



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR, ORGANISATIONAL
JUSTICE, ORGANISATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS AND
PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AMONG POLICE FORCE IN PAKISTAN**

SULTAN ADAL MEHMOOD

GSM 2019 18



**COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR, ORGANISATIONAL
JUSTICE, ORGANISATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS AND
PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AMONG POLICE FORCE IN
PAKISTAN**

By

SULTAN ADAL MEHMOOD

**Thesis Submitted to Putra Business School, in Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

July 2019

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs, and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my late father Muhammad Saeed who sacrificed all his comforts to make me able to achieved this success and my beloved mother Abida Begum who raised and supported me in every happy and sad moment of my life. Her prayers are the most valuable resource I own today.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR, ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE, ORGANISATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AMONG POLICE FORCE IN PAKISTAN

By

SULTAN ADAL MEHMOOD

July 2019

Chairman : Devika Nadarajah, PhD
Faculty : Putra Business School

Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) is commonplace in organisations. The consequences of such behaviour have been proven inimical for organisations and their stakeholders. The police force is considered a vital state institution; but, the presence of CWB among police employees is very rampant especially in underdeveloped countries such as Pakistan. Organisational justice (OJ) is regarded as a prime determinant of CWB. Although numerous researchers have studied the relation of OJ and CWB, none of them have explored the role of organisational embeddedness (OE) and psychological ownership (PO) in this regard. This study thus aimed to investigate the mechanisms through which OJ is translated into CWB among the police in Pakistan. Such relationship is explained through a moderated mediation model where organisational embeddedness mediates between OJ and CWB, and PO moderates the relationship between OE and CWB. The COR theory was used as the underpinning theory to explain the interrelationships among the constructs.

Data were collected by administering a cross-sectional survey to the employees working in 33 police stations, chosen one from each circle of the capital city of Lahore. Three hundred and thirty-one responses were received. The proposed model was tested using PLS-SEM to address the treatment of higher-order reflective-formative constructs of OE and CWB. The data supported the claim that OE mediates the relationship between OJ and CWB. Also, it was found that PO moderated the negative relation of OE with CWB. Thus, the results supported the proposed conceptual framework based on the COR theory.

This study will give practitioners new insights into how they can minimise the occurrence of CWB among police employees. Apart from providing a work environment based on fair procedures and policies, the intervening role of embeddedness in the organisation and PO can contribute positively in shaping the behaviours of police employees.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

TINGKAH LAKU KERJA YANG TIDAK PRODUKTIF, KEADILAN ORGANISASI, KEBENARAN ORGANISASI DAN PEMILIKAN PSIKOLOGI DI KALANGAN POLIS DI PAKISTAN

Oleh

SULTAN ADAL MEHMOOD

Julai 2019

Pengerusi : Devika Nadarajah, PhD
Fakulti : Putra Business School

Tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif merupakan satu fenomena yang biasa di organisasi. Kesan tingkah laku yang tidak produktif telah memudaratkan keadaan untuk organisasi dan golongan yang terdekat dengan organisasi. Pihak polis merupakan golongan yang penting, namun isu tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif semakin menular di kalangan kakitangan polis terutamanya di negara-negara yang membangun seperti Pakistan. Keadilan Organisasi merupakan factor utama ke atas tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif. Terdapat pelbagai kajian antara keadilan organisasi dan tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif, namun kajian amat kurang terhadap kebenaran organisasi dan pemilikan psikologi. Fokus utama kajian ini adalah untuk memahami bagaimana kebenaran organisasi berhubung dengan tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif di kalangan kakitangan polis di Pakistan melalui kebenaran organisasi dan pemilikan organisasi dengan berpandukan pemeliharaan sumber teori.

Soal selidik diberikan kepada kakitangan polis yang bertugas di 33 balai polis di bandar Lahore dan sebanyak 331 maklumbalas diterima. Model dikaji menggunakan PLS-SEM. Analisis data membuktikan bahawa kebenaran organisasi berfungsi sebagai pengantara di antara keadilan organisasi dan tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif. Didapati juga bahawa pemilikan psikologi menguatkan kesan negatif kepada kebenaran organisasi ke atas tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif. Keputusan analisa menyokong pemeliharaan sumber teori.

Kajian ini memberi pandangan baru bagaimana mengurangkan tingkah laku kerja yang tidak produktif di kalangan kakitangan polis melalui polisi yang adil, mempertingkatkan kebenaran dan pemilikan psikologi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to sincerely express my greatest gratitude to my supervisory committee, especially Dr. Devika Nadarajah who made me believe and work on my abilities with her guidance, priceless time, advice, and encouragement throughout this research journey. She cares like a sister, meets like a friend and teaches like a great mentor. I have seen in her the height of professionalism. I am also indebted to Prof. Murali Sambasivan who is a real research guru. He taught me art and science of research. Prof. Ho Jo Ann is another person who helped and guided me whenever needed.

Second, Ph.D. Journey would not be easy for me without heartily support of my family. I was lucky to have the company of my elder brother Dr. Muhammad Saood Akhtar. While sharing the home, he was always there to align my academic direction in right way. Also, I am grateful to my beloved better half Aliya Adil, who always supported my cause, brought peace and satisfaction with her presence and paved my way towards success.

I cannot finish without acknowledging the support of my friends especially Laiba Ali and Muhammad Asif Raza. I enjoyed the true compatibility with them. Getting them around always made me feel honored. They assisted me in accomplishing my research goals. I am also indebted to my junior research fellows including Ali Pervaiz, Umair Nazir and Imran Majeed for their direct and indirect support.

Finally, I want to pay profound gratitude to the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan for selecting me in this scholarship program.

I certify that an Examination Committee met on 23 July 2019 to conduct the final examination of Sultan Adal Mehmood on his thesis entitled " Counterproductive Work Behaviour, Organisational Justice, Organisational Embeddedness and Psychological Ownership Among Police Force in Pakistan" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Abu Bakar Abd. Hamid, PhD

Professor
Putra Business School
Serdang, Selangor
(Chairman)

Dahlia Binti Zawawi, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Economics and Management
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Hooi Lai Wan, Carol, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Social Sciences
The University of Nottingham, Malaysia
(External Examiner)

Chris Rowley, PhD

Professor Emeritus
Cass Business School
United Kingdom
(External Examiner)

PROF. TS. DR. M. IQBAL SARIPAN

Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic & International)
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

On behalf of,
Putra Business School

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Devika Nadarajah, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Putra Business School
(Chairman)

Ho Jo Ann, PhD

Associate Professor
Department of Management and Marketing
Faculty of Economics and Management
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Murali Sambasivan, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Business and Law
Taylor's University, Malaysia
(Member)

PROF. TS. DR. M. IQBAL SARIPAN

Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic & International)
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

On behalf of,
Putra Business School

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations, and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name and Matric No: Sultan Adal Mehmood, PBS16141346

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities, as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Chairman of Supervisory Committee

Signature : _____
Name : Dr. Devika Nadarajah
Faculty : Putra Business School

Member of Supervisory Committee

Signature : _____
Name : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ho Jo Ann
Faculty : Faculty of Economics and Management, UPM

Signature : _____
Name : Prof. Dr. Murali Sambasivan
Faculty : Taylor's University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
APPROVAL	v
DECLARATION	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the Study	1
1.3 Motivation of the Study	2
1.4 Problem Statement	5
1.5 Research Questions	9
1.6 Research Objectives	9
1.7 Significance of the Study	9
1.7.1 Theoretical	9
1.7.2 Managerial	10
1.8 Scope of the Study	11
1.9 Definitions of Terms	11
1.10 Chapter Summary	12
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 Counterproductive Work Behaviour	13
2.2.1 Definitions	13
2.2.2 Typology	15
2.2.3 Potential Antecedents	16
2.2.3.1 Situational-based Perspective	16
2.2.3.2 Person-based Perspective	18
2.3 Organisational Justice	21
2.3.1 Outcomes of Organisational Justice	22
2.3.2 Components of Organisational Justice	23
2.4 Organisational Embeddedness	25
2.4.1 Determinants of Organisational Embeddedness	26
2.4.2 Outcomes of Organisational Embeddedness	28
2.5 Psychological Ownership	32
2.5.1 Determinants of Psychological Ownership	33
2.5.2 Outcomes of Psychological Ownership	34
2.6 Psychological Ownership and Organisational Embeddedness	36
2.7 Summary of Research Gaps	37
2.8 Review of Relevant Theories	38

2.8.1	Conservation of Resources Theory	38
2.8.2	Social Exchange Theory	41
2.9	Conceptual Framework	42
2.10	Interrelationships among Constructs and Hypothesis Development	42
2.10.1	OJ and CWB	42
2.10.2	OJ and OE	43
2.10.2.1	OJ and OF	44
2.10.2.2	OJ and OL	45
2.10.2.3	OJ and OS	45
2.10.3	OE and CWB	46
2.10.3.1	OF and CWB	46
2.10.3.2	OL and CWB	46
2.10.3.3	OS and CWB	47
2.10.4	Mediation of OE between OJ and CWB	47
2.10.4.1	Indirect Effect of OJ on CWB	47
2.10.5	PO and CWB	49
2.10.6	Moderation of PO between OE and CWB	50
2.11	Chapter Summary	51
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	52
3.1	Introduction	52
3.2	Research Philosophy	53
3.2.1	Ontology	53
3.2.2	Epistemology	54
3.3	Research Approach	54
3.4	Methodological Choice	55
3.5	Research Strategy	56
3.6	Time Horizon	57
3.7	Sampling Design	57
3.7.1	Population	57
3.7.2	Sampling Frame	57
3.7.3	Sampling Technique	59
3.7.4	Sample Size	59
3.7.5	Mode of Administration	61
3.8	Generation of the Questionnaire	62
3.8.1	Step One: Specifying the information sought	62
3.8.2	Step Two: Determining the type of questionnaire and method of administration	62
3.8.3	Step Three: Content of items (Operationalisation of constructs)	62
3.8.3.1	Counterproductive Work Behaviours	63
3.8.3.2	Organisational Embeddedness	63
3.8.3.3	Psychological Ownership	63
3.8.3.4	Organisational Justice	64
3.8.3.5	Marker Variable	65
3.8.4	Step Four: Form of response to each question	67
3.8.5	Step Five: Question wording	67
3.8.5.1	Translation Process	68

3.8.6	Step Six: Question Sequence	71
3.8.7	Step Seven: Questionnaire Layout and Physical Characteristics	72
3.8.8	Step Eight: Re-examination and Revision of Questionnaire	72
3.8.9	Step Nine: Questionnaire Pre-testing	72
3.9	Pilot Study	73
3.9.1	Reliability	74
3.9.2	Discriminant Validity	75
3.10	Data Entry of Completed Questionnaires	76
3.11	Methodological Concerns of Previous Research, Mediation and Moderation Analysis	76
3.11.1	Mediation Analysis	76
3.11.2	Moderation Analysis	77
3.12	Use of PLS-SEM	78
3.13	Structural Model	79
3.13.1	Higher-Order Constructs	79
3.14	Ethical implications	80
3.15	Chapter summary	80
4	DATA ANALYSIS	81
4.1	Introduction	81
4.2	Descriptive Statistics of the Respondents	81
4.3	Descriptive Statistics for the questionnaire items	82
4.4	Normality Assessment	85
4.5	Common Method Variance	86
4.6	Measurement Model Assessment	88
4.6.1	Model Specification	89
4.6.1.1	Confirmatory Tetra Analysis (CTA)	91
4.6.2	Reflective Measurement Assessment	94
4.6.2.1	Internal Consistency Reliability	96
4.6.2.2	Convergent Validity	96
4.6.2.3	Discriminant Validity	98
4.6.3	Formative Measurement Model	101
4.6.3.1	Collinearity among LOCs	102
4.6.3.2	Significance and Relevance	102
4.7	Structural Model Analysis	102
4.7.1	Collinearity Issues Assessment	103
4.7.2	Path Coefficient Assessment	104
4.7.3	Coefficient of Determination	105
4.7.4	Effect Size	105
4.7.5	Predictive Relevance (Q^2)	106
4.7.6	Importance Performance Map Analysis (IPMA)	106
4.7.7	Mediation Effect Assessment	108
4.7.8	Moderation Effect Assessment	108
4.7.9	Summary of Hypothesis	110
4.8	Chapter Summary	111

