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Abstract
Norm violations can not only cause harm but also contribute to the well-being of organizations. During the last several decades, two different foci of research on workplace norm violations have generated a host of empirical studies on both constructive and destructive norm-violating behavior (NVB). However, the two closely related bodies of literature have remained in almost complete isolation from each other. Our conceptual review seeks to kindle a new perspective to better understand the general concept of NVB in organizations by combining the bifurcated silos of both constructive and destructive NVB. By conducting a systematic literature review of research on workplace NVBs over the past 30 years, we synthesize the major
research findings on both constructive and destructive deviance into a general framework and examine the major antecedents, moderators, mediators, and outcomes as they fit within the major theoretical perspectives. Moreover, we study the commonalities of constructive and destructive NVB, focusing especially on the overlapping and dynamic relationships between the two concepts. To conclude, we propose new lines of inquiry for future research to assist academics and practitioners in understanding and managing different forms of organizational norm violations.

INTRODUCTION

Like many companies, Sherwin-Williams requires employees to limit personal activities during work time and prohibits the improper personal use of company resources. Therefore, it is not surprising that Tony Piloseno, a part-time Sherwin-Williams employee, was fired for using the company’s equipment and paints while he was at work to make paint-mixing videos for his personal TikTok channel. The company accused Piloseno of engaging in workplace deviance by making “these videos during [his] working hours” and wasting the company’s “properties [and] facilities” (Chen 2020). But Piloseno claimed that he was doing market promotion for the company, introducing Sherwin-Williams’ product to his 1.2 million TikTok followers. How would you categorize Piloseno’s behavior? Does Piloseno’s intent matter? Was he engaging in (counterproductive or destructive) workplace deviance (i.e., voluntary actions that violate significant organizational norms and may cause harm to the organization and/or individuals within the organization) (Robinson & Bennett 1995) when he made unauthorized videos during company hours using the company’s equipment and product? Or should his actions be considered constructive deviance (i.e., voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms but intends to contribute to the well-being of the organization, its members, or both) (Galperin 2012) because he was motivated to market the company’s brand and increase sales by attracting younger customers?

How about the two CVS employees who were fired because they did not call the police but instead pulled a thief to the ground when he was trying to run out of the front door (Reinke 2018)? Should their norm-violating behavior (NVB) be considered constructive because they intended to protect their employer’s property? Or should their behavior be deemed destructive because they unnecessarily initiated a violent physical confrontation that jeopardized their safety and the safety of others?

Our opening examples suggest that the current conceptualizations of NVB as either constructive or destructive NVB may not be as appropriate as the field’s partitioning of these sister constructs suggests. Over the last three decades, there has been increased interest in organizational NVBs; this broad behavioral umbrella includes a number of constructs, such as antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg 1997), counterproductive behavior (Spector & Fox 2005), workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson 2000), prosocial rule breaking (PSRB) (Morrison 2006), positive deviance (Spreitzer & Sonenshein 2004), and constructive deviance (Galperin 2003, 2012). While this growth in the literature has advanced our understanding of the various forms of NVBs in organizations, the increased research has inadvertently muddied the construct clarity of constructive and destructive NVB.

In the destructive NVB literature, for example, some scholars have included motivation for the counter-normative behavior (e.g., revenge, retaliation, organizational aggression) in their definitions (but not always in their measurements), and others have taken a victim’s perspective
in their construct definitions which may suggest (unproven) intent (e.g., antisocial behavior, bullying, victimization) (see Bennett et al. 2018). The constructive NVB literature, although younger, is following the same path with multiple conceptualizations. Some scholars focus on norm violation and positive intent (see Galperin 2003, 2012), while others include constructs that are not necessarily norm violations and/or constructs that do not focus on pro-organizational intent (e.g., creativity, extrarole behavior, and voice) (Vadera et al. 2013, Warren 2003). For example, while voice is sometimes included as a form of constructive NVB (Vadera et al. 2013, Warren 2003), voice measures include behaviors that are not necessarily norm violations, such as developing and making suggestions concerning issues or speaking up and encouraging others to get involved (Van Dyne & LePine 1998).

Organizational behavior theorists (Van Dyne et al. 1995) have emphasized the need to better understand organizational constructs by removing construct contamination and preventing conceptual confusion. Prior research has mostly investigated constructive and destructive NVB in complete isolation from each other, resulting in two bifurcated bodies of literature with very little overlap. We argue that the channeling of two sister concepts as two separate streams of research has limited our understanding of their relationships. We suggest that integrating constructive and destructive NVB under the umbrella term of organizational NVB may provide a useful new perspective to understand these two related concepts. Since both concepts are defined as violations of significant norms in organizations (Galperin 2003, 2012; Robinson & Bennett 1995), the conceptual and empirical distinction between constructive and destructive NVB may not always be as clear as has been implied.

Therefore, we merge the research streams of constructive and destructive NVB by considering both their commonalities and differences in one comprehensive review. This synthesis provides unique contributions to the field since it develops new insights into norm violations in organizations and opens important avenues for future scholarship. Specifically, we conduct a systematic literature review of research on workplace NVB in business and management journals and related disciplines over the past 30 years. Although the destructive NVB literature is more mature than the constructive NVB literature, the literature on constructive NVB has developed significantly in recent years. Figure 1 shows the publication trends for these two bodies of literature. The relative growth rates show that the research on constructive NVB is approximately 10 years behind destructive NVB; i.e., there were 31 constructive NVB articles published in 2017–2019, doubling the rate of the previous 2-year period. In contrast, destructive NVB achieved 31 publications per year in approximately 2009 and doubled the rate of the previous year in approximately the same year. Thus, the burgeoning research in the two bodies of literature provides a great opportunity to synthesize and understand the interplay of constructive and destructive NVB.

Our article makes several important contributions to the literature. We challenge the traditional bifurcated view of constructive and destructive NVB by identifying and reviewing the major theories that have been applied to workplace NVB in both arenas of constructive and destructive workplace NVB. Drawing on these theories, we discuss how empirical findings can help navigate our understanding of NVB in organizations, especially how research in one stream may help traverse steep currents and obstacles in the other stream. Secondly, we draw on the extant empirical research on both constructive and destructive workplace NVB to identify individual, dyadic/team, and organizational factors that explain both constructive and destructive forms of NVB. Finally, we propose a 2 x 2 framework for understanding the role of intentions and outcomes in NVB. We suggest critical research directions arising from our synthesis of different bodies of literature on NVB.
CONCEPTUALIZATION OF NORM-VIOLATING BEHAVIOR

Norm-violating (i.e., deviant\(^1\)) behavior has a long tradition in criminology, social psychology, and sociology. For example, several classic studies suggest that nonconformity and NVB are common but obscured phenomena in both interpersonal and organizational life. Although it is helpful to review classic work in different disciplines to gain an appreciation of how the field has evolved to its present state, we confine our review to the applied psychological and organizational scholarship over the past 30 years.

