ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact of individual factors i.e. big five personality traits and dark triad personality contributing to deviant workplace behavior and the moderating role of transformational leadership. The results were analyzed from a questionnaire derived from a sample of 380 employees belonging to 20 Public organizations of the province of Punjab Pakistan. SPSS-21 and SmartPLS packages were employed to analyze the quantitative data. Partial least squares method of structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) was adopted for the testing of hypotheses. Results revealed significant relationship and supported the hypothesis of the direct impact of individual factors i.e. big five personality traits and dark triad personality on deviant workplace behavior. However, transformational leadership partially moderates the relationship between dark triad personality and DWB. This research paper is a pioneer work in the context of public sector of Pakistan and is a continuation of the existing literature on supporting theories of transformational leadership i.e. Social Learning theory, Social Exchange theory and Breach of Psychological Contract theory. This research also provides new directions within this area, by encouraging new debate about the role of transformational leadership in order to control deviant workplace behavior in the public organizations.
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INTRODUCTION

Pakistan is one of the developing country facing a serious problem of deviance workplace behaviour among employees within public organizations, since its independence in 1947 (Bashir, Nasir, Qayyaum & Bashir, 2012; Nadeem, Ahmad, Ahmad, Batool & Shafiq, 2015). Public organizations of Pakistan derived its inheritance from the colonial system from the 18th century; however after 70 years of independence it could not incept its indigenous practices to run the public machinery to managing people and the resources of the country (Nadeem et al., 2015; Bashir et al., 2012). The public sector is rife with corruption from top to bottom (Nadeem et al. 2015). Every cog of public administration machinery reflected counterproductive behavior (Yousaf et al., 2015) or anti-social behavior either financially corrupt or ethically deviant (Nasir & Bashir, 2012).

It is a common understanding that Pakistani organizations are controlled, managed, regulated and operated by the government, either autonomously or semi-autonomous to being characteristically ailing with deviant behavior at the workplace among public employees (Bashir et al., 2012; Nadeem et al., 2015). In addition, nowadays, unethical and deviant workplace behavior is becoming an emerging issue/problem within the organizations (Usmani, Kalpina, & Husain, 2013). It is found that DWB is a widespread problem in most Pakistani organizations (Fatima, Atif, Saqib & Haider, 2012) but remained unexplored (Bashir, Nasir, Saeed & Ahmed 2011). Favouritism, nepotism and cronyism are also the major causes of deviant workplace behavior in Pakistani public organizations (Bashir et al., 2011). The whole operation of public administration is trapped in red tape that affects the behavior of the employees toward resigned satisfaction (Quratulain & Khan, 2013). Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) has been a neglected area in organizational research (Farhadi et al., 2015), even though DWB is a common behavior in public sector organizations (Mehmood & Arif, 2011). Some public employees even become perpetrators, intermediaries or observers which allows deviant acts to occur at the workplace.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND FRAMEWORK

Prior studies on the relationship of individual factors and deviant workplace behavior and the role of transformation leadership are reviewed in this section in order to develop the framework and hypothesis of this study.

Deviant Workplace Behavior

In the present era, the study of the behavior of individuals at the workplace has become imperative due to globalization, industrialization and technological
advancement (Appelbaum, Deguire, & Lay, 2005). Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) is one of the most vital areas of research influencing the behavior of employees at the workplace (Appelbaum, Iaconi & Matousek, 2007). DWB affects the health of organizations (Yildiz, Alpkan, Ates & Sezen, 2015). Additionally, deviant workplace behavior (DWB) is a vital concern for research due to its evolving (Yildiz et al., 2015) and growing level and possible outcome as an influencer (Spector & Fox, 2005). Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) in not novel within the corporate world (Javed, Amjad, Faeqer-Ul-Ummi, & Bukhari, 2014), but resources which create a deviant workplace behavior are still guiding new dimensions to examine the passage of time and circumstances (Shakir & Siddique, 2014). The literature review of various scholars have defined DWB (Appelbaum et al., 2007) and clarified the outcomes of deviant workplace behaviors. But studies regarding workplace deviance behaviors are still in need to be considered (Javed et al., 2014; Yıldız et al., 2015).