5	DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS	112
5.1	Introduction	112
5.2	Discussion	112
	5.2.1 Summary of the Findings	112
	5.2.2 Research Question 1	113
	5.2.3 Research Question 2	114
	5.2.4 Research Question 3	115
	5.2.5 Research Question 4	116
	5.2.6 Research Question 5	116
5.3	Theoretical Contribution	117
5.4	Managerial Implications	118
5.5	Research Limitations	120
5.6	Direction for Future Research	120
5.7	Concluding Statement	121
	REFERENCES	122
	APPENDICES	153
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	167

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page	
1.1	Reported Counterproductive Acts among police officers in Punjab Pakistan	5
2.1	Definitions of CWB-related constructs	14
3.1	Differences between quantitative and qualitative research	56
3.2	Population and Sampling Frame	58
3.3	Distribution of Questionnaires	61
3.4	Measures of Psychological Ownership	64
3.5	List of the Measurement Items	66
3.6	Translated Questionnaire	69
3.7	Profile of Respondents in Pilot Study	74
3.8	Reliability of Constructs	75
3.9	Fornell Larcker criterion (pilot study)	75
3.10	HTMT Criterion (pilot study)	76
4.1	Profile of the Respondents	82
4.2	Descriptive Statistics of the Questionnaire Items	83
4.3	Normality Assessment	86
4.4	Harman single factor result	87
4.5	Correlations of MV with focal variable	88
4.6	Criterion for a reflective or formative measure	90
4.7	Reflective and formative measures used in this study	91
4.8	CTA-PLS Result	93
4.9	Measurement Model Assessment of LOCs	97
4.10	Cross Loadings	99
4.11	Fornell-Larcker Criterion	100

4.12	HTMT Criterion	101
4.13	Measurement Model Assessment of HOCs	101
4.14	Lateral Collinearity result	103
4.15	Summary of Direct Relationships	105
4.16	Effect Size (f^2)	106
4.17	IPMA values	107
4.18	Hypothesis Results for Mediation	108
4.19	Effect Size in Moderation	109
4.20	Hypothesis Result of Moderation	109
4.21	Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results	111

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Conceptual Framework	42
2.2 Hypothesised Framework	51
3.1 The Research Onion Model	53
3.2 Research process	55
3.3 G power Analysis	60
3.4 Second-order reflective formative construct	80
4.1 Measurement Model	95
4.2 Structural Model Steps	103
4.3 Path Coefficient Result	104
4.4 IPMA graph	107
4.5 Moderation Analysis	109
4.6 Two-Way Interaction Plot	110
5.1 Final Model with Significant Relationships	113

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CWB	Counterproductive Work Behaviours
OJ	Organisational Justice
OE	Organisational Embeddedness
OF	Organisational Fit
OL	Organisational Link
OS	Organisational Sacrifice
PO	Psychological Ownership
CCPO	Capital City Police Officer
SEM	Structure Equation Modelling
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
PLS	Partial Least Square

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Chapter one presents introduction of the research which comprise the following main sections: background of the research, the problem statement, research objectives, research questions, hypothesis, significance of this research and definitions of the key terms

1.2 Background of the Study

Counterproductive work behaviours (CWB) at a workplace entails all those voluntary behaviours which being opposed to organisational values, norms, and legitimate interests, are detrimental to the organisation itself, its workers or stakeholders (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The notion of CWB is conceptually similar to deviant behaviour, antisocial behaviour (Thau, Crossley, Bennett, & Sczesny, 2007), dysfunctional behaviour, organisational misbehaviour (Martinson, Anderson, Crain, & De Vries, 2006), workplace incivility (Penney & Spector, 2005), organisational retaliatory behaviour (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) and corrupt behaviour (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). CWB can range from minors (e.g., procrastination, bullying) to severe ones (e.g., theft, vandalism, corruption); however, forms of such behaviours are always positively correlated (Marcus & Schuler, 2004).

CWB are rampant in public and private organisations alike. Consequences of such behaviour have proven inimical to employees, stakeholders, organisations, communities and even national interests. Therefore, management experts, social scientist, psychologist and government bodies are equally interested towards its determinants. CWB are a complex phenomenon; therefore, it deserves scholarly attention. The costs associated with these acts have financial, social and psychological implications.

The organisations where economics plays a major role, occurrences of counterproductive behaviours have become more deleterious. It continues to be a severe and pervasive problem globally that leads to billions of dollars costs and lower levels of organisational effectiveness and performance (Dunlop and Lee, 2004). For example, it is estimated that 20 percent of business failure and an annual loss of \$6–\$200 billion in US organisation results from workplace deviance (Diefendorff and Mehta 2007). Recently, a report on industry research revealed that inventory shortage costs approximately \$15 billion dollars annually. Whereas employee's theft is the main contributing factor of this shortage. Organisational Theft caused inventory shortage 34.5% in 2015, 35.8% in 2016 and 30% in 2017 (Hollinger & Moraca 2017). Moreover, the Kroll (2017)'s Intelligence Unit surveyed 545 senior executives

worldwide across multiple industries and geographies from around the world operating in a wide variety of sectors and reported that 75% of them reported that they had fallen victim of theft of the physical asset and other fraud incidents within the past year. They held current and former employees as most common perpetrators of theft and fraud. The proportion of executives that reported their companies fell victim to fraud in the past year rose significantly to 82%, from 75% in 2015 and 70% in 2013. According to a report, Asian countries also have a high percentage of loss amounting to \$20 billion next to USA and Africa (Kroll, 2017).

The National Safe Workplace Institute estimates that lost productivity and legal expenses cost employers \$4.2 billion (Bensimon, 1994). Other costs include insurance losses, damage, and the waste of property, tarnished reputations, and weakened employee morale (Filipczak, 1993). Another study estimates that monetary cost of experiencing incivility is approximately \$14,000 per employee annually, due to project delays and cognitive distraction from work (Pearson & Porath, 2009). These statistics are alarming as they indicate that incivility affects many employees and has a substantial financial impact on their organisations.

Apart from economic costs, CWB also entails indirect costs. For example, such behaviours may affect their stakeholders physically, mentally or both. This is evident from the fact that between the years 1997-2008, 1,260 people were killed by work associates in the USA (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). More recently the number of fatal workplace injury cases due to violence of co-workers were recorded 703 in 2015 and 866 in 2016 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). Moreover, in another survey almost two million were physically attacked, nearly 6 million threatened, and about 16 million workers were harassed (Northwestern National Life Insurance Company, 1993). Even a relatively less severe form of negative behaviour may endanger employee's wellbeing in manifold ways. For instance, victims of harassment are likely to experience increase occurrences of depression and anxiety (Bowling, Beehr, & Lepisto, 2006) and decreased emotional well-being, life satisfaction and job satisfaction (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002). Likewise, victims of workplace bullying are associated with discrete emotions such as anger, depression, and anxiety (Bauer & Spector, 2015). Such emotions may diminish job performance, organisational productivity and contribute to high turnover and work pressure (Spector & Fox, 2005). Thus, it earns a lousy name for the company and keeps good human resource away. Moreover, employees subjected to workplace incivility may experience worry, withdraw from work, try to avoid the instigator and even take their frustration out on customers (Pearson, C. 2010). At the micro level, CWB affects manager's perception of employee's overall performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). As a result, employee individual career progression might get affected.

1.3 Motivation of the Study

In public organisations, the prevalence of corrupt behaviour has severe implications. The term corrupt behaviour conceptually overlaps with CWB and related terms in management literature (Ashforth, Gioia, Robinson, & Trevino, 2008; Bennett &

Robinson, 2003; Marcus & Schuler, 2004). However, corruption a relatively stronger term that represents not just a corrupt behaviour of an individual, but also a process which can spread like an infection in other individuals (Ashforth et al., 2008). Bashir, (2012) found that bribery is an essential dimension of CWB in public sector organisations. As the prime objective of public organisations is to provide services to the public regardless of earning the profit, corrupt behaviour at the high levels of government may distort policies and central functioning of the state, where leaders may get the benefit at the expense of the public good. Also, these behaviours result in everyday abuse of entrusted powers by public officials in their interaction with ordinary citizens which can undermine access of their basic services or goods in places like courts, police stations, hospitals and other departments. Corruption is a key indicator of performance in public sector organisations. Transparency International, which presents the corruption barometer in public sector, reported that in many countries, people are deprived of their most basic needs and go to bed hungry every night because of corruption (Clark, 2017). The report further points out that Asian countries are among most of the highly corrupt countries including Pakistan that is ranked at 116 /176 in most corrupt countries. While 82% of the population perceives that police in Pakistan is the most corrupt public department (Transparency International 2018).

Usually, police work for the protection of people, to maintain law and order in society, to ensure smooth flow of traffic and to safeguard the rights of community members (Green & Gates, 2014). Therefore, society is regarded as a primary stakeholder for the poor performance of the police. Correspondingly, the impact of police behaviour is not only limited to the police department, but it also has strong implications on society at large. Nature of police work is unique because of some characteristics where they are lawfully authorized with some powers: police act as state agent of formal social control, that render them the capacity to influence other people's life (Walker, 1993). For example, police may restrict a person's freedom of movement, use reasonable force to arrest a suspicious person, take a person's personal property and search their body if required. Besides, police profession entails with little supervision from others that render them freedom in the decision-making process. These characteristics put police at ethical and moral complexities (MacVean & Neyroud, 2012) where potential for abuse of these powers is high (Klockars and Kutnjak Ivković, 2004).

Performance of police is determined by the lawful usage and application of these entrusted powers. Otherwise, it can harm person's dignity and human rights. When police act counterproductively; use their power beyond the law, society at large becomes at risk. That is, not only the immediate victims who are affected with violence and abuse of power rather, their families, communities, schools and service providers assisting them lose faith in police integrity (Hopkins, 2007). Moreover, appropriate behaviour of police is central to craft their image in community which helps to maintain perceptions of police legitimacy, building citizen trust, and promoting voluntary cooperation during police-citizen interactions (Jackson, Asif, Bradford, & Zakria Zakar, 2014b; Ugelvik, 2016).

When police legitimacy (felt obligation to obey legal authorities) reduces, public become uncooperative, hesitant to obey laws, does not accept state's right to monopolise the use of force in society (Bradford, Huq, Jackson, & Roberts, 2013). That may lead to lawlessness and related problems. It is evident that people do not bother to stop at traffic signal because of the perception that if caught by the cop, they can get rid of them by giving bribe. At another instance, cyber loafing practices among traffic cop convey a message to potential law violator that they are not being watched. Similarly, lack of public cooperation and trust can bring ineffective performance (Jackson, Asif, Bradford, & Zakar, 2014a).

Plethora of research indicates that key driver of CWB among police is organisational injustice (Crawshaw, Cropanzano, Bell, & Nadisic, 2013; Jackson, Asif, Bradford, & Zakar, 2014a; Van Craen & Skogan, 2016; Wu, Sun, Chang, & Hsu, 2017). It is perception of internal injustice that converts into external injustice (Van Craen & Skogan, 2016). External injustice is when police treat public unfairly: For example, when police marginalise common people against influential one. Also, when they drive criminal justice system in favour of rich people by taking bribes and by putting the poor behind the bar. All such behaviours of police cumulatively make the perception of public negative towards police.

The police in Pakistan is perceived as most corrupt public institution (Transparency International 2018). Various counterproductive practices endemic among the police employees cumulatively made their perception negative in public. Police employees adopt such practices when they follow a well-established organisational culture that is characterised as oppressive, corrupt and authoritative (Suddle, 2015). This culture is legacy of old British colonial rule. British ruled in Indian subcontinent for about ninety years (1857-1947). At the time of independence in 1947, Pakistan inherited the coercive criminal justice system from Britishers in which police was governed through the 1861 Police Act. Through this act, police had mostly been used as an oppressive instrument of the state. Its primary functions were to curb the rebellion, protect the elites and to manage administrative affairs (e.g., tax collection). In other words, the purpose of policing was to facilitate British hegemonies regardless of public service (Vinod Kumar & Verma, 2008). As a consequence, the culture of policing in Pakistan shaped to make it coercive in style.