Just as there is a distinction between positive and negative NVB in these other disciplines (e.g., Ben-Yehuda 1990, Wilkins 1965), there are generally two distinct bodies of research on workplace NVB. On the one hand, the destructive NVB literature focuses on the negative and dysfunctional forms of employee NVB, highlighting that workplace NVB often leads to a variety of undesirable, harmful, and costly outcomes for both organizations and employees (e.g., Bennett & Robinson 2002; Robinson & Bennett 1995, 1997; Spector et al. 2006). On the other hand, research on constructive NVB suggests that not all NVBs in the workplace are bad. Indeed, some forms of workplace NVB can be beneficial because they may lead to healthy outcomes for employees and organizations (e.g., Galperin 2003, 2012; Morrison 2006; Vadera et al. 2013).

MOVING BEYOND BIFURCATION: THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NORM-VIOLATING REVIEW

Previous reviews of NVB have exclusively focused on either destructive (e.g., Baharom et al. 2017, Carpenter & Berry 2017, Dalal 2005) or constructive NVB (e.g., Vadera et al. 2013). Although

\(^{1}\)Although the term deviant has negative connotations, past research has distinguished positive deviance from negative deviance (e.g., see Hertime & van de Fliert 2018, Spreitzer & Sonenshein 2004).
Table 1  Typology of norm/rule violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive (self-perspective)</th>
<th>Constructive (other's perspective)</th>
<th>Nonconstructive or destructive (other's perspective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived by both parties as constructive</td>
<td>2. Perceived by self as constructive; perceived by others as nonconstructive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived by self as nonconstructive; perceived by others as constructive</td>
<td>4. Perceived by both parties as nonconstructive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

there are different ways to understand the connections between destructive and constructive NVB, we suggest that at least three important factors may obscure their distinction.

First, not all deviant behaviors are strictly constructive or destructive. Instead, some deviant behaviors can lead to indeterminate outcomes; a behavior can be intended to be harmful but yield positive outcomes for the organization, or it may be intended by the actor to be constructive but may yield negative outcomes. For example, Christian Smalls, a former Amazon employee at the Staten Island, New York, facility, organized and attended a protest to demand Amazon close the facility for deep cleaning after colleagues had tested positive for COVID-19. From Smalls’ perspective, he acted to improve workplace safety. However, his manager and other employees might have perceived that he put others at risk by violating both Amazon’s social distancing guidelines and a paid 14-day quarantine (Fung 2020). Consequently, this suggests that although many NVBs can be clearly labeled as constructive or destructive (because motive and outcome match), some counter-normative behaviors may be harder to classify. As shown by our opening examples, some deviant behaviors may be viewed as constructive to some observers but destructive to others (Table 1). Thus, judging whether an NVB is constructive or destructive (or both) is sometimes difficult because different roles and perspectives may lead to different judgments.

Secondly, the current conceptualization of constructive versus destructive norm violations does not explain who decides, and based on what criteria, whether an NVB is constructive or destructive when people have different interpretations and judgments. For example, the time horizon may blur or complicate the conceptual distinction between constructive and destructive norm violations since NVB can have short- and long-term consequences. Although many NVBs may lead to consistent positive or negative outcomes both now and in the future, some other NVBs may result in one kind of outcome (positive or negative) in the short run but the opposite outcome in the long run. When such differences arise, deciding whether an NVB is constructive or destructive may be challenging.

Finally, the same employee can engage in both constructive and destructive NVB. A small but growing number of empirical studies demonstrates that the average correlation between the two constructs is often approximately 0.50 and sometimes even higher (e.g., Christ-Brendemühl & Schaar 2019, Dahling et al. 2012, Galperin 2012, Kong & Kim 2017, Malik & Lenka 2019). For example, the same employee who bends the rules to help a customer may also engage in similar deviant actions to give unauthorized free and discounted goods or services to a friend or acquaintance (Brady et al. 2012, Sarpong & Maclean 2017). Similarly, the same employee who engages in aggressive behaviors toward coworkers may also defy authority to improve work procedures. Thus, since the same employees may engage in both constructive and destructive NVB, it is important to identify the common antecedents to both behaviors.

In sum, our discussion so far suggests that constructive and destructive NVBs are not always orthogonal. Some NVBs may be ambiguous, and it may be difficult for observers to identify the actor’s intention. In addition, the same employees may also engage in both constructive and destructive NVB. Thus, our review seeks to synthesize the constructive and destructive NVB literature by identifying the underlying connections between constructive and destructive norm
violations. This synthesis allows us to provide a holistic view of constructive and destructive NVB. We offer our suggested framework to better understand the relationship between different forms of NVBs, develop new insights, and open important avenues for future scholarship.

**COVERAGE OF THE REVIEW**

To analyze the confluence of NVB in organizations, we performed a systematic literature review to examine the current literature on workplace NVB and develop a general framework for negative and positive norm violations. We searched major databases (EBSCO Host, Google Scholar, PsychINFO, and Web of Science) for published and peer-reviewed studies in English between 1990 and 2020. We also searched for past reviews and meta-analyses related to (either destructive or constructive) workplace NVB (e.g., Berry et al. 2007, Pletzer et al. 2020). In line with the meta-analysis by Berry et al. (2007), we used the following keywords: “antisocial behavior, counterproductive behavior, counterproductive work behavior, dysfunctional work behavior, interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, workplace deviance, and workplace deviant behavior,” when we searched destructive norm-violating behavior. For our search of constructive norm-violating behavior, we used the key terms of “constructive deviance, positive deviance, prosocial rule breaking (PSRB), and bootlegging.”

We also included the additional keyword “organization” in our keyword searches to ensure that the articles were relevant to the organizational context.

Using this approach, we identified an initial sample of 1,900 publications for negative workplace NVB and 245 publications for positive workplace NVB. After eliminating duplicates, we analyzed all the abstracts and jointly decided on the inclusion criteria to ensure the quality of the selected articles. Specifically, our inclusion criteria were: (a) the articles were consistent with our definitions of destructive and constructive NVB and (b) the articles had an organizational focus. Based on these criteria, most of the articles included were based on samples of working adults. A small number of articles (1.4%) with samples of university students were also included in the review because these studies were written in organizational contexts (e.g., Burns et al. 2014). However, community samples (e.g., adolescents, juveniles, parents, and school students) were excluded because these studies are unlikely to be generalizable to an organizational context.

