and interpersonal ($\bar{x}$ = 1.43) deviance than female respondents ($\bar{x}$ = 1.45 and $\bar{x}$ = 1.36 respectively). Also, it was shown that respondents with higher educational levels showed lower levels of workplace deviance. When organization size is taken into consideration, organizational deviance was highest among employees coming from small organizations while interpersonal deviance was highest among employees from medium sized organizations. Deviant behaviors were more often

present among employees working in organizations in private or majority private ownership then among public or majority public companies.

In terms of organizational culture, most respondents were employed by organizations with dominant hierarchy culture (45.6%), followed by clan culture (21.9%), market culture (17.1%) and adhocracy culture (15.4%).

In order to test the relationship between organizational culture and deviant behavior, a correlation analysis was conducted (Table 2).

Table 2. Individual effects of demographic background and different types of organizational cultures on workplace deviance.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Gender (M = 1; F = 2)	Corr. coef.	1.000							
	Sig. (2-tailed)								
(2) Age	Corr. coef.	0.125	1.000						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.054							
(3) Education (Non degree = 1, Bachelor = 2, Master or PhD = 3)	Corr. coef.	−0.035	−0.045	1.000					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.580	0.489						
(4) CLAN_Average	Corr. coef.	−0.076	−0.104	−0.224 **	1.000				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.230	0.108	0.000					
(5) Adhocracy_average	Corr. coef.	−0.092	−0.144 *	−0.168 **	0.619 **	1.000			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.148	0.026	0.008	0.000				
(6) MARKET_average	Corr. coef.	0.011	−0.039	−0.190 **	0.673 **	0.591 **	1.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.868	0.545	0.003	0.000	0.000			
(7) HIERARCHY_average	Corr. coef.	0.127 *	0.035	−0.183 **	0.480 **	0.303 **	0.716 **	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.045	0.593	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000		
(8) ORG_DEV	Corr. coef.	−0.172 **	−0.127 *	−0.022	−0.062	0.033	−0.152 *	−0.204 **	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006	0.050	0.734	0.327	0.603	0.016	0.001	
(9) INTERPERS_DEV	Corr. coef.	−0.050	−0.035	0.022	−0.060	−0.085	−0.159 *	−0.154 *	0.532 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.435	0.593	0.734	0.342	0.179	0.012	0.015	0.000

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Source: Authors' work.

As shown in Table 2 and the correlation matrix, several statistically significant correlations have been found between gender, age and two types of organizational culture and deviant behaviors towards organization (at $p < 0.05$). The negative sign of the correlation coefficient between age and deviance towards organization, although rather weak, still indicates that as employees get older, their level of deviant behaviors towards organization is slowly decreasing. Goals and rules oriented cultures, which corresponds to market and hierarchy culture according to CVF, are also statistically significantly correlated with deviant behaviors towards organization. Negative sign implies that as values attributed to market and hierarchy culture get more typical for the organization, the level of deviance towards organization might be decreasing. Interpersonal deviance also shows a weak negative but statistically significant correlation with goals and rules-oriented cultures, that is market and hierarchy culture.

In order to examine the effect of the dominant values in market and hierarchy culture on the level of occurrence of different forms of deviant workplace behaviors separate regression analyses have been conducted (Table 3). Clan and adhocracy culture did not show statistically significant correlation with workplace deviance so were omitted from further research. As shown in Table 3, values attributed to market and hierarchy culture were further analyzed in order to determine its role in workplace deviance.

Although it has been confirmed that certain cultural types are correlated with organizational and interpersonal deviant behaviors, when values and their interaction are analyzed, some of them do not produce significant relationships. Market culture attributed value "job clarity" has been found to negatively impact both forms of deviant workplace behaviors. Although its impact is rather

weak, the negative sign implies that as the job clarity increases, employees exhibit fewer deviant behaviors. Furthermore, emphasizing efficiency value as a part of the market culture has a statistically significant impact on interpersonal deviance. The positive sign indicates that as the emphasis on efficiency is increasing, employees might show more interpersonal deviant behaviors. When it comes to rules/hierarchy culture, when organizational values interact they do not individually produce significant relationship and the overall impact on deviance is nullified. Variances associated with models explaining market and hierarchy culture values as antecedents of workplace deviance are quite low, but with statistically significant predictors.