After independence from British rule, political elites of Pakistan, which replaced the old colonial masters, used police to fulfil their vested interest (Abbas, 2016). Apart from it, research shows that police in Pakistan has lost its trust and legitimacy due to various corrupt behaviours (Jackson, Asif, Bradford, & Zakria, 2014b). The behaviour of police employee is product of long-established organisational culture which was essential to maintain dominant image of police as well as authority of the state. Unfortunately, very little attention paid to improve the administrative, procedural, legal and behavioural issues of policing. As a result, the extended legacy of colonial policing system remained mainly unchanged.

Punjab is the most populated province of Pakistan with highest number of police strength. Whereas Lahore is the capital city of Punjab. Being a metropolitan city and having sensitive locations within, Lahore police has special standing for researchers as well as practitioners (Jackson, Asif, Bradford & Zakria 2014). Hence, this research is interested to investigate the CWB in the context of Lahore police in Pakistan. Motivation of current study is the prevalence of CWB in police in Pakistan as shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 : Reported Counterproductive Acts among police officers in Punjab Pakistan

Acts	2014	2015	2016	2017
Torture	12	21	8	15
Death in custody	06	07	471	10
Bribe	826	593	609	861
Absence from duty	32499	26329	26614	30791
Negligence	7349	8612	10317	9394
Criminal case	497	456	1736	736
Inefficiency	9287	12432	11767	14372
Poor performance	2168	2052	1855	2276
Lack of supervision/interest in official duty	338	474	1077	520
Misuse of official powers	342	645	589	600
Failed to control crime	73	158	226	84
Disobeying the orders of seniors/Courts	684	755	1115	615
Misbehaviour with colleagues	75	82	109	125
Illegal confinement	103	60	65	36
Delay in registration of FIR	135	183	344	165
Delay in submission of challan/investigation	1995	1449	1298	802
Failed to recover case- property	168	96	123	166
Faulty investigation	1099	1229	1039	1093
Escape of accused	289	99	189	106
Failed to arrest accused	1219	1508	1881	1684
Total	59164	57318	61422	64458

(Source : Official website <https://www.punjabpolice.gov.pk/>)

1.4 Problem Statement

Police in Pakistan is perceived as most corrupt organization. Therefore, police reforms had been a challenge for academics and practitioners alike. For that purpose, in 2002 new police order was introduced. Many other initiatives have been taken to improve the policing in Pakistan (Ata-Ullah & Ijaz, 2016, Suddle, 2015, Hassan Abbas, 2011), but till present times, behavioural issues remained largely unresolved. Table 1.1 represents the list of various counterproductive acts which were officially reported in Punjab police during last four years. It is also evident that counterproductive acts such as absence from the work, bribe, and poor performance are on the rise. Media news revealed that since 2000 the Punjab Police had been involved in rampant corruption, including forging documents, using department money for personal use and disappearance of police records after exchange of bribes. Further it was found that

corruption worth Rs 2,020,000,000 had been unearthed in the provincial police department (Haider, R. 2017). The counterproductive behaviour of police is observable from day to day media reporting: For example two policemen were suspended after an inquiry where they were found manhandling and misbehaving with an elderly couple (Geo News, 2017). In another instance, human right watch reported that in year 2015 almost 2000 people were extra judicially killed by Pakistan police (The Guardian, 2017). More recently, 15 police officer in Lahore were punished with charge of dishonesty, corruption and misbehaving (Express Tribune, 2017). Similarly, anticorruption has arrested an Assistant Sub Inspector for taking bribe (The Nation, 2018).

CWB can be the consequence of numerous factors including individual differences, such as employees' personal traits and abilities (e.g., Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Dalal, 2005; Dilchert, Ones, Davis, & Rostow, 2007; Salgado, 2002). Other factors include job experiences (e.g., Kulas, McInnerney, DeMuth, & Jadwinski, 2010), and work stressors, such as severe work conditions, harsh supervision, role ambiguity, or role and interpersonal conflicts (Bruk-Lee & Spector, 2006; Diefendorff & Mehta, 2007; Fox & Spector, 2005; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007). Besides, unclear job description, employment insecurity, lack of internal career opportunities and inappropriate appraisal system (Shamsudin, Subramaniam & Ibrahim, 2011), lack of motivation (Osezua, Abah, & Daniel, 2009) un-acceptance of the peer group (Fox & Freeman, 2013), job stress (Penney & Spector, 2005), leader mistreatment (Walter, Lam, Huang, & Miao, 2015), intent to quit (Lawal, Babalola, & Ordu, 2016), and injustice (Dajani & Saad, 2017) are some other stimulus of CWB.

Among all the organisational inducement factors, perception of organisational justice (OJ) has been found to be a consistent and most significant predictor of CWB (Carpenter & Berry, 2014; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, 2001). OJ refers to the overall perception of the employees whether or not the organisation is fair concerning the distribution of rewards, procedures adopted for that distribution, and the interpersonal treatment (Colquitt, 2001). Perception of justice is essential to maintain a stable and constructive employee-employer relation. CWB in response to organisational injustice is mainly explained with the broad lens of social exchange theory. Which suggests, an employee always seeks to balance the exchange relationship with employer. In doing so, employee reciprocates the perceived unfair treatment with the action or inactions preferably harmful to the organisation. This is prominently evident in police organisations where counterproductive acts mostly due to lack of OJ (Crawshaw, Cropanzano, Bell, & Nadisic, 2013; Jackson, Asif, Bradford, & Zakar, 2014; Van Craen & Skogan, 2016; Y. Wu, Sun, Chang, & Hsu, 2017). For example, research reveals that in police, it is the perception of internal injustice that converts into external injustice (Van Craen & Skogan, 2016). External injustice is when police treat public unfairly which ultimately leads to the community police trust deficit (Carr & Maxwell 2017). Current evidences also show that OJ is essential to manage uncertainty among law enforcement professional (Wolfe, Rojek, Manjarrez, & Rojek, 2018). Moreover, research reveals that OJ yields numerous beneficial work-related outcomes among police officers including greater job satisfaction, trust in their agency and less misconduct (Myhill &

Bradford, 2013; Tankebe, Hills, Cole, 2014; Wolfe & Nix, 2016; Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). As the interaction of OJ with different national culture can bring different behavioural outcomes (Shao, Rupp, Skarlicki, & Jones, 2011), this research is interested to investigate OJ as prime predictor of CWB in Pakistan police setting.

Research indicates that OJ is not always directly linked to CWB (Chernyak-Hai and Tziner 2014). Therefore, organisational researchers are now more interested in investigating the intervening mechanism that can explain this psychological pathway more comprehensively. For example, this relationship can be intervened by burnout (Shkoler & Tziner, 2017), psychological contract breach (Cohen, 2017), work alienation (Dajani, 2017), moral identity (Wu, Sun Zhang & Wang, 2016), leader-member exchange (Akremi, Vandenberghe, & Camerman, 2010), moral courage (Crawshaw et al., 2013), moral disengagement (Hystad, Mearns, & Eid, 2014) and feeling of identification (Martinson, Anderson, Crain, & De Vries, 2016). Alternatively, COR theory posits that organisational embeddedness (OE) may also mediate in this relationship (Kiazad, Holtom, Hom, & Newman, 2015). Overall embeddedness consists of two distinct parts: organisational (on-the-job) embeddedness and community (off the job) embeddedness (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski & Erez, 2001). OE refers to the accumulated affective and non-affective job-related constraints (links, fit, and sacrifice) which enmesh employees in a specific job within a specific organisation (Harris, Wheeler, & Kacmar, 2011).

Mediation of OE may exist between OJ and CWB on the basis of COR theory: COR theory argues that individuals are motivated to gain, accumulate and protect resources and those who lose resources at work, are more likely to experience strain in the form of burnout, depression (Chen, Powell & Cui, 2014), and other negative psychological outcomes (Hobfoll, Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003; Shin, Taylor, & Seo, 2012). Moreover, COR theory posits that deep embeddedness in organisation/job means the employee is in the state of resource abundance (Wheeler, Harris, & Sablinski, 2012); because embeddedness consists of diverse factors (fit, links, sacrifices) that may keep motivating a person to stay in a particular job or organisation. Embeddedness factors contribute to the staying intention of an employee more than job satisfaction and job commitment (Lee, Mitchell, Sablinski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004). Therefore, employees regard embeddedness factors as valuable resources. However, in situations of organisational injustice, individuals who experience reduced resources (manifested via higher strain) are more likely to engage in CWB. Whereas, deeply embedded employees are immune to resource depletion because they can gain extra resources by reinvesting abundant resources (Wheeler & Halbesleben, 2009). Therefore, such employees are likely to experience less stress or strain that lead to CWB. In other words, OJ provides employees favourable conditions for resource accumulation, making them deeply embedded and the threat of resource loss will bar them from CWB. CWB potentially put these resources at risk. For instance, interpersonal deviance in the form of abusive supervision or sexual harassment, resulting in bad fame may hinder in making links in an organisation and even outside of work. Similarly, production deviance in the form of absenteeism or procrastination resulting in low performance may hamper career growth.

Thus, conceptually OE provides a psychological pathway to explain the relationship between OJ and CWB. But, empirical evidence for this relationship is barely traceable in literature. Therefore, this study intends to unfold the role of OE as a mediator to explain the CWB in response to organisational injustice.

Research shows that the effects of OE on employee's deviance are inconsistent and equivocal: One stream of researcher argues on the basis of COR theory and held that OE provides rich resources which prevents employee from CWB (Avey, Wu, & Holley, 2015; Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007; Holtom, Burton, & Crossley, 2012; Kiazad et al., 2015). On the other hand, few studies posit that high embeddedness in an organisation is not always beneficial (see Appendix 1). They argue that OE may cause immovability whereby employee tend to show reactance in the form of CWB (Allen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2017; Marasi, Cox, & Bennett, 2016). Thus, inconsistent and immature and uneven relationship between OE and CWB arises the interest of current scholarships to discover the conditions under which OE can be productive (Darrat, Amyx, & Bennett, 2016).

Previous research has shown that OE represents the state of resource abundance (Sender, Rutishauser, & Staffelbach, 2018; Singh, Shaffer, & Selvarajan, 2018; Wheeler, Harris, & Sablynski, 2012). The perceived value of such resources is important and it should be sufficient to deter the employees engaging in CWB. This study takes stand on COR theory and argues that PO help to increase the value of resources. In other words, when highly embedded employees will own the organisation psychologically, they are less likely to engage in CWB. Therefore, this research takes PO as potential moderator for this relationship of OE and CWB. PO is a "state of mind" wherein an individual believes that he owns a tangible or intangible target of ownership, such as his job or the organisation, or its part even without any legal status of doing so (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001). Although PO is an emergent construct in management research, there is a surprising paucity of empirical research focusing specifically its effects on CWB (Dawkins, Tian, Newman, & Martin, 2017).

Based on COR parlance, employees value the tangible and intangible resources, which they possess. A sense of possession (feeling as though an object, entity, or idea is 'MINE' or 'OURS') is the core of PO (Furby, 1978). Psychology of possession is important because it reinforces the value of possessions in several ways. First, because it creates a positive attitude whereby employee evaluates the target of ownership favourably (Beggan, 1992). Second, people view tangible and intangible possessions as part of the extended self (Dittmar, 1992). Third, feelings of ownership trigger a sense of responsibility for the entity and causes individuals to protect and defend their ownership. Hence in the presence of PO embedded employee feels himself more resourceful. While in absence of PO, state of embeddedness (fit, links, sacrifice) may void psychological possession of the resources and are likely be devalued by the employees. Such employees may feel stuck in organisation and become reluctant stayer. They would have no concerns to protect the valueless resources, they possess. Consequently, behaving deviantly would have no stake for them.

To address the issue of CWB in Pakistan police context and to address the various literature gaps, this study presents a moderated mediation model. In this model, CWB will be examined in response of OJ whereas OE mediates this relationship. Moreover, PO moderates the relationship of OE and CWB.

1.5 Research Questions

The general research question is “What is the role of OE and PO in explaining the relationship of OJ and CWB among police officers in Pakistan?”