With the help of three research assistants, the research team coded abstracts independently to determine whether the abstracts fit our criteria. The initial agreement among the independent coders was 98%. We resolved all inconsistencies in the coding via discussion. Based on the aforementioned inclusion criteria, we identified a total of 427 publications, which included 350 publications on negative organizational NVB, 65 publications on positive organizational NVB, and 12 articles that examined both destructive and constructive norm violations. The total number of articles we reviewed is higher than that in other reviews of deviant behavior published to date in leading management journals. Next, we identified antecedents, mediators, moderators, outcomes, significant relationships among study variables, the theory used, and the type of paper (quantitative methods, qualitative methods, theory paper, meta-analysis, or review paper). We summarize our major findings, which consistently identify commonalities of constructive and destructive NVB in Table 2. More detailed information is available from the authors upon request.

---

2 Bootlegging, a specific form of constructive deviance, is the process by which individuals take the initiative to work on ideas that have no formal organizational support and are often hidden from the sight of senior management but are undertaken with the aim of producing innovations that will benefit the company (Criscuolo et al. 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Citation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Avery et al. 2012, Fleming 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Bodankin &amp; Tziner 2009, Bolton et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Berry et al. 2007, Bodankin &amp; Tziner 2009, Curtis et al. 2013, Pletzer et al. 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Berry et al. 2007, Bodankin &amp; Tziner 2009, Bolton et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>(Trait) creativity</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Augsdorfer 2012, Globocnik &amp; Salomo 2015, Ng &amp; Yam 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>Job (dis)satisfaction</td>
<td>Antecedent and mediator</td>
<td>Duffy et al. 1998, Judge et al. 2006, Pan et al. 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>Role breadth self-efficacy</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Galperin 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>Organizational identification</td>
<td>Boundary condition</td>
<td>Kim &amp; Töh 2019, Lee et al. 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>Ethical ideology/ethical idealism</td>
<td>Boundary condition</td>
<td>Hastings &amp; Finegan 2011, Zhu et al. 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of workplace conditions</td>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Berry et al. 2007, Cohen &amp; Ehrlich 2019, Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of workplace conditions</td>
<td>Perceived human resources management practices</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Malik &amp; Lenka 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of workplace conditions</td>
<td>Perceived access to information</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Galperin 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of workplace conditions</td>
<td>Felt obligation</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>Khan 2017, Li et al. 2017, Lin &amp; Johnson 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of workplace conditions</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>Boundary condition</td>
<td>Palmer et al. 2017, Yıldız et al. 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Citation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Individual perceptions of workplace conditions</td>
<td>Psychological contract violations</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>Cohen &amp; Ehrlich 2019, Ma et al. 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation-related constructs</td>
<td>Workaholism</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Galperin &amp; Burke 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation-related constructs</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Antecedent and boundary condition</td>
<td>Erdogan et al. 2018, Lorinkova &amp; Perry 2017, Mackey et al. 2015, Sharma &amp; Singh 2018, Tu &amp; Luo 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Stress and well-being</td>
<td>Job demands</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Dahling et al. 2012, Smoktunowicz et al. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Stress and well-being</td>
<td>Organizational constraints</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Kannan-Narasimhan 2014, Meier &amp; Spector 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Workplace behaviors</td>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviors</td>
<td>Outcome and antecedent</td>
<td>Berry et al. 2007, Li et al. 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad/team</td>
<td>Workplace behaviors</td>
<td>Customer aggression</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Kong &amp; Kim 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad/team</td>
<td>Workplace behaviors</td>
<td>Coworker behavior</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Morrison 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad/team</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Abusive supervision</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Garcia et al. 2015, Michel et al. 2016, Mitchell &amp; Ambrose 2007, Pan et al. 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad/team</td>
<td>Norms/culture</td>
<td>Expected reciprocity</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
<td>Brady et al. 2012, Garcia et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Due to the lack of integration between the negative and positive norm-violating literature, our primary objective in this article is to identify the overlaps and discuss the connections and commonalities between the two bodies of norm-violating literature. Thus, although our review covers a great variety of constructive and destructive NVB issues, the considerable breadth of this section mainly provides an overview of the existing overlaps between the two isolated bodies of literature. We provide more complete information and the details for every article included in the review as Supplemental Material.

By focusing on how NVBs have been conceptualized and measured in the organizational context, our review examines the antecedents, moderators, mediators, and outcomes of workplace NVB at the individual, dyadic/team, organizational, and national levels. We have structured this review as follows. First, we broadly discuss the major theoretical frameworks and highlight the empirical evidence for their effects on both constructive and destructive NVB (see Table 2). Second, we identify and summarize the overlapping variables in all the empirical studies. Finally, we suggest a typology of NVB (see Table 1) and develop an agenda for future research with respect to the theoretical, empirical, and practical implications.

Although constructive and destructive NVB developed as two distinct and isolated bodies of literature, there are common theories in the extant literature that explain both positive and negative norm violations. Thus, our review first provides a theory-based comparison of constructive and destructive NVB. Table 3 summarizes all the theories referenced in our review of NVB in organizations. Our analysis suggests that social exchange theory (SET) is the most utilized theory for explaining both constructive and destructive NVB (referenced in 13.33% and 15.79% of the studies, respectively). The breadth of SET allows it to explain most exchanges (Cropanzano et al. 2017). SET suggests that individuals engage in NVBs to benefit or harm their organization or coworkers depending on whether their exchanges with their organizations are positive or negative. Extant research suggests that social exchange relationships are symmetrically related to NVBs: Whereas positive exchange relationships increase constructive NVB, negative exchange relationships increase destructive NVB. However, recent research has started to challenge this assumption, suggesting that positive exchanges may lead to destructive NVB or vice versa (Pan et al. 2018, Wang et al. 2022). For example, Pan et al. (2018) showed that although abusive supervision resulted in job dissatisfaction, a certain degree of job dissatisfaction increased job-related productive NVB. In contrast, Wang et al. (2022) showed that high compensation increased the likelihood of employees engaging in destructive NVB to benefit the leader at the expense of others.