Table 3. Organizational values and relation to workplace deviance.

Variable	Values	Organizational Deviance	Interpersonal Deviance
	Constant	1.824 ***	1.718 ***
	Clear objectives	0.025	−0.097
Goals (market) culture values	"Ask" oriented	0.024	−0.137
	Efficiency	0.108	0.224 **
	Job clarity	−0.279 **	−0.161 *
R^2		0.041	0.057
	Constant	1.898 ***	1.700 ***
	Unity of command	−0.125	−0.086
Rules (hierarchy) culture	Compliance to standards	−0.007	−0.090
	Compliance to rules	−0.078	0.044
	Procedures driven	0.026	−0.050
R^2		0.027	0.031

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$. Source: Authors' work.

5. Discussion

Deviant workplace behavior can have numerous negative repercussions for employees, the organization and its customers. Antecedents of deviant behavior can be analyzed both on the individual and organizational level and this research focused on the role of organizational culture in preventing deviant behavior. Previous research on this matter is scarce [21], although the literature emphasizes organizational culture as one of the key factors that can control employee behavior, e.g., [58]. Therefore its impact on supporting deviant behaviors should not be neglected. The analysis confirmed that certain types of culture can be related with deviant behaviors, thus confirming our first hypothesis about the connection between organizational culture and deviant workplace behaviors. Still, this research showed that the type of culture matters, as market and hierarchy cultures show statistically significant correlation with deviant behavior, but clan and adhocracy culture were not related to deviance. The effect of hierarchy culture values on deviant behavior has been also confirmed by Fulmore [20], Di Stefano et al. [21], and Kanten and Ulker [53] which indicates that establishing clear procedures, as well as compliance to such rules and regulations, can be used as a tool to diminish deviant workplace behavior. Unlike previous research, this research shows that market oriented culture with working environment that emphasizes clear objectives and efficiency can also minimize deviant behaviors.

Since organizational cultures consist of many values combined in a unique way, it is important to understand which organizational values encourage deviant behavior. Some previous studies have found that positive working environment results from active employee participation, autonomy, fairness or cooperation e.g., [50–52]. As a part of the research, in terms of identifying selected values that act as antecedents of deviant behavior, we further on tested if certain values attributed to dominant organizational culture that had connection with deviant behavior, are connected to it. In that sense, it was explored which of the individual values related with market and hierarchy culture have a proven

relationship with deviant behaviors. Regression analysis indicates that higher job clarity decreases both individual and organizational deviance. This implies that deviant behavior can be work related, in case employees have clear job-related objectives they might be less willing to express their deviant behaviors. On the other hand, poor job design with unclear job roles and objectives might motivate employees to show deviant behavior towards other employees or the whole organization.

Another value related with market culture that is connected and might act as a source of deviant behavior is focus on efficiency. A strong emphasis on efficiency has the potential to increase destructive behaviors towards other employees. Most likely, this negative effect of emphasizing efficiency might occur in circumstances when other mechanisms that support efficiency are not put in place (e.g., unclear or unrealistic goals, reward systems that does not reward efficiency or lack of feedback about efficiency).

Research results indicate that emphasizing only certain values attributed to hierarchy culture can be related with fewer deviant behaviors. This does not confirm our three hypotheses about connection of values attributed to clan, adhocracy and hierarchy culture and deviant behavior. Still, hypothesis on the positive connection of values attributed to market culture and deviant behavior can be partially accepted, as value of job clarity is negatively related to deviant behavior, while focus on efficiency was positively related.

However, it is necessary to stress that low R^2 coefficient on all regression analysis performed indicates that workplace deviance surely has other antecedents than corporate culture. These ones can be person-based (such as age and gender, as our research also indicated) or related to the characteristics of the job performed. As Martinko et al. ([59], p. 41) emphasize, deviance needs to be looked as a result of "a complex interaction between the person and the environment in which the individual's reasoning about the environment and expected outcomes drive the individual's behavior".