Following are the specific research questions:

1. Does OJ influence police officer’s OE?
2. Does OE influence police officer’s CWB in organisation?
3. Does OE mediate between the relationship of OJ and CWB?
4. Does police officer’s PO influences CWB?
5. Does PO moderate the relationship of OE and CWB?

1.6 Research Objectives

To explore how OE and PO influence OJ and CWB among police officers in Pakistan.

Specific objectives are:

1. To examine the influence of OJ on police officer’s OE.
2. To determine the influence of OE on police officer's CWB.
3. To investigate the mediating effect of OE between the relationship of OJ and CWB.
4. To investigate influence of PO on CWB.
5. To investigate the moderating effects of PO on relationship of OE and CWB.

1.7 Significance of the Study

1.7.1 Theoretical

Previously the relationship of OJ and CWB was based on social exchange theory. This study will provide a new way of looking this relationship with the lens of COR theory. This study is expected to contribute in body of literature in two ways. First, this study contributes in explaining the mechanism of how perception of OJ translates to CWB. This study will evaluate the role of OE in the light of COR theory to explain this

mechanism. This study expects that resources (in the form of OE) gained through OJ can play a central role in mitigating CWB: That is, OJ helps a person in accumulating resources, making him deeply embedded in organisation. Then, the fear of resource loss keeps that person away from CWB.

Second, this study is expected to explain the moderating role of PO in the relationship of OE and CWB. In this way, this study will explain under what condition more embeddedness in organisation is better. As COR theory posits that if resources are owned psychologically, they become more valuable and increased fear of their loss will keep a person from engaging in CWB. Conversely, if resources are not owned psychologically, becoming valueless those may lead to CWB; because losing those resources would have no stake for the owner.

This study is also expected to contribute empirically in the following ways. First, this study will investigate behavioural prediction of OE which is relatively less examined in literature (Lee, Hom, Eberly, & Li, 2017; Lee, Mitchell, Sablinski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004). Second, this study will contribute in less known antecedents of OE by investigating OJ thus address the call for future research (Ghosh, Sekiguchi, & Gurunathan, 2017). Third, in most of the research OE has been used a single reflective measure regardless of its dimensions. This study will examine OE as a formative construct at dimensions (fit, links, sacrifice) level (William, Burch, & Mitchell, 2014). Fourthly, this research will address the call for future research by exploring the relationship of PO on CWB (Dawkins et al, 2017).

1.7.2 Managerial

This study will give practitioners a new insight regarding how they can minimise occurrences of CWB in employees: Apart from providing a work environment based on fair procedure and policies, they should take care of employee's embeddedness in organisation; helping them making links, making them fit in organisation and increasing their perceived cost of leaving would minimise their chances of engaging in CWB.

Policy makers and business leaders usually concern with the employees who are enthusiastic stayers (who want to stay and can stay), and enthusiastic leavers (who want to leave and can leave). However, little is known of reluctant stayers (who want to leave but must stay) and reluctant leavers (who want to stay but must leave) (Lee et al., 2017). This research will give insight of reluctant stayers. Knowing about reluctant stayers is important because such employees may endanger the employer and organisation. Psychological withdraw state theory warns that over-embedding the misfit employees may result as reluctant stayers. These people prefer to leave but feel little control over leaving. Out of embeddedness dimensions (fit, link, sacrifice), they are weak in 'fit' however they have many 'sacrifices'. That is, they want to leave, but they feel "I have to stay." With COR perspective, they may regard 'fit' factors as valueless resources. Being dissatisfied with their job they stay because they don't have

better employment alternatives. Such employees are likely to incur costly sacrifices (to themselves or families) upon leaving (e.g., lose health care coverage). They might be motivated by end job benefits as in the case of public employees. They stay but don't perform. Reluctant stayers may find themselves stuck and thus disgruntled with their employment may engage in various types of counterproductive work behaviour.

1.8 Scope of the Study

Most studies on the issue of OJ, CWB (Cohen & Diamant, 2017) and OE (Ramesh & Gelfand, 2010) are based on western context, whereas eastern context remained largely unexplored. Pakistan can be a one example among eastern countries where issue of CWB is rampant especially in police which is considered as the most corrupt public sector organisation (Clark, 2017). What is unique characteristic of Pakistan regarding its cultural values is collectivism, high power distance (Hofstede, 2017).

In collectivist culture people are more prone to make formal and informal bonds. Collectivists perceive themselves as interdependent with their social groups and prioritize group interests over self-interests. Hence investigating the OE in collectivist context may reveal interesting results (Collins & Mossholder, 2014; Fiske, 2002; William Lee et al., 2014). Recently, there is call for future research to investigate the role of OE among different culture (Ghosh et al., 2017).

Research suggests that fairness when interact with different national culture produces different behavioural outcomes (Shao, Rupp, Skarlicki, & Jones, 2011). Therefore, it is important to examine the effects of OJ on CWB in Pakistani setting. Organizations such as Police where there is high power distance are characterized as submissive, tolerant and less sensitive to unfair treatment and direct questioning of authority is not a common and accepted practice (Shao et al., 2011).

1.9 Definitions of Terms

Counterproductive work behaviours

Counterproductive work behaviours (CWB) can be defined as any volitional acts by employees that potentially violate the legitimate interests of, or do harm to, an organisation or its stakeholders (e.g., Sackett & DeVore, 2001).

Organisational embeddedness

Organisational embeddedness (OE) refers to the accumulated affective and non-affective job-related constraints (links, fit, and sacrifice) which enmesh employees in a specific job within a specific organisation (Harris, Wheeler, & Kacmar, 2011).

In line with previous research (e.g., Allen, Peltokorpi, & Rubenstein, 2016; Ng & Feldman, 2010; Peltokorpi, Allen, & Froese, 2015), the terms *job embeddedness* and *organisational embeddedness* are conceptualised synonymously in this research, because most employees who are embedded in their jobs are also embedded in their organisations (Ng & Feldman, 2010).

Psychological ownership

Psychological ownership (PO) is defined as a state of mind in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership or a piece of that target is “theirs” (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001).

Organisational justice

Organisational justice (OJ) refers to an individual’s perceptions of overall fairness in an organisation in terms of the outcomes received (distributive justice), the decision-making processes followed to reach those outcomes (procedural justice), and the interpersonal treatment received and the explanations given (interpersonal and informational justice) (Colquitt, 2001).

1.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter begins with overview of the sections, followed by background of the problem. Then motivation of the study is discussed with respect to prevalence of CWB in police. After that problem statement, research questions and research objectives are discussed. This is followed by scope of the study. Last section defines important constructs used in this study.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, H. (2016). 5. Internal Security Issues in Pakistan Prospects of Police and Law Enforcement Reform. In C. Jaffrelot (Ed.), *Pakistan at the Crossroads*. New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press. <http://doi.org/10.7312/jaff17306-007>
- Adams, J. S. (1965). *Inequity In Social Exchange* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Elsevier.
- Afsar, B., & Badir, Y. F. (2016). Person–organisation fit, perceived organisational support, and organisational citizenship behaviour: The role of job embeddedness. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, *15*(3), 252–278. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1147936>
- Akremiti, El, A., Vandenberghe, C., & Camerman, J. (2010). The role of justice and social exchange relationships in workplace deviance: Test of a mediated model. *Human Relations*, *63*(11), 1687–1717. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726710364163>
- Allen, D. G., Peltokorpi, V., & Rubenstein, A. L. (2016). When “embedded” means ‘stuck’: Moderating effects of job embeddedness in adverse work environments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(12), 1670–1686. <http://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000134>
- Allen, J. A., Yoerger, M. A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Jones, J. (2015). Would you please stop that!?: The relationship between counterproductive meeting behaviours, employee voice, and trust. *Journal of Management Development*, *34*(10), 1272–1287. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0032>
- Ambrose, M. L., & Arnaud, A. (2005). Are Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice Conceptually Distinct? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 59-84). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organisational justice research: A test of mediation. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(2), 491–500. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0013203>
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organisational injustice. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(1), 947–965.
- Ampofo, E. T., Coetzer, A., & Poisat, P. (2017). Relationships between job embeddedness and employees’ life satisfaction. *Employee Relations*, *39*(7), 951–966. <http://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2016-0199>

- Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P., & Rolnicki, S. (2017). Leader-member exchange and organisational citizenship behaviours: Contextual effects of leader power distance and group task interdependence. *The Leadership Quarterly*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.11.002>
- Anderson, N., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Nijstad, B. A. (2004). The routinization of innovation research: a constructively critical review of the state-of-the-science. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25(2), 147–173. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.236>
- Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Discriminating among organisational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 22(4), 347–366. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.92>
- Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J., & Lay, M. (2013). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behaviour. *Corporate Governance: the International Journal of Business in Society*, 5(4), 43–55. <http://doi.org/10.1108/14720700510616587>
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3100347>
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2006). Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation, and avoidance in organisations. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 653–668. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.653>
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organisational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 23(3), 267–285. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.138>
- Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L.-Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 191–201. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191>
- Ashforth, B. E., Gioia, D. A., Robinson, S. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2008a). Re-Viewing Organisational Corruption. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(3), 670–684. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2008.32465714>
- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008b). Identification in Organisations: An Examination of Four Fundamental Questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325–374. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316059>
- Ata-Ullah, N.-U.-S., & Ijaz, S. (2016). “This Crooked System.” Human Rights Watch, 2016.

- Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Crossley, C. D., & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological ownership: theoretical extensions, measurement and relation to work outcomes. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 30(2), 173–191. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.583>
- Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Palanski, M. E. (2012). Exploring the Process of Ethical Leadership: The Mediating Role of Employee Voice and Psychological Ownership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(1), 21–34. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1298-2>
- Avey, J. B., Wu, K., & Holley, E. (2015). The Influence of Abusive Supervision and Job Embeddedness on Citizenship and Deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129(3), 721–731. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2192-x>
- Bagozzi, R. P. (2007). On the meaning of formative measurement and how it differs from reflective measurement: Comment on Howell, Breivik, and Wilcox (2007). *Psychological Methods*, 12(2), 229–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.229>
- Bal, P. M., de Lange, A. H., Zacher, H., & Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2013). A lifespan perspective on psychological contracts and their relations with organisational commitment. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 22(3), 279–292. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.741595>
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(3), 461–484. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.3.461>
- Bashir, S., Nasir, M., Qayyum, S., & Bashir, A. (2012). Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behaviours in Public Sector Organisations of Pakistan. *Public Organisation Review*, 12(4), 357–366. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-012-0177-8>
- Bauer, J. A., & Spector, P. E. (2015). Discrete Negative Emotions and Counterproductive Work Behaviour. *Human Performance*, 28(4), 307–331. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2015.1021040>
- Bauer, T. N., & Green, S. G. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of management journal*, 39(6), 1538–1567. <https://doi.org/10.5465/257068>
- Becker, J. M., Klein, K., & Wetzels, M. (2012). Hierarchical latent variable models in PLS-SEM: guidelines for using reflective-formative type models. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5-6), 359–394. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2012.10.001>
- Beggan, J. K. (1992). On the social nature of nonsocial perception: The mere ownership effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(2), 229–237. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.229>

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2003). The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 247-281). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bennett, R., & Marasi, S. (2015). Workplace Deviance. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioural Sciences* (Second Edition, pp. 722–726). Elsevier. <http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.22006-0>
- Bensimon, H. F. (1994). Violence in the workplace. *Training and Development*, 48(1), 26–32.
- Bernhard, F., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2011). Psychological ownership in small family-owned businesses: Leadership style and nonfamily-employees' work attitudes and behaviors. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(3), 345-384. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111402684>
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organisational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 410–424. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in Social Exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2), 193–206. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1964.tb00583.x>
- Bollen, K. A., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2017). In defense of causal-formative indicators: A minority report. *Psychological Methods*, 22(3), 581–596. <http://doi.org/10.1037/met0000056>
- Bollen, K. A., & Ting, K.-F. (1993). Confirmatory Tetrad Analysis. *Sociological Methodology*, 23, 147. <http://doi.org/10.2307/271009>
- Bollen, K. A., & Ting, K.-F. (2000). A tetrad test for causal indicators. *Psychological Methods*, 5(1), 3–22. <http://doi.org/10.1037//1082-989x.5.1.3>
- Bollen, K., & Lennox, R. (1991). Conventional wisdom on measurement: A structural equation perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(2), 305–314. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.110.2.305>
- Bolton, L. R., Becker, L. K., & Barber, L. K. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behaviour dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(5), 537–541. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.047>