Thus, despite its wide application, SET simply assumes that constructive and destructive NVB are the two ends of a single continuum. It falls short of addressing the connections between the
## Table 3 Summary of all the referenced theories in our review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major theory</th>
<th>Constructive NVB studies (%)</th>
<th>Destructive NVB studies (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective events theory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression model</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of resources theory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice theory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality theory</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination theory</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation theory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social bonding theory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cognitive theory</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity theory</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social information processing theory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social learning theory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Organizational) strain theory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress related theories</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait activation theory</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other theories (less than 2% in both the constructive and destructive NVB literature)</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: NA, not applicable; NVB, norm-violating behavior.

two, especially the (shared) underlying motivation to violate norms as a result of an experienced social exchange relationship and the importance of context in determining whether the NVB is constructive or destructive.

Different personality theories are the second most referenced antecedent in the destructive NVB literature (13.53%). In particular, a host of research studies has shown that several important personality traits, such as Machiavellianism, narcissism, neuroticism, and psychopathy, are positively related to destructive NVB (Berry et al. 2007, Bolton et al. 2010, DeShong et al. 2015, Pletzer et al. 2020). A smaller but substantial number of studies in the literature of constructive NVB (8%) offer personality traits as a predictor with either a positive (+) or negative (−) relationship to NVB [e.g., conscientiousness (−), neuroticism (−), Machiavellianism (+), and risk propensity (+)] (Bodankin & Tziner 2009, Dahling et al. 2012, Galperin 2012, Yıldız et al. 2015). Distinct from the other theories, personality theories offer a dispositional approach, predicting that individual differences are important predictors of either constructive or destructive NVBs and in some cases may predict both forms of NVB. For example, Machiavellianism was found to be positively related to both destructive and constructive NVB (Galperin 2012), while neuroticism was found to be related to destructive NVB (+) and constructive NVB (−) in opposite directions (Bodankin & Tziner 2009). However, personality theories are often inadequate to explain how and why situational factors may influence NVBs.

Referenced by 8% of the constructive NVB studies, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner 1985) ties with personality theory as the second most referenced theory in constructive NVB studies. Social identity theory suggests that employees who identify with their organization or group are often more likely to engage in constructive NVB (e.g., Dahling & Gutworth 2017, Hornsey 2016, Li et al. 2019), especially when they find that their organization strays from the right course of action (Hornsey 2016). For these highly identified employees, internalized
organizational identity motivates them to engage in constructive NVB because they care strongly about their organization (Packer & Miners 2014). Social identity theory has also been used by a small portion of studies in the literature on destructive NVB (1.50%). The logic behind these studies is precisely the opposite: Employees who weakly identify with their organization are more willing and likely to engage in destructive NVB out of self-interest because they are less concerned about their organization’s well-being (e.g., Enns & Rotundo 2012, Liu & Berry 2013). Taken together, social identity theory has been used to explain both constructive and destructive NVB. In the case of social identity theory, there are relatively consistent findings, and both forms of NVB behave as expected by the theory. Greater identification with the source of the norms results in fewer behaviors intending to violate the norms in harmful ways and more behaviors intending to violate the norms in constructive ways.

Of course, in both bodies of literature, there are far more theories than the most frequently referenced ones we have discussed here so far. However, extant research rarely considers both constructive and destructive NVB using the same theoretical lens (for exceptions, see Galperin 2012, Galperin & Burke 2006, Malik & Lenka 2019). Our review suggests that one theory alone seems unlikely to explain the differences and connections between constructive and destructive NVB. Specifically, constructive and destructive NVBs are not necessarily on the same continuum, nor do they simply parallel each other in an opposite fashion. In fact, we suggest that organizational NVB is not always clearly and statically destructive or constructive. As a result, one behavior may be considered constructive by some observers and destructive by the actor or vice versa. Also, the same employees may engage in both constructive and destructive NVB.

REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON NORM-VIOLATING BEHAVIOR

Following our review of theoretical perspectives on NVB, this section reviews the empirical studies on particular variables utilized in studies of NVB. By identifying the overlapping variables in constructive and destructive NVB, our review can provide a richer understanding of the interplay of constructive and destructive NVBs and can help discover the commonalities between the two isolated bodies of literature. We begin by discussing the main antecedents in both the destructive and constructive literature, largely focusing on the overlapping variables. Next, we review how the major moderators impact the relationships between different antecedents and constructive and destructive norm violations. Third, we identify and discuss the main mediators used in both constructive and destructive research. Finally, we review the outcomes of positive and negative norm violations. Our review of the empirical literature discusses the antecedents, moderators, mediators, and outcomes at the individual, dyadic/team, and organizational levels in the constructive and destructive literature. We have identified the major antecedents of constructive and destructive NVB separately and present them in our Supplemental Material.

Individual-Level Antecedents

Prior research on constructive and destructive norm violations has investigated a broad range of individual-level antecedents. The major overlapping individual-level antecedents we identify for both constructive and destructive norm violations include (a) demographic differences (age), (b) personality traits [extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness to experience, Machiavellianism, (trait) creativity], (c) risk-taking tendencies, (d) attitudes and beliefs [organizational commitment, job (dis)satisfaction, role breadth self-efficacy], (e) individual perceptions of
workplace conditions [procedural justice/injustice, access to information, and perceived human resources management (HRM)], (f) motivational-related constructs (psychological empowerment, different components of workaholism), and (g) stress and well-being (job demands, role ambiguity, role conflict, job/work autonomy and control, and organizational constraints).

Whereas some of these antecedents show opposite relationships with constructive and destructive NVB (e.g., procedural justice is negatively related to destructive NVB and positively related to constructive NVB), many other antecedents (e.g., extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, readiness for change, self-efficacy, Machiavellianism, risk-taking tendencies, job demand, role ambiguity, role conflict, organizational constraints, access to information) have been found to have similar (positive/negative) relationships with both constructive and destructive NVB. These overlaps imply either that the same employees are engaging in both types of deviance or that the same traits cause some employees to act constructively and others to act destructively. For example, Machiavellianism has been found to be positively related to both constructive and destructive NVB (Galperin 2012). While people with high Machiavellian tendencies (high Machs) are typically described as using manipulative and deceitful behaviors and as individuals who treat others as objects to achieve a desired end (Hunt & Chonko 1984), high Machs may violate norms in favor of their own interests and/or to accomplish goals to help their organizations, assuming that the organizational interests are aligned with their personal goals.