Deviant workplace behavior (DWB) has been studied under different terms such as retaliation and dysfunctional behavior; organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996) and counterproductive workplace behavior (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). In the words of Robinson and Greenberg (1998), “there is no common definition regarding workplace deviance that is generally agreed upon” due to initial stage of research area. Robinson and Greenberg also cited the definition of two eminent scholars who have elaborate this construct of deviant workplace behavior (DWB), where they operationalized it and its key dimension as well as recognized its boundaries (Javed et al., 2014). Eminent research scholars Robinson and Bennett (1995), defined Deviance workplace behavior as “a voluntary behavior engaged by employee that is contrary to the significant organizational norms and it is considered as a threat to the well-being of an organization and/or its members”. Earlier researchers have given different expressions to the term deviance workplace behavior such as counter productive work place behavior (Mangione & Quinu, 1975), antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), organizational misbehavior (Ackyrod & Thompson, 1999), workplace sabotage (Harris & Ogbonna, 2002), worker resistance (Thompson & Ackroyd, 1995) and non-complaint behavior (Puffer, 1987) among others, “Bad Behavior” in Organizations (Griffin & Lopez, 2005). According to Greenberg, (1997) “anti-social behavior” that is defined as “any behavior that brings harm or is intended to bring harm to the organization and its employees or its stakeholders”. In the words of Robinson and Morrison (1995) “workplace deviance” that is defined as “voluntary behavior of organizational members that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing, threatens the well-being of the organization and its members”.
Deviant workplace behaviors (DWB) of employees are directly harmful to the organization or to other employees in the organization (Spector et al., 2006) which can range from relatively minor to very serious affects (Kanten & Ülker, 2013). Griffin and Lopez (2005) noted that all individuals who enter the working organization have the potential to exhibit this destructive behavior that can be classified as minor and major deviance. Firstly, minor production deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), such as working slowly intentionally, avails excessive breaks (Bashir et al., 2012), gossiping on non-work topics with co-workers during official working hours, arriving late to the workplace and leaving the office early, day dreaming while on the job (Nasir & Bashir, 2012) and being involved in cyber loafing (Lim, 2002). The second major production deviance are stealing from the organization, doing work slowly to obtain unnecessary due overtime, using photocopy machines for personnel purpose without permission, as well as taking office supplies or equipment home (Anjum & Pervaiz, 2013; Spector and Fox, 2005). On the other hand, interpersonal deviance also falls into two categories, which are minor and major interpersonal deviance. Instances of the first minor deviance are political deviance such as making fun, dealing rudely and blaming other co-workers for mistakes on a job, disobeying supervisor’s directions and instructions (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The second is personal aggression (major) such as cursing, humiliating, bullying or stalking and saying hurtful things to co-workers and assaulting with injury to co-workers (Brown, 2008). For example, a study by Fahradi et al. (2012) which was conducted in Malaysia claims personality traits would contribute to predict deviant workplace behavior. Findings of the study demonstrate that the issues associated with DWB and personalities in Asian culture, particularly Malaysia, were mostly in line with previous studies in Western society (Fahradi et al., 2012).

**Demission of Deviant Workplace Behavior**

Demission of deviant workplace behavior contains the individual negative acts at the workplace such as abuse against others/bullying, withdrawal, theft, sabotage, production deviance withdrawal, misuse of time and resources, and kickback (Bashir et al., 2012; Spector et al., 2006).

**Abuse against others/bullying**

Abuse or bullying means an act towards co-workers as well as organizational members, treating and handling them violently (Kohut, 2007). Accounting to Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh and Kessler (2005), “Abuse consists of harmful behaviors directed toward co-workers and others that harm either physically or psychologically through making threats, nasty comments,
ignoring the person or undermining the person’s ability to work effectively. Abuse or bullying consists of overt harmful behaviors of an employee (Izawa, Kodama, & Nomura, 2006). Eminent scholars Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, and Kessler (2006), asserts that abuse is an act to harm the fellow workers. Unpleasant comments are the main cause of abuse at the workplace. Verbal aggression constituted abuse (Porath & Erez, 2009). “Bullying” at the work place leads to abuse. In the words of Oghojafor, Muo and Olufayo (2012) work place bullying are “abusive, intimidating or insulting behavior, abuse of power or unfair punishment which upsets, threatens, and humiliates the recipient, undermining their self-confidence, reputation and ability to perform”.