- Bolton, L. R., Harvey, R. D., Grawitch, M. J., & Barber, L. K. (2012). Counterproductive work behaviours in response to emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediational approach. *Stress and Health, 28*(3), 222-233. <http://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1425>
- Bordia, P., Restubog, S. L. D., & Tang, R. L. (2008). When employees strike back: Investigating mediating mechanisms between psychological contract breach and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1104–1117. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1104>
- Bowling, N. A., Beehr, T. A., & Lepisto, L. R. (2006). Beyond job satisfaction: A five-year prospective analysis of the dispositional approach to work attitudes.
- Bradford, B., & Quinton, P. (2014). Self-legitimacy, Police Culture and Support for Democratic Policing in an English Constabulary. *British Journal of Criminology, 54*(6), 1023–1046. <http://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu053>
- Bradford, B., Huq, A., Jackson, J., & Roberts, B. (2013). What price fairness when security is at stake? Police legitimacy in South Africa. *Regulation & Governance, 8*(2), 246–268. <http://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12012>
- Brehm, J. W. (1966). A Theory of Psychological Reactance.
- Brislin, R. W. (2016). Back-translation for cross-cultural research: *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1*(3), 185–216. <http://doi.org/10.1177/135910457000100301>
- Brockner, J., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Diekmann, K. A. (2009). Towards a “fairer” conception of process fairness: why, when and how more may not always be better than less. *The Academy of Management Annals, 3*(1), 183–216. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19416520903047228>
- Brown, G., Pierce, J. L., & Crossley, C. (2014). Toward an understanding of the development of ownership feelings. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 35*(3), 318–338. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.1869>
- Bruk-Lee, V., & Spector, P. E. (2006). The social stressors-counterproductive work behaviours link: Are conflicts with supervisors and coworkers the same? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(2), 145–156. <http://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.2.145>
- Brunetto, Y., Xerri, M., Shriberg, A., Farr Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The impact of workplace relationships on engagement, well-being, commitment and turnover for nurses in Australia and the USA. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 69*(12), 2786–2799. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12165>
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017). National Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries in 2016, United States Department of Labour. Retrieved April 21, 2018, from <https://www.bls.gov>
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (2017). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. Routledge.
- Burton, J. P. (2014). The role of job embeddedness in the relationship between bullying and aggression. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 24*(4), 518–529. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.944169>
- Burton, J. P., Holtom, B. C., Sablinski, C. J., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2010). The buffering effects of job embeddedness on negative shocks, *76*(1), 42–51. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.006>
- Cain, M. K., Zhang, Z., & Yuan, K.-H. (2016). Univariate and multivariate skewness and kurtosis for measuring nonnormality: Prevalence, influence and estimation. *Behaviour Research Methods, 49*(5), 1716–1735. <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0814-1>
- Campbell, N. S., Perry, S. J., Maertz, C. P., Jr, Allen, D. G., & Griffeth, R. W. (2013). All you need is ... resources: The effects of justice and support on burnout and turnover. *Human Relations, 66*(6), 759–782. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712462614>
- Carpenter, N. C., & Berry, C. M. (2014). Are counterproductive work behaviour and withdrawal empirically distinct? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Management, 0149206314544743*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314544743>
- Carr, J. D., & Maxwell, S. R. (2017). Police officers' perceptions of organisational justice and their trust in the public. *Police Practice and Research, 1*, 1–15. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2017.1387784>
- Ceylan, A., & Sulu, S. (2010). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship of procedural injustice to job stress. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business, 5*(2), 43. <http://doi.org/10.2478/v10033-010-0016-1>
- Chao, J. M. C., Cheung, F. Y. L., & Wu, A. M. S. (2011). Psychological contract breach and counterproductive workplace behaviours: testing moderating effect of attribution style and power distance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(4), 763–777. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.555122>
- Chen, J.-Q., Hou, Z.-J., Li, X., Lovelace, K. J., Liu, Y.-L., & Wang, Z.-L. (2015). The role of career growth in Chinese new employee's turnover process. *Journal of Career Development, 43*(1), 11–25. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0894845315571412>

- Chen, S., Westman, M., & Eden, D. (2009). Impact of enhanced resources on anticipatory stress and adjustment to new information technology: A field-experimental test of conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(3), 219–230. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0015282>
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behaviour, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo Y De Las Organizaciones, 30*(1), 1–12. <http://doi.org/10.5093/tr2014a1>
- Chi, N.-W., & Han, T. S. (2008). Exploring the linkages between formal ownership and psychological ownership for the organisation: The mediating role of organisational justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 81*(4), 691–711. <http://doi.org/10.1348/096317907x262314>
- Chin, W. W., Thatcher, J. B., Wright, R. T., & Steel, D. (2013). Controlling for common method variance in pls analysis: the measured latent marker variable approach. In *New Perspectives in Partial Least Squares and Related Methods* (Vol. 56, pp. 231–239). New York, NY: Springer, New York, NY. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-8283-3_16
- Chiu, W. C. K., Hui, C. H., & Lai, G. W. F. (2007). Psychological ownership and organisational optimism amid China's corporate transformation: effects of an employee ownership scheme and a management-dominated board. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(2), 303–320. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585190601102539>
- Clark, A. K. (2017). Measuring Corruption: Transparency International's "Corruption Perceptions Index." In *Corruption, Accountability and Discretion* (Vol. 29, pp. 3–22). Emerald Publishing Limited. <http://doi.org/10.1108/S2053-769720170000029001>
- Cohen, A., & Diamant, A. (2017). The role of justice perceptions in determining counterproductive work behaviours. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 9*, 1–24. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1340321>
- Cohen, J., & Borenstein, M. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc Incorporated.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organisations: A Meta-Analysis. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 278–321. <http://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 599–609. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.599>

- Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Walter, F., & Holt, D. T. (2010). Organisational justice and individuals' withdrawal: unlocking the influence of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(3), 367–390. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00864.x>
- Collins, B. J., & Mossholder, K. W. (2014). Fairness means more to some than others: interactional fairness, job embeddedness, and discretionary work behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 40(2014), 1492–1503. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527132>
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organisational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: a meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 730–742.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199–236. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0031757>
- Conway, N., & Coyle Shapiro, J. A. M. (2012). The reciprocal relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and employee performance and the moderating role of perceived organisational support and tenure. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 85(2), 277–299. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02033.x>
- Crawshaw, J. R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C. M., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Organisational justice: New insights from behavioural ethics. *Human Relations*, 66(7), 885–904. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713485609>
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E., Daniels, S., & Hall, A. (2016). Social exchange theory: a critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 1–64. <http://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organisational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34–48. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895338>
- Cropanzano, R., Slaughter, J. E., & Bachiochi, P. D. (2005). Organisational justice and black applicants' reactions to affirmative action. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1168–1184. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1168>
- Cropanzano, R., Stein, J. H., & Nadisic, T. (2011). *Social Justice and the Experience of Emotion*. Routledge.

- Crossley, C. D., Bennett, R. J., Jex, S. M., & Burnfield, J. L. (2007). Development of a global measure of job embeddedness and integration into a traditional model of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 1031–1042. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1031>
- Dajani, M. A. Z., & Saad Mohamad, M. (2017). Perceived organisational injustice and counterproductive behaviour: the mediating role of work alienation evidence from the Egyptian public sector. *International Journal of Business and ...*, *12*(5), 192. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v12n5p192>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(6), 1241–1255. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Darrat, M. A., Amyx, D. A., & Bennett, R. J. (2016). Examining the impact of job embeddedness on salesperson deviance: The moderating role of job satisfaction. *Industrial Marketing Management*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2016.10.012>
- Davenport, E. C., Davison, M. L., Liou, P. Y., & Love, Q. U. (2015). Reliability, dimensionality, and internal consistency as defined by cronbach: distinct albeit related concepts. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *34*(4), 4–9. <http://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12095>
- Dawkins, S., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Martin, A. (2017). Psychological ownership: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, *38*(2), 163–183. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.2057>
- Delbridge, R. (2006). Extended Review: The Vitality of Labour Process Analysis. *Organisation Studies*, *27*(8), 1209–1219. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606069145>
- Delbridge, R., & Keenoy, T. (2010). Beyond managerialism? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *21*(6), 799–817. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003729309>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *20*(4), 457–469. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0039002>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Vol. 236). SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications.
- Diamantopoulos, A., Riefler, P., & Roth, K. P. (2008). Advancing formative measurement models. *Journal of Business Research*, *61*(12), 1203–1218. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.009>

- Diefendorff, J. M., & Mehta, K. (2007). The relations of motivational traits with workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 967–977. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.967>
- Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K.-H. (2012). Lagged mediator effects of self-control demands on psychological strain and absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 85(4), 556–578. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2012.02058.x>
- Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., Davis, R. D., & Rostow, C. D. (2007). Cognitive ability predicts objectively measured counterproductive work behaviours. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 616–627. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.616>
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Dittmar, H. (1992). *The social psychology of material possessions (illustrated)*. Wheatsheaf Books.
- Donner, C., Maskaly, J., Fridell, L., & Jennings, W. G. (2015). Policing and procedural justice: a state-of-the-art review. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38(1), 153–172. <http://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-12-2014-0129>
- Douglas, S. P., & Craig, C. S. (2013). Collaborative and Iterative Translation: An Alternative Approach to Back Translation. *Dx.Doi.org*, 15(1), 30–43. <http://doi.org/10.1509/jimk.15.1.030>
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331–351. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3069350>
- Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organisational citizenship behaviour, and business unit performance: the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25(1), 67–80. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.243>
- Filipeczak, B. (1993). Armed and dangerous at work. *Training*, 30(7), 39-43.
- Fiske, A. P. (2002). Using individualism and collectivism to compare cultures--A critique of the validity and measurement of the constructs: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 78-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.78>
- Flaherty, S., & Moss, S. A. (2007). The impact of personality and team context on the relationship between workplace injustice and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(11), 2549–2575. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00270.x>

- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115–130. <http://doi.org/10.2307/256422>
- Fox, S., & Freeman, A. (2013). Narcissism and the deviant citizen: A common thread in CWB and OCB. *The Role of Individual Differences in Occupational Stress and Well Being*, 9, 151–196. [http://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555\(2011\)0000009009](http://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555(2011)0000009009)
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (Eds.). (2005). Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10893-000>
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 59(3), 291-309.. <http://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803>
- Furby, L. (1978). Possession in humans: an exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behaviour and Personality: an International Journal*, 6(1), 49–65. <http://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1978.6.1.49>
- Furnham, A., & Siegel, E. M. (2011). Reactions to Organisational Injustice: Counter Work Behaviours and the Insider Threat. In *Justice and Conflicts* (pp. 199–217). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-19035-3_12
- Galperin, B. L., & Burke, R. J. (2007). Uncovering the relationship between workaholism and workplace destructive and constructive deviance: an exploratory study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(2), 331–347. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500404853>
- Ghosh, D., & Gurunathan, L. (2015). Job embeddedness: a ten-year literature review and proposed guidelines. *Global Business Review*, 16(5), 856–866. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0972150915591652>
- Ghosh, D., Sekiguchi, T., & Gurunathan, L. (2017). Organisational embeddedness as a mediator between justice and in-role performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 75, 130–137. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.02.013>
- Giosan, C., Holtom, B., & Watson, M. (2005). Antecedents to job embeddedness: The role of individual, organizational and market factors. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 5(1), 31-44.
- Green, T., & Gates, A. (2014). Understanding the process of professionalisation in the police organisation. *The Police Journal*, 87(2), 75–91. <http://doi.org/10.1350/pojo.2014.87.2.662>