**Dyadic/Team-Level Antecedents**

While the NVB literature has largely focused on individual-level antecedents, some studies have also examined dyadic/team-level antecedents. The overlapping dyadic/team-level antecedents we identify in both the constructive and destructive literatures include abusive supervision, customer aggression, ethical leadership, leader–member exchange (LMX), expected reciprocity, group norms, and coworker behavior. Whereas some of these antecedents have been found to share opposite relationships with constructive and destructive NVB (e.g., ethical leadership, LMX, expected reciprocity, etc.), some have been found to affect both constructive and destructive NVB in the same direction (e.g., aggressive supervision, coworker behavior, customer aggression, etc.). For example, Kong & Kim (2017) found that customer aggression increased both constructive and destructive NVB. On the one hand, customer aggression can increase negative emotions and destructive NVB. On the other hand, it may also lead to constructive NVB when employees try to meet the aggressive demands from these customers. Thus, employees may respond differently to similar leader behavior and team dynamics, suggesting that more research is needed for individual and contextual moderators.

**Organizational-Level Antecedents**

Compared with individual- and dyadic/team-level research, organizational antecedents have been less well examined for both constructive and destructive norm violations. Nonetheless, we identify two major overlapping organizational-level antecedents in our review: organizational sanctions and organizational climate. On the one hand, organizational sanctions and a law/rule organizational climate have been found to decrease both constructive and destructive norm violations (Baskin et al. 2016, Borry & Henderson 2020, Fleming 2020, Grasmick & Kobayashi 2002, Kobayashi & Kerbo 2016, Mertens & Recker 2020); on the other hand, an instrumental/self-interest-based organizational climate has been shown to increase both constructive and destructive norm violations (Baskin et al. 2016, Peterson 2002). Organizational climates with a heavy focus on rules and law and the presence of organizational sanctions suggest a fear-based system where employees are anticipating (and hence avoiding) negative consequences for any sort of norm
violation. However, since only a small number of studies have investigated organizational-level antecedents, there is a clear need to better understand how different organizational-level antecedents contribute to both constructive and destructive norm violations.

**Overall Summary of Antecedents**

Our empirical review identifies a broad range of overlapping antecedents for both constructive and destructive norm violations at the individual, dyadic/team, and organizational levels. While research on individual-level antecedents is most plentiful for both constructive and destructive NVB, dyadic/team and organizational antecedents have also received some research attention for both forms of norm violation. The breadth and diversity of the overlapping antecedents suggest that constructive and destructive NVBs are not isolated concepts or simply orthogonal to each other. Instead, the common and overlapping antecedents suggest that a number of different individual, dyadic/team, and organizational factors jointly contribute to both constructive and destructive NVB. Thus, there is a clear need to investigate the two concepts more comprehensively rather than maintaining the arbitrary border between them, which perpetuates the separation of the two streams of research. In the next section, we review the overlapping moderators of norm violations in organizations.

**Individual-Level Moderators**

As would be expected in a more mature area of study, the destructive NVB studies have investigated a broader set of individual-level moderators in terms of personalities, attitudes and perceptions, emotions and moods, and motivations and behaviors than those reported in the constructive NVB literature. Compared with the independent variables discussed earlier, moderation effects involve multiple variables and their relationships, making a concise summary more difficult. Therefore, we identify the overlapping moderators for the previously listed independent variables instead of describing the specific moderation relationships among different variables.

At the individual level, researchers have examined the following moderators for both constructive and destructive NVB: neuroticism, perceived organizational support, ethical ideology/ethical idealism, psychological empowerment, and organizational identification. These overlapping moderators have been found to moderate the effects of the following independent variables on either constructive or destructive NVB or both: Dark Triad personalities (Palmer et al. 2017), abusive supervision (Garcia et al. 2015, Mackey et al. 2015), supervisor and/or organizational support (Khan 2017, Yıldız et al. 2015), job stressors (Yu et al. 2019), ethical leadership (Zhu et al. 2018), organizational justice (Hastings & Finegan 2011), organizational culture (Khan 2017), and leaders’ past experience (Kim & Toh 2019).

**Dyadic/Team- and/or Organizational-Level Moderators**

Research on dyadic/team- and organizational-level moderators is rather limited, especially for organizational-level moderators. Among the constructive NVB empirical articles included in our review, approximately 9.23% investigated team-level moderators, and only 3.08% examined organizational-level moderators. For the destructive NVB empirical articles, 8.68% of the articles investigated team-level moderators, and only 3.89% included organizational-level moderators.

At the dyadic/team level, previous research has investigated the moderating effects of LMX on the relationship between various antecedents and NVB. For example, Tu & Luo (2020) found that LMX moderated the relationship between paternalistic leadership and PSRB. In contrast, Kluemper et al. (2019) showed that LMX moderated the relationship between employees’
experienced rudeness in dealing with coworkers and leader perceptions of the employees’ destructive NVB. Zhang et al. (2018) also found that LMX moderated the relationship between surface acting and sabotage behavior. In addition, Kim & Toh (2019) showed that a group leader’s identification with a former group moderated the relationship between the cultural tightness of the group and both positive and negative group NVB.

At the organizational level, although an ethical climate has been suggested as a common moderator for both constructive and destructive NVB, no empirical evidence has been found in the constructive norm-violating literature. In the destructive NVB literature, Chen et al. (2013) found that an ethical climate moderated the relationship between employees’ negative affectivity and destructive NVB. In the constructive NVB literature, Vardaman et al. (2014) also proposed in their theory paper that an ethical climate would moderate (i.e., make more positive) the effects of various antecedents (job autonomy, risk preference, conscientiousness, self-esteem, self-efficacy, neuroticism, and internal and external locus of control) on constructive NVB, but no empirical study has tested their propositions.

Overall Summary of Moderators

Despite the growing research examining the moderators between the antecedents and NVBs, studies have focused mainly on the individual moderators rather than those at the dyadic/team, organizational, or national level. Some studies have examined the moderating role of organizational climate (Chen et al. 2013, Mawritz et al. 2012), which provides a greater understanding of the potential differences in norm violation across organizations. We further address this issue in the section titled New Directions for Future Research.

Individual-Level Mediators

At the individual level, we observed five major overlapping mediators for both constructive and destructive norm violations: (a) job (dis)satisfaction, (b) trust, (c) work or employee engagement, (d) felt obligation, and (e) psychological contract violations. These mediators have been found to mediate the effects of personality traits (e.g., Machiavellianism and state hostility) (Belschak et al. 2018, Judge et al. 2006), employee attitudes and perceptions of their organizations (e.g., job insecurity, organizational support, and HRM practices) (Kura et al. 2016, Ma et al. 2019, Malik & Lenka 2019), and leadership and leader–member relationships (e.g., abusive supervision, ethical leadership, differentiated empowering leadership, and goal congruence with supervisor) (De Clercq et al. 2014, Den Hartog & Belschak 2012, Li et al. 2017, Pan et al. 2018, Malik & Lenka 2019) on constructive and destructive norm violations.