Withdrawal

Withdrawal is another dimension of deviant workplace behaviors and intentions of employees (Spector et al., 2006). Withdrawal has been studied comprehensively in the organizational behavior, human resource management and management field but remained under study (Carraher & Buckley, 2008). Withdrawals are negative behaviors that mitigate intentional amount of working time than the required time by the organization (Spector et al., 2006). Withdrawal consists of behaviors that restrict the amount of time working which is less than is required by the organization. It includes absence, arriving late or leaving early, and taking longer breaks than authorized (Spector et al., 2006). Eminent researcher Koslowsky (2000) pointed out that withdrawal behavior may be means of coping with conflicting work and non-work obligations. In the U.S., organizations have lost an estimated $50 billion annually and 20 percent of failure of businesses was due to withdrawal behavior. In addition, 33-75 percent of all employees at the workplace have engaged in other type of behaviors such as withdrawal, abuse, theft, sabotage and production deviance (Coffin, 2003; Koslowsky, 2000) and cyber loafing (Lim, 2012). Withdrawal behavior of employees at the workplace deteriorated the overall performance of the organization (Spector et al., 2006) and withdrawal behaviors of employee consume almost 15% of an organization’s payroll globally (Faulk & Hicks, 2015).

Theft

Theft is stealing physical property or assets from organization (Chen & Spector, 1992). Theft is an act of intentionally harming the organization by employees (Niehoff & Paul, 2000) for satisfaction of their instrumental motives (Spector et al., 2006). Another study of Galperin (2002) recorded that theft is one of the aspects of deviant behavior that instigate employee towards the breach of the organizational norms. Theft or stealing can take different
forms i.e. stealing merchandise, misleading records, pilferage, overcharging and short-changing, deception, payroll fraud and stealing cash and voiding a sale etc. (Gabbidon et al., 2006; Mishra & Prasad, 2006). According to the Shulman Center for Compulsive Theft and Spending (2007), “employee theft is the fastest growing crime in America. Seventy-five percent of employees steal from the workplace and most do so repeatedly”. Appelbaum and Shapiro, (2006) defined theft as “unauthorized appropriation of the company property by employees either for one’s own use or for sale to another”. In addition, Hollinger and Adams (2010) reported in USA, approximately $15.9 billion loss retailers attributed about 45% of their inventory shortage during 2010, which was due to employee’s theft. Employee’s theft, stealing and occurrence of fraud in an organization is generally reported in each organization either in the public or private sector in Pakistan (Bashir et al., 2012; Nasir & Bashir, 2012).

Production Deviance

In the words of Spector et al. (2006) production deviance is another important demission of deviant workplace behavior. In this category of deviance behavior, the employee intentionally hamper the quantity and quality of work that affects the organization production and efficiency. In these ways, the employee intentionally slows down the quantity and quality of work that affects the efficiency and productivity of the organization (Hollinger & Clark 1982; Gruys & Sackett, 2003). It is also a serious dimension of deviant workplace behavior; if employee deliberately create problems and hurdles against success of the organization, ultimately it can affect the organizational performance (Coffin, 2003) and effectiveness (Nevins-Bennett, 2016). Nevins-Bennett (2016) defined production deviance as “Any conscious counterproductive acts brought about by the intentional behavior of an organizational member which violates significant organizational norms of acceptable production level in a manner which is contrary to the interest of the organization that harms or intend to harm the organization delineating the minimal quality and quantity of work to be accomplished and by extension resulting in a decline in organizational performance and profitability”. In the UK, it is estimated that $600 million loss of productivity per year was due to web-surfing reported at the workplace (Taylor, 2007).

Sabotage

Sabotage workplace deviance has been of interest to a broad range of researchers and Practitioners (Ambrose, Seabright & Schmink, 2002). Sabotage is an important dimension of deviant workplace behavior (DWB) which closely relates to production deviance (Spector, et al., 2006). Although
production deviance is passive whereas sabotage is active in fact, both approaches are knotted together theoretically (Robinson & Bennet, 1995).