- Greenberg, J. (1988). Cultivating an Image of Justice: Looking Fair on the Job. *Academy of Management Executive*, 2(2), 155–158. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AME.1988.4275532>
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2013). Handbook of Organisational Justice. Psychology Press. <http://doi.org/10.1089/env.2010.0017>
- Greenberg, J., & Giacalone, R. A. (1997). Antisocial Behaviour in Organisations. SAGE, 1997 - Business & Economics.
- Greene, J., Mero, N., & Werner, S. (2017). The negative effects of job embeddedness on performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 1(4), 71. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2017-0074>
- Griep, Y., Vantilborgh, T., & Jones, S. K. (2018). The relationship between psychological contract breach and counterproductive work behaviour in social enterprises: Do paid employees and volunteers differ? *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 12(1), 0143831X1774402. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X17744029>
- Grijalva, E., & Newman, D. A. (2014). Narcissism and Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB): Meta-Analysis and Consideration of Collectivist Culture, Big Five Personality, and Narcissism's Facet Structure. *Applied Psychology*, 64(1), 93–126. <http://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12025>
- Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(1), 30–42. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00224>
- Gudergan, S. P., Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Will, A. (2008). Confirmatory tetrad analysis in PLS path modeling. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12), 1238–1249. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.012>
- Guest, D. E. (2011). Human resource management and performance: still searching for some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(1), 3–13. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2010.00164.x>
- Haider, R. (2017, November 22). Rs 2 billion corruption unearthed in Punjab Police. *Pakistan Today*.
- Hair, Joe F, Jr, Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121. <http://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>
- Hair, Joe F, Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2018). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 42(3), 00–00. <http://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>

- Hair, Joe, Sarstedt, M., Gudergan, S. S. P., & Ringle, C. M. (2017a). *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*. Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Hair, Joseph F. (2013). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. SAGE.
- Hair, Joseph F, Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., & Thiele, K. O. (2017b). Mirror, mirror on the wall: a comparative evaluation of composite-based structural equation modeling methods. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(5), 616–632. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0517-x>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The construct validity of an alternative measure of burnout: Investigating the English translation of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 208–220. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500340728>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1452–1465. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0017595>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J.-P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the “COR.” *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1334–1364. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527130>
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Wheeler, A. R., & Rossi, A. M. (2012). The costs and benefits of working with one’s spouse: A two-sample examination of spousal support, work–family conflict, and emotional exhaustion in work-linked relationships. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 33(5), 597–615. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.771>
- Han, T. S., Chiang, H.-H., & Chang, A. (2010). Employee participation in decision making, psychological ownership and knowledge sharing: mediating role of organisational commitment in Taiwanese high-tech organisations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(12), 2218–2233. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2010.509625>
- Harris, K. J., Wheeler, A. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2011). The mediating role of organisational job embeddedness in the LMX–outcomes relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 271–281. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.003>
- Hassan Abbas. (2011). *Reforming Pakistan's Police and Law Enforcement Infrastructure*. United States Institute of Peace.
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis*, Second Edition. Guilford Publications.

- Henderson, D. J., Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2008). Leader--member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: A multilevel examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(6), 1208–1219. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0012678>
- Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organisational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 17*(4), 406–419. <http://doi.org/10.2307/40604498>
- Henle, C. A., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2005). The role of ethical ideology in workplace deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 56*(3), 219–230. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-2779-8>
- Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 116*(1), 2–20. <http://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382>
- Henssen, B., Voordeckers, W., Lambrechts, F., & Koiranen, M. (2014). The CEO autonomy–stewardship behaviour relationship in family firms: The mediating role of psychological ownership. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 5*(3), 312–322. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.01.012>
- Heo, M., Kim, N., & Faith, M. S. (2015). Statistical power as a function of Cronbach alpha of instrument questionnaire items. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 15*(1), 86. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-015-0070-6>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513–524. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organisational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behaviour, 5*(1), 103–128. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Johnson, R. J., Ennis, N., & Jackson, A. P. (2003). “Resource loss, resource gain, and emotional outcomes among inner city women”: Correction to Hobfoll et al. (2003). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(2), 248–248. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.248>
- Hollinger, R. C., & Moraca, B. (2017). National retail security survey. *National Retail Federation, University of Florida*. Retrieved from <https://nrf.com/system/tdf/Documents/NRSS-Industry-Research-Survey-2017.pdf?file=1&title=National%20Retail%20Security%20Survey%202017>
- Holtom, B. C., Burton, J. P., & Crossley, C. D. (2012). How negative affectivity moderates the relationship between shocks, embeddedness and worker behaviours, *80*(2), 434–443. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.12.006>

- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2006). Increasing human and social capital by applying job embeddedness theory. *Organisational Dynamics*, 35(4), 316–331. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2006.08.007>
- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Inderrieden, E. J. (2005). Shocks as causes of turnover: What they are and how organisations can manage them. *Human Resource Management*, 44(3), 337–352. <http://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20074>
- Hom, P. W., Tsui, A. S., Wu, J. B., Lee, T. W., Zhang, A. Y., Fu, P. P., & Li, L. (2009). Explaining employment relationships with social exchange and job embeddedness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 277–297. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0013453>
- Hopkins, T. (2007). Complaints against Police Behaviour in Flemington, Victoria, 2006. *Alternative Law Journal*, 32(1), 32–36. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X0703200110>
- Hou, S. T., Hsu, M. Y., & Wu, S. H. (2013). Psychological ownership and franchise growth. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 15(5), 415–435. <http://doi.org/10.1108/13552550910983004>
- Houser, D., Vetter, S., & Winter, J. (2012). Fairness and cheating. *European Economic Review*, 56(8), 1645–1655. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurocorev.2012.08.001>
- Huang, S.-C., & Zhang, Y. (2013). All roads lead to Rome: The impact of multiple attainment means on motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(2), 236–248. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0031039>
- Hulland, J., Baumgartner, H., & Smith, K. M. (2018). Marketing survey research best practices: evidence and recommendations from a review of JAMS articles. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46(1), 92–108. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0532-y>
- Hystad, S. W., Mearns, K. J., & Eid, J. (2014). Moral disengagement as a mechanism between perceptions of organisational injustice and deviant work behaviours. *Safety Science*, 68, 138–145. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.03.012>
- Ikävalko, M., Pihkala, T., & Kraus, S. (2012). The role of owner-managers' psychological ownership in sme strategic behaviour. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 23(3), 461–479. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2010.10593496>
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 269–277. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.269>
- Jackson, J., Asif, M., Bradford, B., & Zakar, M. Z. (2014a). Corruption and Police Legitimacy in Lahore, Pakistan. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2421036>

- Jackson, J., Asif, M., Bradford, B., & Zakria Zakar, M. (2014b). Corruption and Police Legitimacy in Lahore, Pakistan. *British Journal of Criminology*, 54(6), 1067–1088. <http://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu069>
- Jans, N. A. (1989). Organisational commitment, career factors and career/life stage. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 10(3), 247–266. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030100305>
- Jarvis, C. B., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2003). A critical review of construct indicators and measurement model misspecification in marketing and consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2), 199–218. <http://doi.org/10.1086/376806>
- Jensen, J. M., & Patel, P. C. (2011). Predicting counterproductive work behaviour from the interaction of personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(4), 466–471. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.04.016>
- Jensen, J. M., Opland, R. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2010). Psychological contracts and counterproductive work behaviours: employee responses to transactional and relational breach. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(4), 555–568. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9148-7>
- Jiang, K., Liu, D., McKay, P. F., Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (2012). When and how is job embeddedness predictive of turnover? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(5), 1077–1096. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0028610>
- Jiang, K., Meijerink, J., Lepak, D. P., & Paauwe, J. (2013). “Explaining Employee Perceptions of HRM: Sensemaking, Framing and Co-Creation by Providers and Users.” *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2013(1), 15547–15547. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2013.15547symposium>
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one’s supervisor and one’s organisation: relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviours. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 30(4), 525–542. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.563>
- Joseph F Hair, J., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. SAGE Publications.
- Joseph F Hair, J., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Gudergan, S. P. (2017). *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*. SAGE Publications.
- Joseph F. Hair, Marko Sarstedt, Christian M. Ringle, (2019) "Rethinking some of the rethinking of partial least squares", *European Journal of Marketing*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2018-0665>

- Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 126–138. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.126>
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Simon, L. S., & Judge, T. A. (2013). A head start or a step behind? Understanding how dispositional and motivational resources influence emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Management, 42*(3), 561–581. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313484518>
- Kaur, D., Sambasivan, M., & Kumar, N. (2013). Effect of spiritual intelligence, emotional intelligence, psychological ownership and burnout on caring behaviour of nurses: a cross-sectional study. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 22*(21-22), 3192–3202. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.12386>
- Khosa, T. (2015, November 10). Police reforms agenda. *Dawn*. <http://doi.org/http://www.dawn.com/news/1218608>
- Kiazad, K., Holtom, B. C., Hom, P. W., & Newman, A. (2015). Job embeddedness: A multifoci theoretical extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 641–659. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0038919>
- Kim, K., del Carmen Triana, M., Chung, K., & Oh, N. (2016). When do employees cyberloaf? An interactionist perspective examining personality, justice, and empowerment. *Human Resource Management, 55*(6), 1041–1058. <http://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21699>
- Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A., & Treviño, L. K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(1), 1–31. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0017103>
- Klockars, C. B., Kutnjak Ivković, S., & Haberfeld, M. R. (2004). Police integrity in the United States of America. *The contours of police integrity, 265-282*.
- Knapp, J. R., Smith, B. R., & Sprinkle, T. A. (2014). Clarifying the relational ties of organisational belonging. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies, 21*(3), 273–285. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1548051814529826>
- Korsgaard, M. A., Schweiger, D. M., & Sapienza, H. J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment, and trust in strategic decision-making teams: the role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(1), 60–84. <http://doi.org/10.2307/256728>
- Krishnaveni, R., & Deepa, R. (2013). Controlling common method variance while measuring the impact of emotional intelligence on well-being. *Vikalpa, 38*(1), 41-48.

- Kroll. (2017). *Businesses See a Significant Rise in Fraud and Risk Incidents During 2016. Global Fraud and Risk Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.kroll.com/en-us/intelligence-centre/press-releases/building-resilience-in-a-volatile-world>
- Krosnick, J. A. (2018). Questionnaire Design. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Survey Research* (pp. 439–455). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54395-6_53
- Kulas, J. T., McInnerney, J. E., DeMuth, R. F., & Jadwinski, V. (2010). Employee Satisfaction and Theft: Testing Climate Perceptions as a Mediator. *The Journal of Psychology, 141*(4), 389–402. <http://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.141.4.389-402>
- Kulik, C. T., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Justice in the Workplace: From Theory to Practice, Vol. 2. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(4), 785. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3094836>
- Lam, C. K., Walter, F., & Huang, X. (2017). Supervisors' emotional exhaustion and abusive supervision: The moderating roles of perceived subordinate performance and supervisor self-monitoring. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 38*(8), 1151–1166. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.2193>
- Lancaster, G. (2007). *Research Methods in Management*. Routledge.
- Lawal, A. M., Babalola, S. S., & Ordu, U. F. (2016). The Roles of Pay Satisfaction and Intent to Leave on Counterproductive Work Behaviour among Non-Academic University Employees. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Journal of Psychological and Behavioural Sciences, 3*(10).
- Lee, T. W., Hom, P., Eberly, M., & Li, J. J. (2017). Managing employee retention and turnover with 21st century ideas. *Organisational Dynamics*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.08.004>
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Sablinski, C. J., Burton, J. P., & Holtom, B. C. (2004). The Effects of Job Embeddedness on Organisational Citizenship, Job Performance, Volitional Absences, and Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*(5), 711–722. <http://doi.org/10.2307/20159613>
- Lev, S., & Koslowsky, M. (2012). Teacher Gender as a Moderator of the On-the-Job Embeddedness-OCB Relationship¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(1), 81–99. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00868.x>
- Li, H., Wang, Q., & Ma, Y. (2014). Research on the relationship between organisational justice and emotional exhaustion: the moderating effect of CWB (Vol. 1, pp. 1081–1090). Presented at the International conference on Management Innovation and Information Technology, Southampton, UK: WIT Press. <http://doi.org/10.2495/MIIT131362>