Dyadic/Team- and Organizational-Level Mediators

Research on team- and organizational-level mediators is limited for both constructive and destructive norm violations. First, at the team level, Kim & Toh (2019) found that the cultural tightness of a group mediated the negative relationship between a leader’s prior group cultural experience and both negative and positive forms of group NVB in the current group. Second, at the organizational level, research on both constructive and destructive NVB has investigated the mediating role of an ethical climate. On the one hand, Sittisom (2020) found that an ethical climate mediated the effects of HRM practices on constructive NVB among pharmaceutical companies. On the other hand, Mayer et al. (2010) examined the mediating effect of an ethical climate on the relationship between ethical leadership and destructive NVB among employees and supervisors from 300 units in different organizations.
Overall Summary of Mediators

The common and overlapping mediators in this review once again highlight the need to consider the similarities between constructive and destructive NVB rather than considering them as isolated phenomena. Destructive NVB research has examined more unique individual-level mediators than the constructive NVB literature. We further discuss the role of mediators in the section titled New Directions for Future Research. Future research on constructive and destructive NVB may also require an examination of the outcomes of both destructive and constructive NVB.

Outcomes of Norm-Violating Behaviors

The two most commonly investigated outcomes for both constructive and destructive norm violations are (in-role) job performance and/or productivity and extrarole behavior [e.g., organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)]. However, the pattern of results is not conclusive about how norm violations relate to these outcomes. First, empirical studies on destructive norm violations have demonstrated that destructive NVB is negatively related to job performance at individual, dyadic/team, and organizational levels (Cole et al. 2008, Detert et al. 2007, Dunlop & Lee 2004). On the other hand, research on constructive NVB has shown that constructive NVB is also negatively related to coworkers’ job performance and loyalty (Dahling et al. 2012, Li et al. 2019, Gong & Wang 2020, Shum et al. 2019), although some forms of constructive NVB (e.g., customer-oriented norm violations) can increase customer satisfaction and loyalty (Boukis 2016, Brady et al. 2012, Gong & Wang 2020, Jung & Yoo 2019). While the limited constructive NVB literature has examined its effect on team or organizational performance, the relationship between constructive NVB and the employee’s own performance is less well understood. Second, previous research suggests that constructive and destructive NVBs may affect extrarole behavior, such as OCB. The constructive NVB literature shows that constructive norm violation behavior is positively related to OCB (Li et al. 2019). The empirical results of studies examining the effects of destructive norm violation on OCB are mixed (Fox et al. 2012, Taylor et al. 2012). Thus, good citizens in organizations not only engage in constructive NVB but may also reduce their productivity and mistreat coworkers (Fox et al. 2012).

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our literature review shows a growth in research on both constructive and destructive NVBs and suggests that the two kinds of NVBs are related instead of isolated concepts. We call on future research to build on these insights to develop a more comprehensive understanding of NVB in organizations. We focus on two main areas for future research— theoretical integration and methodological advances—and their practical implications.

Holistically Examining the Overlapping Antecedents

We encourage researchers to further scrutinize the common antecedents of constructive and destructive NVB for research insights. Due to the divergent streams of research, there is no holistic understanding of what causes norm violations. Since some antecedents have been studied more by one stream than the other, our first recommendation is for significant causal agents from one form of norm violation to be investigated for the other form. Our review has discussed several common precursors that may give insight into a common theory for constructive and destructive norm violations. For example, since abusive supervision and customer aggression have been found to contribute to both constructive and destructive norm violations (Kong & Kim 2017, Mitchell & Ambrose 2007, Pan et al. 2018), how employees apply different coping strategies may help
explain the common sources for both forms of norm violations in organizations. We point out
the gaps where there is strong evidence in one stream, but the variable has not been considered
in the other literature as future research opportunities. However, we advise that future research
should not just borrow a variable from the sister literature and ask how it might affect the other
form of norm violation. It should be theory driven, focusing on the broader question of what
causes constructive or destructive norm violation.

Our review suggests that the most used theory for explaining antecedents in both norm viola-
tion literature is SET; hence, SET appears to be a good theory to start with for developing broad
hypotheses of what motivates individuals to violate norms. For example, SET theory has been
broadly applied in research examining the effects of justice perceptions and leadership behaviors
on norm violation. While previous research has largely focused on the effects of injustice and
negative leader behavior (e.g., abusive supervision) on destructive norm violation (e.g., Mitchell
& Ambrose 2007), recent research has begun to consider how leader mistreatment may induce
constructive norm violation (Pan et al. 2018) or how positive leader behavior or exchange may
lead to destructive norm violation (Wang et al. 2022). Future research might explore how positive
and negative leader behaviors [e.g., (lack of) perceived supervisor support, reward and punishment
practices, psychological contract breaches] may jointly contribute to constructive and destructive
NVB. These positive and negative antecedents in social exchange relationships are associated with
both forms of norm violations. SET could establish a broader understanding of these interrelated
phenomena. For example, SET might suggest that a lack of perceived organizational support will
engender greater NVB of both varieties because the lack of support implies a negative exchange
balance, which will result in a desire to violate organizational rules by either withdrawing (negative
NVB) or going around the rules to help customers.

Affect events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) is another theoretical perspective that could
be combined with SET to inform the study of norm violation. Numerous studies have investi-
gated the impact of both positive and negative affect on destructive NVBs (e.g., Balducci et al.
2011, Johnson et al. 2010, Yang & Diefendorff 2009). However, little work on constructive NVB
has considered the role of affect. Future studies might therefore explore the relationship between
affect and constructive norm violation. For example, prior research has shown that positive affect
is positively related to future helping intention (Lin et al. 2019), cognitive flexibility (Isen 1987),
and creativity in organizations (Amabile et al. 2005). Thus, it may be the case that (intrinsic) desires
to be helpful and creative may increase the likelihood of those experiencing positive affect engag-
ing in constructive NVB, as long as there are no sanctions for breaking the rules or a legalistic
organizational climate.