**Misuse of Time and Resources**

A study by Bashir et al. (2012) investigated misuse of official time and resources of public organization and pointed out that the public employees carry out personal business during official hours, taking longer lunch/pray break and use unauthorized organization resources of the public organizations such as making long personal calls from official telephone and playing games on official computer and chatting and gossiping during official working hours (Gruys, 1999; Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Spector et al., 2006; Lim, 2002). In this current era, numerous technological advancement that inspired other imperative changes has been observed (Brkic & Aleksic, 2016) due to prompt development and innovation of information technologies as well as the internet, contributing to the different types of deviance in the organization (Lim, 2002). Cyber loafing is one of them and the best example of misuse of time and resources. However, in today’s modern business world, it is practically impossible to work without computers equipment and internet connection (Derina & Gökçeb 2016). It is pertinent to mention that approximately $120 billion dollars cost on sickness absenteeism was sustained by U.S. organizations/institutions in overall expenses and this dollar amount has persisted over the past decade (Biron & Bamberger, 2012).

**Corruption / Kickback**

Accepting Kickback is another type of property deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). According to Bashir et al. (2012) accepting kickback is a type of corruption and it is an important dimension of deviant workplace behavior in public organizations. Corruption is the most serious dimension of deviance behavior prevalent in Pakistan at all levels compared to other factors of deviant workplace behavior (Bashir et al., 2012; Islam, 2004). Kickback has negative impact on public organizations of countless developed and developing countries like Pakistan (Bashir et al., 2011). Even though hard evidence of corruption’s incidence is difficult to attain, however, different surveys and reports, historical accounts and case studies indicate that corruption/kickback is pervasive in Pakistan at all levels (Pellegrini, 2007). Therefore, corruption has made institutions or organizations in Pakistan extremely inefficient (Abbasi, 2011). This has led to a general impression that practice of corruption has increased in volume over time and there is less evidence that show people feel any guilt performing it (Javed, et al., 2014). Employers working in such climate normally engage in unethical and deviant workplace behavior for personal gains as kickback. Corruption
is a deliberately accepted organizational norm in the public sector of Pakistan (Shahid & Ahmad, 2016). It is this reason employees automatically deactivates self-condemnation and experience moral disengagement (Detert et al., 2008). According to Transparency International ranking of Corruption Perception Index, Pakistan is ranked at 126th on the list of 176 least corrupt countries. The prevalence of corruption on such a wide scale can be stated through apt expression. Ehtisham (2009) aptly conclude, “From policemen on the beat to the highest ranks, from legal clerks to judges, from minor revenue officials to senior administrators, from storekeepers to high-ranking engineers, all government and private agencies are involved in corruption”.

**Individual Factors and Deviant Workplace Behavior**

The relationship between individual factors and deviant workplace behavior is presumed as independent variable i.e. Big five personality trait (Mount, Ilies, and Johnson, 2006) and dark triad personally traits are assumed to predispose some individuals to engage in deviant behavior (Smith & Lilienfeid, 2013). Personality traits emphasise on Big five personality traits i.e. “extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experiences” (Smith & Lilienfeid, 2013) as well as dark triad personality such as Machiavellianism, narcissism and psychopath (Smith & Lilienfeid, 2013). The deviant behaviors are likely to be effected by individuals’ personality trait instead of ability linked factors because individuals make conscious choices to engage these behavior (Mount, et al. 2006). According to Mount et al. (2006) deviant workplace behaviors are likely to be subjected to individuals’ personality traits rather than ability-related factors because individuals make conscious choices when they engage in counterproductive behaviors.

The presumed dimension of individuals with Big five personality traits are predictors to deviance behavior (Mount et al., 2006) as extraversion refer to a marked engagement with the external component; agreeableness, which refer to the level of one’s sense of social coordination and cooperation and; conscientiousness concerning the way individual control, regulate and direct impulses; and neuroticism which refers to individual inclination to experience negative feelings (Bolton & Grawitch, 2011); and openness to experiences refer to creative innovative, and imaginable individual (Johnson & Osttendorf, 1993) and other dimension of individual factor is presumed dark triad personality predictors of deviant behavior: Machiavellianism refers to individual construct having desire associated with inclination to achieve personal goals to pursue power regardless of honesty (Smith & Lilienfeid, 2013); narcissism refer to personality construct defined by grandiosity, as a lack of empathy and sense of entitlement (Smith & Lilienfeid, 2013),
Extreme self-aggrandizement of individual (O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks & McDaniel, 2012). Finally, psychopath is an individual personality construct which refers to thrill-seeking and impulsivity, with low empathy and anxiety and lack of guilt (Spain, Harms & Lebreton, 2013; O’Boyle et al., 2012).