6. Conclusions

By focusing on the relationship between organizational culture and its characteristics that are related to greater frequency of workplace deviance occurrence, this study tried to provide additional insight and understanding of sustainable work environments and their development. Every corporate culture includes a unique set of company-specific values that can be attributed to several cultures, although features of a specific type of culture will probably dominate. Results of the empirical research provide evidence that organizational cultures and its core values will be among factors that determine the level of deviant behavior. By focusing on creating culture that values higher job clarity and job design with clear job roles and objectives, managers can help to create environment with lower levels of both individual and organizational deviance. Although this kind of value is usually typical for market cultures, having clearly defined one's job position can be applied in any culture type therefore such finding has a broader application in the context of corporate culture and is not limited to market culture. Focus on efficiency can also be found within any culture, however, as a part of the CVF it is a value most characteristic for market cultures. High demands on efficiency will lead to greater interpersonal deviance. Having this in mind, in order to assure workplace sustainability, managers should not overemphasize efficiency due it its possible counterproductive effect.

Interestingly, emphasis on hierarchy culture that is based on formal chains of command, rules and policies and long-term stability was also related with lower levels of deviance. Such culture-stimulated overall predictability within organizations can therefore be used to minimize deviant behaviors, although examination of specific values within hierarchy culture did not reveal that a certain value acts as antecedent of deviant behavior.

Managers and leaders have an important role in creating a corporate culture that will inhibit or elicit deviance. By communicating expectations and by role modelling, managers transmit cultural precepts to employees regarding desirable behavior, as well as regarding misbehavior [47]. Managers should strengthen desired invisible cultural features by creating inspirational artefacts that will bond employees together and drive them toward positive outcomes. The responsibility of successful leaders and

managers in today's organizations is to develop a corporate culture that will reward workers' efforts and commitment, but in a healthy work environment.

By understanding factors that are connected with deviant behaviors managers can eradicate those organizational or workplace sources of deviant behavior that are under their direct control. Empirical evidence provided in this paper supports the claim that organizational culture, although slightly, can inhibit or support deviant behavior. Promoting adequate value frameworks might enable managers to reduce organizational and interpersonal deviant behavior. Also, it is useful to create environments where other factors that could diminish work deviance exist, especially in the case of market and hierarchy cultures.

As the results of our research emphasize, organizational culture is just one element of the puzzle leading to deviant behavior. Gender and age have also shown statistical correlations with the level of deviant behavior. This suggests that additional individual-based factors, such as attitudes, perception of injustice, personality traits, as well as congruence between personal and organizational values, leader member relation, and managerial style also need to be taken into consideration as potential causes and drivers of deviance. Moreover, mutual effects of these different personal and organizational factors cannot be neglected. Hence, managers should assure existence of organization-related factors such as organizational justice, adequate organizational climate, support and trust, work-related factors such as adequate work load and resources, and consider individually-related factors in the process of employee selection and development.

In that sense, it is necessary to stress several limitations of this study. Respondents self-reported the level of deviant behavior, so it is possible that even though they were guaranteed anonymity some of them provided more socially acceptable answers, making the real level of deviant behavior higher than shown by this research. Corporate culture was operationalized based on CVF so it is possible that some unique values that stimulate deviant behavior were not analyzed as they were not part of this model. Low variance, as mentioned, indicates that other distinct personal and environmental factors influence deviance, thus organizational culture cannot be analyzed as an exclusive factor influencing deviant behavior. Workplace deviance may be conditioned by the culture of the country in which the company operates. Specifically, cultural values might differ in Western and Eastern cultures as well as in different countries and determine what is considered acceptable behavior. Per example, different understandings of time, competitiveness, sharing and involvement versus egocentrism, individualism versus collectivism, etc. might exist in different areas and thus influence on employee behavior. Value system of the industry-type in which the company operates might act similarly as well whether the organization is in profit or non-profit sector. The analysis used a limited number of techniques for data analysis. Further research needs to include additional individual and contextual variables into analysis (especially individual or personality traits) and use other models of corporate culture. Including more study variables in the research should be accompanied with more sophisticated statistical analyses.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.A., I.N.B. and S.R.J.; methodology, A.A., I.N.B. and S.R.J., writing—original draft preparation A.A. and S.R.J., formal analysis I.N.B., writing—review and editing, A.A., I.N.B. and S.R.J.; project administration, A.A.