**Intentions as Mediator**

We encourage researchers to systematically examine the role of intentions in norm violation more.
While the constructive norm violation literature (Galperin 2003, 2012; Spreitzer & Sonenshein
2004) focuses on the motivation to improve the well-being of the organization, its members, or
both, the destructive norm violation literature\(^3\) (Spector & Fox 2005, Neuman & Baron 1998)
focuses on the intent to cause harm to the organization. Psychologically, intention for behavior
is driven by an individual’s inspiration to conduct that specific behavior. The theory of reasoned
action (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980) and the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1991) regard intention
as a crucial antecedent to behavior. Some of the existing theories in the norm violation literature

---

\(^3\)Robinson and Bennett (Bennett & Robinson 2000; Robinson & Bennett 1995, 1997) are an exception to this,
as they do not include intention in their definition nor their operationalization of workplace deviance.
can explain intentions. For example, SET suggests that individuals intend to benefit or harm their organization and/or coworkers depending on whether their exchange relationships with the organization and/or coworkers are positive or negative (Cropanzano et al. 2017). Similarly, motivated information processing theory suggests that employees selectively process social and organizational information (Kunda 1990) (e.g., positive versus negative exchange relationships), which, in turn, determines their intentions (e.g., helping or harming) for engaging in NVB.

We argue that intentions should mediate the relationship between antecedents and manifestations of norm violations (e.g., Ajzen & Fishbein 1980, Vardi & Wiener 1996). On the one hand, the theory of reasoned actions (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980) suggests intentions precede behavior; on the other hand, behavioral decision theory suggests that intentions can be predicted by individual and situational factors (Barron 1974). Integrating the two theoretical perspectives, individual and situational factors lead to intentions, and subsequently, helpful or harmful intentions may lead to constructive or destructive NVB. Thus, we recommend future researchers more comprehensively investigate the role of intentions to better understand positive and negative NVBs in organizational contexts.

While we recommend future researchers identify the role of intentions in their research on NVB, we are aware of the practical difficulty of measuring intentions. In any scale-based survey method, social desirability bias may contaminate or conceal the real intentions of the individuals engaged in NVBs. We recommend that researchers include qualitative methods, such as in-depth unstructured interviews, multisource data points (opinions of peers, subordinates, targets of norm violation, and managers), and event sampling techniques to assess the intentions of norm violators.

**The Relationship Between Constructive and Destructive Norm-Violating Behavior**

As highlighted by our review, few studies have simultaneously examined constructive and destructive norm violations. The limited number of empirical studies has revealed that the correlation between the two constructs is approximately 0.50 and sometimes even higher (e.g., Christ-Brendemühl & Schaarschmidt 2019, Dahling et al. 2012, Galperin 2012, Galperin & Burke 2006, Kong & Kim 2017, Malik & Lenka 2019), which suggests that constructive and destructive NVB are closely related to each other.

We suggest that future research may benefit from a framework to understand better how people may judge and interpret the two different forms of NVB in different circumstances. Thus, we first propose a typology of NVB (see Table 1), which suggests people may share different perspectives about whether an NVB is constructive or destructive. In Cell 1, NVB is constructive for both the focal actor and other parties. In Cell 4, NVB is nonconstructive or destructive from both parties’ perspectives. Thus, the focal actor and other parties have consistent judgments in these two circumstances.

In contrast, people have mixed judgments in Cells 2 and 3. In Cell 2, the focal actor views their NVB as constructive, but other parties do not think so. For example, an employee thinks that they engage in NVB to improve work efficiency. However, their manager or coworkers might not think so because the NVB has negative implications for other employees or the organization.

In Cell 3, the judgments of the focal actor and other parties are reversed. Whereas the focal actor views an NVB as destructive, other parties may think otherwise. For example, employees may feel that their action is disobedient and destructive when they intentionally reduce effort on required projects they believe are hopeless or unnecessary. But their managers may realize that this seemingly destructive or counterproductive NVB actually helps the organization because they can ask these employees to focus more time and effort on other worthwhile or creative endeavors (Mainemelis 2010).
Our typology provides a useful framework for future researchers to better understand and investigate the relationships between constructive and destructive NVBs in at least two ways. First, NVB may be seen through the subjective lens of each observer, biased by their own past experiences and personality. For example, persistence in working on a project after rejection by the boss may be seen as an act of insubordination and, thus, a harmful behavior by some observers. However, some other observers might think the focal employee is a hero, going beyond their duty to contribute to the organization. Thus, future research might further investigate what factors may contribute to different interpretations and judgments of NVBs in organizations.

Second, contextual and organizational factors may contribute to different interpretations and judgments of NVBs. In particular, the same NVB may be considered constructive or destructive in different organizations or contexts (Criscuolo et al. 2014, Dahling & Gutworth 2017). In our opening vignette, for instance, the Sherwin-Williams employee broke company rules by creating TikTok videos of himself mixing paint. In a flexible culture where such rule violations may be tolerated in the interest of innovation, this may be regarded as constructive NVB since it promotes Sherwin-Williams paints to a new audience. In contrast, an organization with a more rigid culture may view this as destructive NVB due to a misdirection of scarce organizational resources. Future research will benefit from holistically examining the organizational contexts of destructive and constructive norm violations and their relationships, especially how organizational and contextual factors may contribute to consistent or conflicting judgments of NVBs.

**Empirical and Methodological Future Directions**

A summary of the proposed future research directions is shown in Table 4. Below, we explain the details of how future research can contribute to the NVB literature.

**Measurement.** Destructive and constructive NVB measures vary in terms of their formative versus reflective nature. On the one hand, the most widely used scales of destructive NVB (e.g., Bennett & Robinson 2000; Spector et al. 2006, 2010) are formative measures, as they measure example behaviors that violate broad performance-enhancing norms (Bennett et al. 2005). These measures were designed to include behaviors that are consistently considered harmful across organizations (e.g., theft, assault, sabotage). The construct is formed by the summation of these behaviors. On the other hand, measures of constructive norm violation are reflective, i.e., the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Summary of future research directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Future research directions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistically examining the overlapping antecedents</td>
<td>Identify the key overlapping antecedents of both constructive and destructive norm violation. Determine how positive and negative leader behaviors jointly contribute to both constructive and destructive norm-violating behavior. Examine the organizational contexts of destructive and constructive norm violations and their dynamic relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions as a mediator</td>
<td>Examine the role of intentions in norm violation more systematically. Use qualitative methods to measure intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological and empirical recommendations</td>
<td>Develop a reflective measure of destructive norm violation. Examine dyadic/team- and organizational-level factors surrounding norm violation. Explore a variety of organizational cultures/national cultures and organizational climates and their relationships with both constructive and destructive norm violations in organizations. Examine the dynamics of norm-violating behavior longitudinally. Use mixed-method approaches combining both qualitative and quantitative methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scale items reflect the violation of significant organizational norms rather than each specific NVB (e.g., Galperin 2012). This works particularly well for the constructive NVB literature, where the norms that are violated may sometimes vary from organization to organization. We argue that reflective measurement would also benefit destructive NVB research where the specific NVBs do change over time (e.g., cyber loafing, cyber bullying, drone surveillance) or across organizations and cultures (e.g., coming late, sleeping at the office, drinking on the job, engaging in harsh competition). An example item would be “I knowingly put my organization at risk through my activities that violated my workplace’s standards of behavior.” A reflective measure also better allows measurement at different levels of analysis (i.e., team violations of organizational norms). Such a measure is currently under development (Bigelow et al. 2024).