On the basis of the above discussion, it is hypothesised that there is positive association between individual factors such as the Big Five personality trait and dark triad personality and deviant workplace behavior of employees. Moreover, the breach of psychological contract supports the relationship as prediction of deviant workplace behavior. The Psychological contract theory characterises that an employee believes in a basic nous, duties, liabilities, rights and rewards, etc., which individuals obtain from his/her employer, in return for the employee’s work and loyalty (Rousseau, 1989). Each employee joins and works in an organization with certain expectations in exchange of his/her services, in that the organization will provide to him/her equitable rewards and opportunities (Trunley & Feldman, 2000). When these expectations are not fulfilled or performed or met by their organization according to the perception of their employees (Robinson & Morisson, 2000) this will result as a breach of the psychological contract (Gakovic & Tetrick, 2003b).

Consequently, this situation will leave employees to feel frustrated, less dedicated and demotivated at the workplace and ultimately, the perception of the breach of psychological contract promotes workplace deviance (Bordia, Restubog & Tang 2008; Kickul, 2001) which affect the organization success such as overlooking job responsibilities, reduced participation in positive business activities benefitting the organization (Bordia et al., 2008) and turnover intention and finally some will attempt to quit from the job (Trunley & Feldman, 1999). Moreover, the result from the breach in psychological contract will decrease the dedication of employees towards the organization (Lambert, Edwards & Cable, 2003), decrease integrity and contribution (Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998) and deprived organizational performance (Lambert et al., 2003; Pate, 2006). On the basis of above discussion, H1 and H2 are hypothesized as the following:

**H1** : There is significant negative relationship between big five personality traits and deviant workplace behavior.

**H2** : There is significant positive relationship between dark triad personality traits and deviant workplace behavior.

**Transformational Leadership and its Moderating Role**

Transformational leadership is an expression of ethical guidelines and the leaders’ noble intensions (Pradhan, & Pradhan 2014). On the basis of
moral influence based on the followers, transformational leadership differs from other leadership styles especially transactional leadership (Bass 1985). It raises different level of morality and values on the leader and the followers too (Pradhan & Pradhan, 2014). A study of Bass (1985) argued that transformational leadership is not a myth but a reality and explained transformational leadership style a way to judge the influence on the followers. Burns (1978) concurred that transformational leadership “occurs when the leaders and followers both engage with each other in such a way that both raises each other to higher level of motivation and morality”. Furthermore, according to Bass (1985) transformational leadership comprised of four components consisting of charisma, inspiration motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. Bass (1985) further explain the four dimensions of transformational leadership as: (i) “charisma” which is a behavior which produces strong emotions in the followers as well as leaders’ identification; (ii) “inspiration to articulate” which is a strong persuasive vision to help out the subordinate’s efforts at the workplace; (iii) “intellectual stimulation” refers to behavior that enhances the awareness of problem as well as motivate followers to identify the problem from narrative perspective and; (iv) “individualized consideration” which is another component in transformation leadership to provide support and guidelines to the followers. Based on the previous literature, it is anticipated that there will be moderate positive relationship among the transformational leadership styles, individual factors i.e. personality trait and dark triad personality characteristics and deviant workplace behavior.

Deviant workplace behavior is traditionally identified in the literature as one of the possible reactions of followers to unethical leadership (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Mayer et al., 2009). Leaders and followers together make up the workplace environment of the organisation (Khan, 2016). The qualities of leadership and its followers’ exchange relationship impact the quality of the work atmosphere or climate leading to favorable or unfavorable outcomes (Khan, 2016). Transformational leadership is a more ethical style of leadership (Treviño, Hartman, & Brown, 2000). Transformational leaders can create significant changes in the life of individuals, and norms (Treviño et. al. 2000), standard and culture of the organization and easily influence followers (Pradhan & Pradhan, 2014). It can change and redesigns perceptions and value as well as aspiration of individuals working in the organization (Burn, 1978). Transformational leadership style is helpful to modify the behavior of employee (Hystad, Mears, & Eid, 2014).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this proposed study, deviant workplace behavior is presumed as a dependent variable and individual factor i.e. big five personality traits and
dark triad personality are presumed as independent variable. Whereas, Transformational Leadership is presumed as a moderating variable.