- Lim, V. K. G. (2002). The IT way of loafing on the job: cyberloafing, neutralizing and organisational justice. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 23(5), 675–694. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.161>
- Lin, C.-P., Hung, W.-T., & Chiu, C.-K. (2007). Being Good Citizens: Understanding a Mediating Mechanism of Organisational Commitment and Social Network Ties in OCBs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(3), 561–578. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9528-8>
- Lind, E. A., & Van den Bos, K. (2002). When fairness works: Toward a general theory of uncertainty management. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 24, 181–223.
- Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114–121. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.114>
- Liu, J., & Liu, Y. H. (2016). Perceived organisational support and intention to remain: The mediating roles of career success and self-esteem. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 22(2), 205–214. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ijn.12416>
- Liu, J., Wang, H., Hui, C., & Lee, C. (2012). Psychological ownership: how having control matters. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(5), 869–895. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01028.x>
- Liu, Y., Bratton, V., Brymer, R., Kelly L Zellars, Y. L. V. B. R. B., & Perrewé, P. L. (2004). An examination of the dysfunctional consequences of organisational injustice and escapist coping. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(4). <http://doi.org/10.2307/40604467>
- MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2012). Common Method Bias in Marketing: Causes, Mechanisms, and Procedural Remedies. *Journal of Retailing*, 88(4), 542–555. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2012.08.001>
- MacVean, A., & Neyroud, P. (2012). *Police ethics and values*. Learning Matters.
- Maertz, C. P., & Campion, M. A. (2004). PROFILES IN QUITTING: INTEGRATING PROCESS AND CONTENT TURNOVER THEORY. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 566–582. <http://doi.org/10.2307/20159602>
- Mallol, C. M., Holtom, B. C., & Lee, T. W. (2007). Job embeddedness in a culturally diverse environment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(1), 35–44. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-007-9045-x>
- Mangione, T. W., & Quinn, R. P. (1975). Job satisfaction, counterproductive behaviour, and drug use at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(1), 114–116. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0076355>

- Marasi, S., Cox, S. S., & Bennett, R. J. (2016a). Job embeddedness: is it always a good thing? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(1), 141–153. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2013-0150>
- Marasi, S., Cox, S. S., & Bennett, R. J. (2016b). Job embeddedness: is it always a good thing? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(1), 141–153. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2013-0150>
- Marchand, C., & Vandenberghe, C. (2016). Perceived organisational support, emotional exhaustion, and turnover: The moderating role of negative affectivity. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 23(4), 350–375. <http://doi.org/10.1037/str0000020>
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of Counterproductive Behaviour at Work: A General Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647–660. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.647>
- Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward an Integrative Theory of Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour: A Causal Reasoning Perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1&2), 36–50. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00192>
- Martinson, B. C., Anderson, M. S., Crain, A. L., & De Vries, R. (2006). Scientists' Perceptions of Organisational Justice and Self-Reported Misbehaviours. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 1(1), 51–66. <http://doi.org/10.1525/jer.2006.1.1.51>
- Mayhew, M. G., Ashkanasy, N. M., Bramble, T., & Gardner, J. (2007). A study of the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in organisational settings. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(5), 477–500. <http://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.5.477-500>
- Mazzola, J. J., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). Counterproductive work behaviors and their ethical dilemmas: Creating just, respectful, and productive organizations. In *Work and Quality of Life* (pp. 157-179). Springer, Dordrecht. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4_9
- McCullough, M. E., Kilpatrick, S. D., Emmons, R. A., & Larson, D. B. (2001). Is gratitude a moral affect? *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2), 249–266. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.127.2.249>
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Research notes. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organisational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626–637. <http://doi.org/10.2307/256489>
- McIntyre, N., Srivastava, A., Fuller, J. F., Phillip Atiba. (2009). The relationship of locus of control and motives with psychological ownership in organisations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 21(3), 883–401. <http://doi.org/10.2307/40604656>

- McNeish, D. (2018). Thanks coefficient alpha, we'll take it from here. *Psychological Methods*, 23(3), 412–433. <http://doi.org/10.1037/met0000144>
- Md-Sidin, S., Sambasivan, M., & Muniandy, N. (2010). Impact of psychological ownership on the performance of business school lecturers. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(1), 50–56. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08832320903217903>
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159–1168. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159>
- Mitchell, M. S., & Cropanzano, R. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*.
- Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2001). 5. The unfolding model of voluntary turnover and job embeddedness: Foundations for a comprehensive theory of attachment. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 23, 189–246. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(01\)23006-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(01)23006-8)
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6). <http://doi.org/10.5465/3069391>
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845–855. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845>
- Myhill, A., & Bradford, B. (2013). Overcoming cop culture? Organisational justice and police officers' attitudes toward the public. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 36(2), 338–356. <http://doi.org/10.1108/13639511311329732>
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 391–419. <http://doi.org/10.1177/014920639802400305>
- Ng, T. W. H. (2015). Embedding employees early on: the importance of workplace respect. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(3), 599–633. <http://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12117>
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The impact of job embeddedness on innovation-related behaviours. *Human Resource Management*, 49(6), 1067–1087. <http://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20390>

- Ng, T. W. H., Lam, S. S. K., & Feldman, D. C. (2016). Organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour: Do males and females differ?, *93*, 11–32. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.005>
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2014). Community embeddedness and work outcomes: The mediating role of organisational embeddedness. *Human Relations*, *67*(1), 71–103. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713486946>
- Nguyen, V. Q., Taylor, G. S., & Bergiel, E. (2017). Organisational antecedents of job embeddedness. *Management Research Review*, *40*(11), 1216–1235. <http://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-11-2016-0255>
- O'Driscoll, M. P., (null), J. L., Pierce, & Coghlan, A.-M. (2006). The psychology of ownership: Work environment structure, organisational commitment, and citizenship behaviours. *Group & Organisation Management*, *31*(3), 388–416. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104273066>
- Osezua, M. E., Abah, E., & Daniel, E. G. (2009). Staff Indiscipline and Productivity in the Public Sector in Nigeria. *African Research Review*, *3*(4). <http://doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v3i4.47580>
- Owolabi, A. B. (2012). Effect of organisational justice and organisational environment on turn-over intention of health workers in Ekiti state, Nigeria. *Research in World Economy*.
- Park, C. H., Song, J. H., Yoon, S. W., & Kim, J. (2013). A missing link: psychological ownership as a mediator between transformational leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Human Resource Development International*, *16*(5), 558–574. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2013.839510>
- Payne, S. C., Cook, A. L., & Diaz, I. (2012). Understanding childcare satisfaction and its effect on workplace outcomes: The convenience factor and the mediating role of work- family conflict. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, *85*(2), 225–244. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02026.x>
- Pearson, C. (2010). The Cost of Bad Behavior: How Incivility Is Damaging Your Business and What to Do about It. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, *18*(6).
- Pearson, C., & Porath, C. (2009). *The cost of bad behavior: How incivility is damaging your business and what to do about it*. Penguin.
- Peltokorpi, V. (2013). Job embeddedness in Japanese organisations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *24*(8), 1551–1569. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.723636>
- Peltokorpi, V., Allen, D. G., & Froese, F. (2015). Organisational embeddedness, turnover intentions, and voluntary turnover: The moderating effects of employee demographic characteristics and value orientations. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, *36*(2), 292–312. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.1981>

- Peng, H., & Pierce, J. (2015). Job- and organisation-based psychological ownership: relationship and outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(2), 151–168. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-07-2012-0201>
- Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): the moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 26(7), 777–796. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.336>
- Penney, L. M., Hunter, E. M., & Perry, S. J. (2011). Personality and counterproductive work behaviour: Using conservation of resources theory to narrow the profile of deviant employees. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 84(1), 58–77. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02007.x>
- Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001a). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organisations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 298. <http://doi.org/10.2307/259124>
- Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001b). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 298–310. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2001.4378028>
- Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(1), 84–107. <http://doi.org/10.1037//1089-2680.7.1.84>
- Pierce, J. L., O’Driscoll, M. P., & Coghlan, A.-M. (2004). Work environment structure and psychological ownership: the mediating effects of control. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(5), 507–534. <http://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.5.507-534>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Preacher, K. J. (2015). Advances in mediation analysis: A survey and synthesis of new developments. *Annual review of psychology*, 66, 825-852.
- Punjab Police. (2018). Annual Policing Plans Capital City District Lahore. Retrieved April 21, 2018, from <https://punjabpolice.gov.pk/annualpolicingplans>
- Raman, P., Sambasivan, M., & Kumar, N. (2016). Counterproductive work behaviour among frontline government employees: Role of personality, emotional intelligence, affectivity, emotional labor, and emotional exhaustion. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo Y De Las Organizaciones*, 32(1), 25–37. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2015.11.002>
- Ramesh, A., & Gelfand, M. J. (2010). Will they stay or will they go? The role of job embeddedness in predicting turnover in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 807.

- Ramos, H. M., Man, T. W. Y., Mustafa, M., & Ng, Z. Z. (2014). Psychological ownership in small family firms: Family and non-family employees' work attitudes and behaviours. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(3), 300–311. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.04.001>
- Reina, C. S., Rogers, K. M., Peterson, S. J., Byron, K., & Hom, P. W. (2017). Quitting the boss? The role of manager influence tactics and employee emotional engagement in voluntary turnover. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 25(1), 5–18. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817709007>
- Reio, T. G. (2010). The threat of common method variance bias to theory building. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(4), 405–411. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1534484310380331>
- Reynolds, P. D., Fitzgerald, B. A., & Hicks, J. (2017). The Expendables: A Qualitative Study of Police Officers' Responses to Organisational Injustice. *Police Quarterly*, 21(1), 3–29. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1098611117731558>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organisational support: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Rigdon, E. E. (2012). Rethinking partial least squares path modeling: in praise of simple methods. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5-6), 341–358. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2012.09.010>
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Mitchell, R., & Gudergan, S. P. (2018). Partial least squares structural equation modeling in HRM research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(1), 1–27. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1416655>
- Robbins, J. M., Ford, M. T., & Tetrick, L. E. (2012). Perceived unfairness and employee health: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 235–272. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0025408>
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572. <http://doi.org/10.2307/256693>
- Rosenbaum, D. P., & McCarty, W. P. (2017). Organisational justice and officer “buy in” in American policing. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 40(1), 71–85. <http://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-07-2016-0114>
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66–80. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.66>
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organisations*. SAGE.

- Rönkkö, M., & Ylitalo, J. (2011). PLS marker variable approach to diagnosing and controlling for method variance (Vol. 3, pp. 2054–2069). Presented at the International Conference on Information Systems 2011, ICIS 2011.
- Rucker, D. D., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation Analysis in Social Psychology: Current Practices and New Recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(6), 359–371. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00355.x>
- Russell, E., Woods, S. A., & Banks, A. P. (2017). Examining conscientiousness as a key resource in resisting email interruptions: Implications for volatile resources and goal achievement. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 90(3), 407–435. <http://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12177>
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviours at work. *Handbook of industrial*.
- Salami, S. O. (2010). Job stress and counterproductive work behaviour: negative affectivity as a moderator. *The Social Sciences*, 5(6), 486–492. <http://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2010.486.492>
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Counterproductive Behaviours. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1- 2), 117–125. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00198>
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2014). PLS-SEM: Looking Back and Moving Forward. *Long Range Planning*, 47(3), 132–137. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2014.02.008>
- Scherer, K. T., Baysinger, M., Zolynsky, D., & LeBreton, J. M. (2013). Predicting counterproductive work behaviours with sub-clinical psychopathy: Beyond the Five Factor Model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(3), 300–305. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.03.007>
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. (2004). Core concepts of organisational behaviour.
- Sekiguchi, T., Burton, J. P., & Sablynski, C. J. (2008). The role of job embeddedness on employee performance: the interactive effects with leader–member exchange and organisation- based self- esteem. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(4), 761–792. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00130.x>
- Selenko, E., Mäkikangas, A., Mauno, S., & Kinnunen, U. (2013). How does job insecurity relate to self- reported job performance? Analysing curvilinear associations in a longitudinal sample. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 86(4), 522–542. <http://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12020>