**Exploring multi-level studies to better understand norm violation.** Most norm violation research focuses on the individual level of analysis. For example, most of the research we reviewed examined demographic variables, personality factors and values, attitudes, workplace perceptions, and stressors as common antecedents of both constructive and destructive norm violation. In contrast, there are limited studies on team- and organizational-level antecedents of norm violation. Therefore, we call for research to examine dyadic/team- and organizational-level factors surrounding norm violation. At the organizational level of analysis, for instance, researchers might want to further investigate the differential relationship between types of ethical climates (rules and procedures, law and code, personal morality) and norm violation. The constructive norm violation literature suggests that a rules and procedures climate decreases the likelihood of PSRB, while a law and code climate increases the likelihood of rule breaking (Baskin et al. 2016). No significant relationship was found between ethical climates and PSRB (Borry & Henderson 2020). While the destructive norm violation studies clearly found an ethical climate to reduce misconduct (own, others’, and observed) (Andreoli & Lefkowitz 2009), research on constructive NVB does not seem to have the same clear pattern. Therefore, we encourage researchers to explore a variety of organizational cultures and climates and their relationships with both constructive and destructive NVBs in organizations.

In addition, because norm violation may have different connotations and implications in different cultures, we also encourage researchers to further explore the role of national cultural values on perceptions of NVB. Previous studies have already investigated the moderating effects of national culture on outcomes of both constructive and destructive NVBs (Chung & Moon 2011, Kalemci et al. 2019, Lian et al. 2012). However, our understanding of the role of national culture on NVB is far from conclusive. Thus, researchers should build upon the research on cultural values and NVB to examine how employees and organizations respond to the same or similar norm violations in different organizational contexts.

**Longitudinal studies.** Although a few studies have examined norm violation over time (e.g., Detert et al. 2007), the majority of the norm violation studies have used cross-sectional designs and hence have overlooked the dynamic nature of NVB over time. Future researchers should examine the dynamics of norm violation behavior longitudinally. It is likely that norm violation trajectories of individuals before, during, and after norm violation depend on personal and contextual factors. In addition, reactions from managers and other employees may also vary with time. It is important that researchers examine key personal and organizational variables to understand how norm violations may develop and change over time. For instance, do norm violators start small and build to violations of more significant norms? Do individuals who start out engaging in constructive NVB end up feeling morally justified to engage in destructive NVB as well? Researchers can conduct longitudinal studies using a time series design, panel design, or diary studies. These approaches will not only help capture how both constructive and destructive
NVB evolves and changes in organizations, they will also provide a better understanding of the dynamic relationships between the two constructs.

**Qualitative and multiple methods.** Our review suggests that there is a greater proportion of qualitative studies in the constructive than in the destructive norm violation literature. Despite the maturity of the destructive norm violation literature, we encourage researchers to incorporate qualitative methods to better understand the dynamic relationships between destructive and constructive NVBs, especially how they change with organizational norms. We encourage a mixed-method approach combining both qualitative and quantitative methods (Johnson & Turner 2003). For example, the study by Chiou et al. (2017) on positive NVB (measured as exceptional performance) employed both semistructured team interviews and focus groups in 10 hospital units and quantitative data from a database containing over 3.3 million patient records. Although this paper was not included in our review because its measure of positive NVB did not fit our definition of norm violation, we suggest that using a mixed-methods approach such as this may provide a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms of both constructive and destructive norm violations, as well as their dynamic relationships over time in organizations.

**Actionable Recommendations for Organizations**

Our review of the organizational norm-violation literature suggests constructive and destructive NVBs are often positively and significantly related to each other. Thus, some innovative trailblazers in organizations may be the same employees engaging in counterproductive behaviors harming their organizations. Practically speaking, organizations need to understand the interplay and dynamic relationships between constructive and destructive NVBs. Organizations may focus on selecting candidates with traits related to reducing dysfunctional NVBs and enhancing constructive NVBs [e.g., high levels of ethical idealism (Zhu et al. 2018)]. In addition, they can also invest in training programs to assist employees in recognizing ethical dilemmas and developing their creativity and decision-making skills to learn how to respond appropriately to situations likely to provoke NVBs (Wang 2019).

Our review also suggests that organizational culture and leadership can impact both forms of NVBs. On the one hand, it is important for human resource managers to conduct regular organizational culture and climate audits to understand employees’ perceptions of socially acceptable behaviors. Managers should communicate the rationale for the most fundamental and critical policies and procedures and the potential consequences of breaking essential norms and rules while encouraging innovation and flexibility and allowing autonomy to disobey and change rigid, senseless, and even dysfunctional rules and regulations. On the other hand, leaders should also set an example for their followers, build trust with their teams, and inspire employees to follow essential rules and regulations. When leaders emphasize high moral standards and act altruistically and morally, employees may be more likely to question and ignore inappropriate policies and procedures and be less likely to engage in wrongful behavior to violate critical organizational rules and norms.

**CONCLUSION**

NVB is important because it can profoundly impact the organization and its members. Although numerous research studies have investigated organizational norm violation, significant knowledge gaps exist for the two separate research streams of constructive and destructive NVB. In particular, our review suggests that the divided efforts of the two streams of research might have produced a plethora of constructs with more conceptual confusion than clarity. Thus, our review challenges the bifurcated view of constructive and destructive NVBs and provides insights into
their dynamic interrelationships in organizations. More importantly, our review builds and extends theory on norm violation in organizations by providing a unifying conceptualization and identifying and explicating its primary antecedents, moderators, mediators, and consequences. It also helps reconceptualize NVB in organizations by identifying new lines of inquiry and providing important managerial insights into effectively managing workplace norms and NVB, a highly important and relevant topic for organizations today. Undoubtedly, important questions remain, and understanding NVB in a multifaceted way (i.e., both constructive and destructive aspects) is critical for effective organizations. We hope our article will help inspire more valuable and critical research to better understand how NVB evolves, changes, and transforms in different organizational contexts and how organizations respond to NVB to foster a better workplace with more effective people and performance.
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