On the basis of the above discussion, it is hypothesised that transformational leadership moderate the effect of individual factors such as big five personality traits and dark triad personality on deviant workplace behavior.

H3 : There is significant moderating effect of transformational leadership between Big five personality traits and deviant workplace behavior.

H4 : There is significant moderating effect of transformational leadership between dark triad personality and deviant workplace behavior.

**METHODOLOGY**

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the impact of individual factors i.e. Big five personality trait and dark triad personality traits contributing to deviant workplace behavior of employees in Pakistani public organizations and the moderating role of transformational leadership among the individual factors i.e. Big five personality trait and dark triad personality traits and DWB. Individual factors such as big five personality traits and dark triad personality traits are also expected to link to deviant workplace behavior. The research design is an explanatory research that help to investigate the impact of changes in existing phenomena and particularly focuses on specific problems to explain the patterns of relationship among
the different variables such as independent variables, dependent variable and moderating or mediating variable. The data collection process employed cross-sectional approach via surveys (questionnaire). Furthermore, as this study focuses on cross-sectional research, it will compare the observations of the different variables simultaneously such as gender, marital status, education, experience, tenure and level of job or marginality position. Quantitative approach was utilized in this research to collect and analyse data because the results of quantitative research are relatively independent. As the objective of the present study is to investigate the impact of individual factors i.e. Big five personality and dark triad contributing to the deviant workplace behavior of workers in public organizations and the moderating role of transformational leadership, therefore the target population for this study consisted of 20 public organizations i.e. universities, autonomous bodies, special institutions and attached departments of the province of the Punjab in Pakistan. Sample of population of employees was determined based on the guidelines presented by Krejcie & Morgan (1970). The current study was conducted in 20 educational public organizations of the Punjab, Pakistan, based in the province capital of Lahore. From the information available from the website of the Government of the Punjab (www.punjab.gov.pk) there are 40 provincial departments, 108 attached department, 152 autonomous bodies and 12 special institutions of the Government of the Punjab. However, only 20 organizations related to education and the training sectors were selected for this study as education aligned organization can benefit from the outcome of this study.

The reason behind choosing these public organizations is that they are all provincial headquarters based and covers the whole province of the Punjab territory. Sekaran (2003), asserts that stratified sampling design is comparatively more efficient in the case of heterogeneous population for meeting the objectives of the study. Cluster sampling for the selection of organizations, which is a purposive, non-probability sampling technique was deemed the most suitable technique for the current study (Sekaran & Boguee, 2010). In the selection of organization, only autonomous bodies and special institution who have their head office /head quarter at the provincial capital Lahore throughout the different region throughout the Punjab will be chosen as geographical area for conducting research. Self-administrated questionnaire was used to collect information from respondent i.e. employees of public organizations situated in Pakistan.

**Measures**

In order to conduct the survey, a self-administrated questionnaire was employed and a close-ended type of questionnaire was used to conduct the
current study. The respondents were only asked to tick the answers given, in the range of 1 to 5. The questionnaire was adopted from previous work of eminent scholars. Deviant workplace behavior in public sector organizations has been measured by a 7 dimension scale of deviance workplace behavior, stated in 76 subscale that can be divided as 4 sub scale to measure “Sabotage” (Spector et al., 2006); 4 sub scale to measure “Withdrawal” (Spector, et al., 2006); 4 sub scale to measure “Theft” (Spector, Fox, Penney, et al., 2006); 3 sub scale to measure to “Property deviance” 5 sub scale to measure “Misuse of time and resources” (Bashir et al. 2012); 5 subscale to measure “Kickbacks /Corruption” (Bashir et al., 2012); 18-sub scale to measure “Abuse to others/ Bullying” (Spector, et al., 2006). In the survey, the data was measured using the Five Likert scale which contain answers ranging from 1 to 5, such as strongly disagree, disagree, to agree and strongly agree.