- Sender, A., Rutishauser, L., & Staffebach, B. (2018). Embeddedness across contexts: A two- country study on the additive and buffering effects of job embeddedness on employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 32(2), 237. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12183>
- Shaheen, S., Bashir, S., & Khan, A. K. (2017). Examining organisational cronyism as an antecedent of workplace deviance in public sector organisations. *Public Personnel Management*, 15, 009102601771665. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017716655>
- Shamsudin, F. M., Subramaniam, C., & Ibrahim, H. (2011). Wrongful behaviours among manufacturing employees in malaysia: an exploratory study. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1876434>
- Shao, R., Rupp, D. E., Skarlicki, D. P., & Jones, K. S. (2011). Employee Justice Across Cultures. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 263–301. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311422447>
- Shin, J., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M.-G. (2012). Resources for change: the relationships of organisational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviours toward organisational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 727–748. <http://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0325>
- Shkoler, O., & Tziner, A. (2017). The mediating and moderating role of burnout and emotional intelligence in the relationship between organisational justice and work misbehaviour. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo Y De Las Organizaciones*, 33(2), 157–164. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2017.05.002>
- Sieger, P., Bernhard, F., & Frey, U. (2011). Affective commitment and job satisfaction among non-family employees: Investigating the roles of justice perceptions and psychological ownership. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 2(2), 78–89. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2011.03.003>
- Siehl, C., Davis, J., & Dyer, W. G., Jr. (1987). Cultural change in family firms: anticipating and managing business and family transitions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(4), 635. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2392903>
- Simmering, M. J., Fuller, C. M., Richardson, H. A., Ocal, Y., & Atinc, G. M. (2014). Marker variable choice, reporting, and interpretation in the detection of common method variance: a review and demonstration. *Organisational Research Methods*, 18(3), 473–511. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114560023>
- Sims, R. R. (2002). *Organisational Success Through Effective Human Resources Management*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Singh, B., Shaffer, M. A., & Selvarajan, T. T. (2018). Antecedents of organisational and community embeddedness: The roles of support, psychological safety, and need to belong. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 39(3), 339–354. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.2223>

- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 434–443. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.434>
- Spagnoli, P. (2017). Organisational socialization learning, organisational career growth, and work outcomes. *Journal of Career Development*, 6, 089484531770072. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0894845317700728>
- Spector, P. E. (2010). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behaviour (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.002>
- Spector, P. E., & Brannick, M. T. (2010). Common method issues: an introduction to the feature topic in organisational research methods. *Organisational Research Methods*, 13(3), 403–406. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110366303>
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151-174). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10893-007>
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviours created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68(3), 446–460. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005>
- Suddle, M. S. (2015). Reforming Pakistan Police: An Overview. *United Nations Asia and*
- Sun, T., Zhao, X. W., Yang, L. B., & Fan, L. H. (2012). The impact of psychological capital on job embeddedness and job performance among nurses: a structural equation approach. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 68(1), 69–79. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05715.x>
- Swider, B. W., Boswell, W. R., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2011). Examining the job search-turnover relationship: the role of embeddedness, job satisfaction, and available alternatives. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2), 432–441. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0021676>
- Tankebe, J., Hills, A., & Cole, B. (2014). Emerging issues of crime and criminal justice in sub-Saharan Africa. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14(1), 3–7. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1748895813510009>
- Tanova, C., & Holtom, B. C. (2008a). Using job embeddedness factors to explain voluntary turnover in four European countries. *The International Journal of Human ...*

- Tanova, C., & Holtom, B. C. (2008b). Using job embeddedness factors to explain voluntary turnover in four European countries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(9), 1553–1568. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802294820>
- Tenenhaus, M., Vinzi, V. E., Chatelin, Y.-M., & Lauro, C. (2005). PLS path modeling. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 48(1), 159–205. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2004.03.005>
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(1), 101-123. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00725.x>
- Tepper, b. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 789–796. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.4.789>
- Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 279-294. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2011.60263085>
- Thau, S., Crossley, C., Bennett, R. J., & Sczesny, S. (2007). The relationship between trust, attachment, and antisocial work behaviours. *Human Relations*, 60(8), 1155–1179. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707081658>
- The Express. (2018, January 21). Lahore police force man to remove clothes for “checking” - The Express Tribune. *The Express Tribune*. <http://doi.org/https://tribune.com.pk/story/1613868/1-lahore-police-force-man-remove-clothes-checking/>
- Tian, A. W., Cordery, J., & Gamble, J. (2016). Staying and performing: How human resource management practices increase job embeddedness and performance. *Personnel Review*, 45(5), 947–968. <http://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2014-0194>
- Transparency International. (2017). Anti-Corruption Day 2017: Empowering citizens’ fight against corruption.
- Trinkner, R., Tyler, T. R., & Goff, P. A. (2016). Justice from within: The relations between a procedurally just organisational climate and police organisational efficiency, endorsement of democratic policing, and officer well-being. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 22(2), 158–172. <http://doi.org/10.1037/law0000085>
- Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2657–2669. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.798921>

- Ugelvik, T. (2016). Low-Trust Policing in a High-Trust Society - The Norwegian Police Immigration Detention Centre and the Search for Public Sphere Legitimacy. *Nordisk Politiforskning*, 3(02), 181–198. <http://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1894-8693-2016-02-08>
- Van Craen, M., & Skogan, W. G. (2016). Achieving fairness in policing. *Police Quarterly*, 20(1), 3–23. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1098611116657818>
- Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25(4), 439–459. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.249>
- Vandewalle, D., Van Dyne, L., & Kostova, T. (1995). Psychological Ownership: An Empirical Examination of its Consequences. *Group & Organisation Management*, 20(2), 210–226. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1059601195202008>
- Vinod Kumar, T. K., & Verma, A. (2008). Hegemony, Discipline and Control in the Administration of Police in Colonial India. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 4(1), 61–78. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-008-9057-0>
- Wagner, S. H., Parker, C. P., & Christiansen, N. D. (2003). Employees that think and act like owners: effects of ownership beliefs and behaviours on organisational effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(4), 847–871. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00242.x>
- Walker, S. (1993). Police Discretion. In *Taming the System* (pp. 21–53). Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195078206.003.0002>
- Walter, F., Lam, C. K., van der Vegt, G. S., Huang, X., & Miao, Q. (2015). Abusive supervision and subordinate performance: Instrumentality considerations in the emergence and consequences of abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1056–1072. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0038513>
- Weng, Q., & McElroy, J. C. (2012). Organisational career growth, affective occupational commitment and turnover intentions, 80(2), 256–265. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.014>
- Werbel, J., & Balkin, D. B. (2010). Are human resource practices linked to employee misconduct? *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(4), 317–326.
- Wheeler, A. R., & Halbesleben, J. B. (2009). Conservation of resources and job embeddedness: An empirical test with social support antecedents. Paper accepted for presentation at the 2009 Academy
- Wheeler, A. R., Harris, K. J., & Sablinski, C. J. (2010). Investing abundant resources through work effort in the job embeddedness - performance relationship. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2010(1), 1–6. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2010.54492321>

- Wheeler, A. R., Harris, K. J., & Sablinski, C. J. (2012). How do employees invest abundant resources? The mediating role of work effort in the job-embeddedness/job-performance relationship. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(S1), E244–E266. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.01023.x>
- Whelpley, C. E., & McDaniel, M. A. (2016). Self-esteem and counterproductive work behaviours: a systematic review. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(4), 850–863. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-01-2014-0008>
- William Lee, T., Burch, T. C., & Mitchell, T. R. (2014). The story of why we stay: a review of job embeddedness. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behaviour, 1*(1), 199–216. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091244>
- Williams, L. J., Hartman, N., & Cavazotte, F. (2010). Method variance and marker variables: a review and comprehensive cfa marker technique. *Organisational Research Methods, 13*(3), 477–514. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110366036>
- Winkel, D. E., Wyland, R. L., Shaffer, M. A., & Clason, P. (2011). A new perspective on psychological resources: Unanticipated consequences of impulsivity and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 84*(1), 78–94. <http://doi.org/10.1348/2044-8325.002001>
- Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2016). Police officers' trust in their agency: does self-legitimacy protect against supervisor procedural injustice? *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 44*(5), 717–732. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816671753>
- Wolfe, S. E., & Piquero, A. R. (2011). Organisational justice and police misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 38*(4), 332–353. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810397739>
- Wolfe, S. E., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). Organisational justice and police misconduct. *Policing: an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 35*(4), pijpsm.2012.18135daa.004. <http://doi.org/10.1108/pijpsm.2012.18135daa.004>
- Wolfe, S. E., Rojek, J., Manjarrez, V. M., Jr., & Rojek, A. (2018). Why does organisational justice matter? Uncertainty management among law enforcement officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 54*, 20–29. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.11.003>
- Wu, M., Sun, X., Zhang, D., & Wang, C. (2016). Moderated mediation model of relationship between perceived organisational justice and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Chinese Human Resources Management, 7*(2), 64–81. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JCHRM-07-2016-0016>
- Wu, P.-C., & Chaturvedi, S. (2009). The Role of Procedural Justice and Power Distance in the Relationship Between High-Performance Work Systems and Employee Attitudes: A Multilevel Perspective. *Journal of Management, 35*(5), 1228–1247. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308331097>

- Wu, Y., Sun, I. Y., Chang, C. K.-M., & Hsu, K. K.-L. (2017). Procedural justice received and given: supervisory treatment, emotional states, and behavioural compliance among taiwanese police officers. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 44(7), 963–982. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0093854817702407>
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009a). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74(3), 235–244. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003>
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009b). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 82(1), 183–200. <http://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X285633>
- Xerri, M. (2013). Workplace relationships and the innovative behaviour of nursing employees: a social exchange perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 51(1), 103–123. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7941.2012.00031.x>
- Yu, Z., Hao, J., & Shi, B. (2018). Dispositional envy inhibits prosocial behaviour in adolescents with high self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 122, 127–133. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.10.022>
- Zhang, H., & Agarwal, N. C. (2009). The mediating roles of organisational justice on the relationships between HR practices and workplace outcomes: an investigation in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(3), 676–693. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802707482>
- Zhang, M., Fried, D. D., & Griffeth, R. W. (2012). A review of job embeddedness: Conceptual, measurement issues, and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(3), 220–231. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2012.02.004>
- Zhu, H., Chen, C. C., Li, X., & Zhou, Y. (2013). From personal relationship to psychological ownership: the importance of manager–owner relationship closeness in family businesses. *Management and Organisation Review*, 9(2), 295–318. <http://doi.org/10.1111/more.12001>

BIODATA OF STUDENT

Sultan Adal Mehmood completed his sixteen years of education with degrees in Criminology & Security Studies as well as in Political Science from University of the Punjab, Lahore. After that in 2015 he was selected in scholarship for Masters leading to PhD program by the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan. He did his MBA in general management from Putra Business School, UPM. Subsequently, he embarked on his PhD studies in management sciences focusing on behavior of the employees in public sector organizations. He achieved GOT award from UPM for completing PhD in less than three years.





UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

STATUS CONFIRMATION FOR THESIS / PROJECT REPORT AND COPYRIGHT

ACADEMIC SESSION : _____

TITLE OF THESIS / PROJECT REPORT :

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR, ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE,
ORGANISATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP AMONG POLICE
FORCE IN PAKISTAN

NAME OF STUDENT: SULTAN ADAL MEHMOOD

I acknowledge that the copyright and other intellectual property in the thesis/project report belonged to Universiti Putra Malaysia and I agree to allow this thesis/project report to be placed at the library under the following terms:

1. This thesis/project report is the property of Universiti Putra Malaysia.
2. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia has the right to make copies for educational purposes only.
3. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia is allowed to make copies of this thesis for academic exchange.

I declare that this thesis is classified as :

*Please tick (v)

CONFIDENTIAL

(Contain confidential information under Official Secret Act 1972).

RESTRICTED

(Contains restricted information as specified by the organization/institution where research was done).

OPEN ACCESS

I agree that my thesis/project report to be published as hard copy or online open access.

This thesis is submitted for :

PATENT

Embargo from _____ until _____
(date) (date)

Approved by:

(Signature of Student)
New IC No/ Passport No.:

Date :

(Signature of Chairman of Supervisory Committee)
Name:

Date :

[Note : If the thesis is CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED, please attach with the letter from the organization/institution with period and reasons for confidentially or restricted.]