References

1.　Jurik, N.C.; Cavender, G. Sustainable workplaces as innovation. *J. Appl. Manag. Entrep.* **2016**, *21*, 53–71. [CrossRef]

2.　Niculita, Z. Psycho-social factors that promote organizational sustainability and innovation. *Ann. Econ. Ser.* **2015**, 222–227.

3.　Kira, M.; Eijnatten, F.M.V. Socially sustainable work organizations: A chaordic systems approach. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.* **2008**, *25*, 743–756. [CrossRef]

4.   Cheang, H.S.; Appelbaum, S.H. Corporate psychopathy: Deviant workplace behaviour and toxic leaders—Part one. *Ind. Commer. Train.* **2015**, *47*, 165–173. [CrossRef]

5.   Sackett, P.; Berry, C.; Wiemann, S.; Laczo, R. Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Hum. Perform.* **2006**, *19*, 441–464. [CrossRef]

6.   Hossain, M.D.; Moon, J.; Yun, J.; Choe, Y.C. Impact of psychological traits on user performance in information systems delivering customer service: IS management perspective. *Decis. Support Syst.* **2012**, *54*, 270–281. [CrossRef]

7.   Grawitch, M.J.; Gottschalk, M.; Munz, D.C. The path to a healthy workplace: A critical review linking healthy workplace practices, employee well-being, and organizational improvements. *Consult. Psychol. J. Pract. Res.* **2006**, *58*, 129–147. [CrossRef]

8.   Smircich, L. Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* **1983**, *28*, 339–358. [CrossRef]

9.   Pearson, C.M.; Andersson, L.M.; Porath, C.L. Workplace incivility. In *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*; Fox, S., Spector, P.E., Eds.; American Psychological Association: Washington, DC, USA, 2005; pp. 177–200.

10.   Cameron, K.S.; Quinn, R.E. *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture Based on the Competing Values Framework*; Addison-Wesley Publishing: Boston, MA, USA, 1999.

11.   Robinson, S.L.; Bennett, R.J. A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1995**, *38*, 555–572.

12.   Howard, L. Validating the competing values model as a representation of organizational cultures. *Int. J. Organ. Anal.* **1998**, *6*, 231–250. [CrossRef]

13.   Kwan, P.; Walker, A. Validating the competing values model as a representation of organizational culture through inter-institutional comparisons. *Organ. Anal.* **2004**, *12*, 21–37. [CrossRef]

14.   Van Rooij, B.; Fine, A. Toxic corporate culture: Assessing organizational processes of deviancy. *Adm. Sci.* **2018**, *8*, 23. [CrossRef]

15.   Kaptein, M. Understanding unethical behavior by unraveling ethical culture. *Hum. Relat.* **2011**, *64*, 843–869. [CrossRef]

16.   Vardi, Y. The effects of organizational and ethical climates on misconduct at work. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2001**, *29*, 325–337. [CrossRef]

17.   Zeka, L. Organizational Culture and Individuals' Experience of Workplace Bullying. Ph.D. Thesis, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN, USA, 2018.

18.   Zheng, W.; Wu, Y.; Chen, X.; Lin, S. Why do employees have counterproductive work behavior? The role of founder's Machiavellianism and the corporate culture in China. *Manag. Decis.* **2017**, *55*, 563–578. [CrossRef]

19.   Kalemci, R.; Kalemci-Tuzun, I.; Ozkan-Canbolat, E. Employee deviant behavior: Role of culture and organizational relevant support. *Eur. J. Manag. Bus. Econ.* **2019**, *28*, 126–141. [CrossRef]

20.   Fulmore, J.A. Testing the Structural Invariance of Affective Commitment on Unethical Proorganizational Behavior across Clan and Hierarchy Organizational Culture Types. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Texas at Tyler, Tyler, TX, USA, 2018.