On the other hand, Individual factors contained 44 subscales for personality trait (John & Srivastava, 1999), 8 items to measure extraversion (1, 6R, 11, 16, 21R, 26, 31R, 36), 9 items to measure Agreeableness (2R, 7, 12R, 17, 22, 27R, 32, 37R, 42), 9 items to measure conscientious (3, 8R, 13, 18R, 23R, 28, 33, 38, 43R), 8 items measure to neuroticism (4, 9R, 14, 19, 24R, 29, 34R, 39), and 10 items to measure openness (5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35R, 40, 41R, 44).

Finally, to measure dark triad personality characteristics 27 sub items were administered, in which 9 items was used to measure Machiavellianism, 9 items to measure narcissism and 9 items to measure to psychopath (Paulhus, &Jones, 2011). In the survey, the data was measured using the Five Likert scale which contain answers ranging from 1 to 5, such as strongly disagree to strongly agree. Additionally, 20 items of transformational leadership was used to measure items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X; Bass & Avolio, 1995). Again the Five Likert scale was used in the survey for this section. Most of the instruments were adopted from earlier research, thus having acceptable range of reliabilities calculated by Cronbach’s Alpha.

DATA ANALYSIS

In order to analyse data, Structural Equation Model (SEM) was used as it is generally favoured in social and behavioral sciences (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). SEM is largely applied in the behavioral and behavioral science field to assess the causal modelling of complex and multivariate datasets in which there are compound measures of proposed constructs (Hair et al., 2013). Applying SEM in the field of social sciences i.e. management
and organizational behavior has considerably increased because of the presence of a number of packages of software that perform SEM (Hair et al., 2013). SEM techniques is used to analysis the data of the present study because it is a general modelling technique which contained combination of path analysis, regression analysis as well as factor analysis. Finally, the focus in SEM is usually on the theoretical construct.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>kewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Five Personality Traits</td>
<td>3.2987</td>
<td>1.01302</td>
<td>-.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Triad Personality Traits</td>
<td>3.1327</td>
<td>0.94667</td>
<td>-.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Workplace Behavior</td>
<td>3.2147</td>
<td>1.00103</td>
<td>-.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>3.1927</td>
<td>1.02403</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.1 exhibits the value of the mean, SD and skewness of the data. The value of mean are in the range of 3.1327 to 3.2987. The value of standard deviation are in the range of 0.94667 to 1.02403 while the values of skewness are within the limit of -1 to +1. The skewness results have confirmed that the data is normal. As all objective variables have been proved normal, so the analysis can move forward for further analysis.

Table 2

Model Fitness Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>IFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table show the Fit indices values for the current research which are Chi-square=1624.46, DF=736, Normed Chi-square=2.208, GFI=0.962, AGFI=0.955, CFI =0.995, TLI=0.980, IFI=0.942, PCLOSE =0.078 and RMSEA=0.049, which show that all the results are within the accepted region which means the measurement model is fit and it can be relied upon. For an instance, the threshold value of RMSEA must be lesser than 0.08 and it is 0.04 in the case of this research.
Table 3 present the results of the psychometric properties. Threshold value for composite reliability must be greater than 0.8, the results shown in the above table meets this criteria because all the values of CR are in the range of 0.806 to 0.901 which are greater than 0.8. While the value of AVE must be greater than 0.5, the results depicted in the above table showed that all the values of AVE is greater than 0.5. Hence the convergent validity and reliability is proved from the results. Fornell and Larcker (1981) asserts that to test the discriminant validity, it is considered essential that values of square root for AVE should be more analogous with correlation values of its own and other variables. The results shown in the above mentioned Table 3 for square root AVE describing values in diagonal and all bold values in diagonal are meeting the criteria which confirm the discriminant validity. Values of Cronbach alpha are also greater than 0.7 for all variables which means that data is reliable.

Table 4 show the values of standardized regression weights obtained after running the structural equation modelling. The results concluded that big five personality traits can decrease the workplace deviance by 21% and the results are significant too as P-value is lesser than 0.05. As far as dark traits of personality are concerned, they can increase the workplace deviance by 10% and the results are also significant for this value.
### Table 5

**Moderation Analysis for Big Five Personality Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.0123</td>
<td>0.0595</td>
<td>58.419</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>.0643</td>
<td>0.0484</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int_1</td>
<td>-.0921</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
<td>3.633</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 depict the results of the moderation analysis. The results can be concluded from the significance value against interaction parameter and as int_1 is carrying the value 0.02 for P which is lesser than 0.05 so it means that transformational leadership is a significant moderator between big five personality traits and deviance workplace behavior. The value of coefficient is showing the strength of this moderation which is 6% that means transformational leadership will increase or speed up the impact of big five traits on workplace deviance by 6%.