21.   Di Stefano, G.; Scrima, F.; Parry, E. The effect of organizational culture on deviant behaviors in the workplace. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Man.* **2017**, *30*, 2482–2503. [CrossRef]

22.   Ma, J.; Liu, C. The moderating effect of emotional intelligence on the relationship between supervisor conflict and employees' counterproductive work behaviors. *Int. J. Conf. Manag.* **2019**, *30*, 227–245. [CrossRef]

23.   Hackney, K.J.; Perrewé, P.L. A review of abusive behaviors at work: The development of a process model for studying abuse. *Organ. Psychol. Rev.* **2018**, *8*, 70–92. [CrossRef]

24.   Van Fleet, D.D.; Griffin, R.W. Dysfunctional organizational culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysfunctional work behaviors. *J. Manag. Psychol.* **2006**, *21*, 698–708. [CrossRef]

25.   Johnson, A.; Nguyen, H.; Groth, M.; White, L. Workplace aggression and organisational effectiveness: The mediating role of employee engagement. *Aust. J. Manag.* **2018**, *43*, 614–631. [CrossRef]

26.   Griffin, R.W.; O'Leary-Kelly, A.M. *The Dark Side of Organizational Behavior*; Wiley: New York, NY, USA, 2004.

27.   Jensen, J.M.; Patel, P.C. Predicting counterproductive work behavior from the interaction of personality traits. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* **2011**, *51*, 466–471. [CrossRef]

28.   Nurul, I.; Kozakoa, A.M.F.; Safin, S.Z.; Rahim, A.R.A. The relationship of big five personality traits on counterproductive work behaviour among hotel employees: An exploratory study. *Procedia Econ. Financ.* **2013**, *7*, 181–187.

29. Raman, P.; Sambasivan, M.; Kumar, N. Counterproductive work behavior among frontline government employees: Role of personality, emotional intelligence, affectivity, emotional labor, and emotional exhaustion. *J. Work Organ. Psychol.* **2016**, *32*, 25–37. [CrossRef]

30. Gruys, M.L.; Sackett, P.R. Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *Int. J. Sel. Assess.* **2003**, *11*, 30–42. [CrossRef]

31. Spector, P.E.; Fox, S.; Penney, L.M.; Bruursema, K.; Goh, A.; Kessler, S. The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2006**, *68*, 446–460. [CrossRef]

32. Alias, M.; Rasdi, R.M.; Ismail, M.; Smah, B.A. Predictor of workplace deviant behavior: HRD agenda for Malaysian support personnel. *Eur. J. Train. Dev.* **2013**, *37*, 161–182. [CrossRef]

33. Choi, Y.H.; Myung, J.K.; Kim, J.D. The effect of employees' perceptions of CSR activities on employee deviance: The mediating role of anomie. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 601–621. [CrossRef]

34. O'Boyle, E.H.; Forsyth, D.; O'Boyle, A.S. Bad Apples or bed barrels: An examination of a group- and organizational-level effects in the study of counterproductive work behavior. *Group Organ. Manag.* **2011**, *36*, 39–69. [CrossRef]

35. Bennett, R.J.; Robinson, S.L. Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2000**, *85*, 349–360. [CrossRef]

36. Applebaum, S.H.; Iaconi, G.D.; Matousek, A. Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviours: Causes, impacts and solutions. *Corp. Gov.* **2007**, *7*, 586–598. [CrossRef]

37. Marcus, B.; Scholer, H. Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2004**, *89*, 647–660. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

38. Pletzer, J.L.; Bentvelzen, M.; Oostrom, J.K.; De Vries, R.E. A meta-analysis of the relations between personality and workplace deviance: Big Five versus HEXACO. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2019**, *112*, 369–383. [CrossRef]

39. Bolton, L.M.R.; Becker, L.K.; Barber, L.K. Big five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* **2010**, *49*, 537–541. [CrossRef]