### Table 6

**Moderation Analysis for Dark Triad of Personality traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.2103</td>
<td>0.1302</td>
<td>53.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>-.0921</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
<td>3.633</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 represent the results of the moderation analysis. The results can be concluded from the significance value against interaction parameter and as int_1 is carrying the value 0.001 for P which is lesser than 0.05 which means that transformational leadership is a significant moderator between dark personality traits and workplace deviance. The value of coefficient show the strength of this moderation which is 9% that imply the transformational leadership will decrease or slow down the impact of big five personality traits on workplace deviance by 6%.

**CONCLUSION**

The current study has provided additional indication and evidence to the growing body of knowledge regarding the impact of individual factors, and
the relationship between deviant workplace behavior and the moderating role of transformational leadership. Despite some limitations of the present study, the results from the study supported the theoretical propositions, key objectives and answered research questions. Although there have been a number of studies carried out to examine the underlying antecedents and causes of deviant workplace behavior. This study, however, addressed the theoretical gap by incorporating transformational leadership as moderating variables between individual factors contributing deviant workplace behavior. The present study also supported the theoretical and empirical framework for the moderating role of transformational leadership on the relationship between individual and deviant workplace behavior. This study has also managed to evaluate how transformational leadership theoretically moderates the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Furthermore, the theoretical framework of this study has also added to the domain breach of psychological contract theory by examining the influence of individual factors i.e. big five personality traits and dark triad personality on deviant workplace behavior. The outcome of this study also provides important practical implication to the head of the institutions, managers, and organization. In spite of some limitations of the present study, several recommendations, directions and guidelines for future research has been drawn in this study (discussed in the next section). Finally, this research paper is the first empirical study in Pakistan in the context of public organizations. This study is a small addition to the global literature and provides new directions for research, by opening a new debate on the importance of the role of transformational leadership in controlling the workplace deviant behavior of individuals working in the Pakistani public organizations. This research also contributes to the plethora of research literature available on theories such as Social Learning theory, Social Exchange theory and breach of Psychological Contract theory.

**Future Directions**

Although, the present study has provided support for a number of the hypothesised relationship among the exogenous, endogenous and intervening variables, the results have to be interpreted under consideration of the study’ limitations:

Firstly, this study assumed and adopted a cross-sectional research design which does not allow casual inferences to be made from the population. Therefore, a longitudinal research design in the future needs to be considered to measure the theoretical constructs at different points in time to confirm the findings of the present study. Secondly, the present study adopts a non-probability sampling technique i.e. quota sampling in which all elements of
the target population were not captured, as such the extent to which sample size represents the entire population cannot be known. The use of quota sampling has limited the extent to which the findings of the study can be generalized to the population. Thirdly, in this present study, it is possible that the respondents belonging to the public sector might have under reported their deviant behavior in the closed-ended questionnaires. Therefore, in the future, researcher may wish to employ other strategies i.e. direct observations, interview, case study etc. to assess deviance workplace behavior in organizations in the public sectors. Fourthly, in the present study, it is pertinent to mention that the deviant workplace behavior reported was subjective. The outcome of the present research demonstrates that subjective data is valid and reliable for assessing deviant workplace behavior. Therefore, in the future the outcome of the present research may be replicated by using objective measures of deviant workplace behavior. Furthermore, the outcome of the present study offers quite limited generalizability because it focused mainly on employees who are working in public organizations located in Lahore the provincial headquarters of Punjab, Pakistan. Therefore, in the future it is essential in order to generalize the findings, to include employees who are working in the other provinces of Pakistan. In addition, it is important to note that there was significant moderating effect of transformational leadership between Individual factors dark triad personality traits and deviant workplace behaviors found. Therefore, in the future, further research is desirable to investigate such type of mediator effects with other moderating variables. Finally, this research is concerned with a national sample thus there is an issue of its generalizability in other countries because the culture and the context of different countries that vary. This research should be extended to different cultures and countries in order to replicate the results of this study.
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