40. Enwereuzor, I.K.; Onyishi, I.E.; Onyebueke, I.F.; Amazue, L.O.; Nwoke, M.B. Personality as a moderator between emotional exhaustion and workplace deviance among teachers. *J. Psychol. Afr.* **2017**, *27*, 41–46. [CrossRef]

41. Arboleda-Florez, J.; Holley, H.; Crisanti, A. Understanding causal paths between mental illness and violence. *Soc. Psychiatry Psychiatr. Epidemiol.* **1998**, *33*, 538–546. [CrossRef]

42. Khattak, M.N.; Khan, M.B.; Fatima, T.; Shah, S.Z.A. The underlying mechanism between perceived organizational injustice and deviant workplace behaviors: Moderating role of personality traits. *Asia Pac. Manag. Rev.* **2019**, *24*, 201–211. [CrossRef]

43. Gregory, B.T.; Harris, S.G.; Armenakis, A.A.; Shook, C.L. Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *J. Bus. Res.* **2009**, *62*, 673–679. [CrossRef]

44. Kochan, F. Analyzing the relationships between culture and mentoring. *Mentor. Tutoring* **2013**, *21*, 412–430. [CrossRef]

45. O'Rilley, C.A.; Chatman, J.A. Culture as social control: Corporations, culture and commitment. *Res. Organ. Behav.* **1996**, *18*, 157–200.

46. Roberts, J. *The Modern Firm, Organizational Design for Performance and Growth*; Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2007.

47. Glomb, T.M.; Liao, H. Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2003**, *46*, 486–496.

48. Schein, E.H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 3rd ed.; Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2004.

49. Valentine, S.; Fleischman, G.; Godkin, L. Rogues in the ranks of selling organizations: Using corporate ethics to manage workplace bullying and job satisfaction. *J. Pers. Sell. Sales. Manag.* **2015**, *35*, 143–163. [CrossRef]

50. Tessema, M.T.; Tsegai, G.; Ready, K.; Embaye, A.; Windrow, B. Effect of employee background on perceived organizational justice: Managerial implications. *Int. Rev. Adm. Sci.* **2014**, *80*, 443–463. [CrossRef]

51. Oladapo, V.; Banks, L.T. Management bullies: The effect on employees. *J. Bus. Stud. Q.* **2013**, *4*, 107–120.

52. Boye, M.W.; Jones, J.W. Organizational culture and employee counterproductivity. In *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*; Giacalone, R., Greenberg, J., Eds.; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1997; pp. 172–184.

53. Kanten, P.; Ulker, F.E. The effect of organizational climate on counterproductive behaviors: An empirical study on the employees of manufacturing enterprises. *Macrotheme Rev.* **2013**, *2*, 144–160.

54. Etikan, I.; Alkassim, R.; Abubakar, S. Comparision of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biom. Biostat. Int. J.* **2016**, *3*, 1–2. [CrossRef]

55. van Muijen, J.J.; Koopman, P.; De Witte, K.; De Cock, G.; Susanj, Z.; Lemoine, C.; Bourantas, D.; Papalexandris, N.; Branyicski, I.; Spaltro, E.; et al. Organizational culture: The focus questionnaire. *Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.* **1999**, *8*, 551–568. [CrossRef]

56. Sušanj, Z. *Organizacijska Klima i Kultura*; Naklada Slap: Jastrebarsko, Croatia, 2005.

57. Feldt, L.S.; Kim, S. A comparison of tests for equality of two or more independent alpha coefficients. *J. Educ. Meas.* **2008**, *45*, 179–193.

58. Al-Jundi, S.A.; Shuhaiber, A.; Al-Emara, S.S. The effect of culture and organisational culture on administrative corruption. *Int. J. Econ. Bus. Res.* **2019**, *18*, 436–451. [CrossRef]

59. Martinko, M.J.; Gundlach, M.J.; Douglas, S.C. Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behavior: A causal reasoning perspective. *Int. J. Sel. Assess.* **2002**, *10*, 36–50. [CrossRef]