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Abstract

REACTIONS TO THE EXTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL DEVIANCE OF COWORKERS:
IMPLICATIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN THE WORKPLACE

Doctor of Philosophy, 2009

Katharine (Kate) Rowbotham

Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

University of Toronto

Drawing on the labelling process in reactions to deviance, a model of the interplay of a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and an individual’s reactions to that coworker has been developed. Three studies were conducted to further explore the model in order to more fully understand the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance. The first study (n=12) was exploratory in nature. It established the relevance of extra-organizational deviance in individuals’ work lives and highlighted the detrimental effect that behaviours outside of work could have at work. It also highlighted the potential for beneficial outcomes in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance. The second study (n=120) was a vignette study that demonstrated significant differences when looking at positive and negative extra-organizational deviance for both attitudinal and behavioural reactions. In this study, when individuals learned of their coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance, perceptions of trust, trustworthiness, and liking all decreased, as did helping. There were no corresponding significant results when individuals learned of their coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance. The second study
also demonstrated the moderating effects of high initial levels of liking and competence under different circumstances. The third study (n=21) provided a more detailed look at the variables in the second study by concentrating on actual situations of extra-organizational deviance that participants had experienced. This study highlighted the complexities in reactions to extra-organizational deviance, particularly as it relates to competence and liking.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

The division between one’s private and public lives has been a popular topic and focus of research in many different areas, including political studies, sociology, psychology and management. The separation between an individual’s personal and professional lives is generally considered a blurry one. Indeed, much work-life research focuses on the crossover between the domains as well as the challenges related to that crossover (see, for example, Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Guest, 2002; Parkes & Langford, 2008; Westman, 2006). Without making normative statements about whether or not private lives should factor into professional lives, I suggest that the overlap between the two spheres is inevitable. What is necessary, then, is a better understanding of the interplay between the personal and professional spheres of one’s life and the individuals who play a role in each of them. The purpose of this research is to examine how behaviours in someone’s personal life affect the reactions to that individual in his or her professional life.

This research examines coworkers’ reactions to an individual’s deviant behaviour that transpires outside the workplace (referred to as “extra-organizational deviance”). Previous organizational research on deviance has focussed on work-related transgressions (e.g. ethical lapses, Maher & Bailey, 1999; counterproductive work behaviours, Robinson & Bennett, 1995) or personal transgressions that occur within the workplace (e.g. an affair with a coworker, Maule & Goidel, 2003), but no academic attention has been paid to the impact of the workplace of deviance that is unrelated to the workplace. However, several examples of extra-organizational deviance have been highlighted in the media recently, suggesting that personal behaviours do indeed have an impact on the workplace: the murder conviction of a CEO years before starting
his own company, leading to the insistence by one of his partners that the information about his conviction be released to shareholders (Waldie, 2004); the physical assault of a young woman in a parking garage by a Nortel executive that resulted in negative attitudes by company employees (Best, 2007; www.allaboutnortel.com); the involvement by a federal employee in a separatist organization in Quebec which resulted in her losing her job (Immen, 2004); the assault by and subsequent arrest of an HBO executive leading to his firing a couple of days later (Ritter, 2007); and, on a more positive note, the intervention by a lawyer in a domestic dispute occurring on the street who was lauded at his workplace for his actions (Armstrong, 2004). Although most of the media attention has focused on negative incidents, it is also important to consider positive incidents in order to fully understand the dynamics of extra-organizational deviance. Further, the media have focused primarily on the organizational implications of extra-organizational deviance, such as loss of reputation (Hymowitz, 2007), but there is little recognition of the effect that these behaviours can have on the employees within the organization. This interpersonal dynamic is the focus of the current research.

Although this research is the first of which I am aware to specifically study the impact of extra-organizational deviance as a workplace phenomenon, management scholars have recently turned their attention to a related area, stigma and its associated processes in organizations. In their introduction to a special journal issue on the topic, Paetzold, Dipboye, and Elsbach (2008) noted that stigmas that exist outside of organizations can have an impact on what happens in the organization. Extra-organizational deviance fits with this particular understanding of stigma at the workplace as suggested by Paetzold et al. (2008), but extra-organizational deviance is a more comprehensive concept that includes both positive and negative behaviours, as previously explained. While there is potential for positive outcomes as a result of stigmatization, the core of
stigmatization is a devaluation or derogation of a social identity (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998).

The concept of stigma is related to, but not synonymous with other negative evaluations of personal and social characteristics. With regard to personal qualities and individual identity, stigma is similar to the concepts of “marginality” (Frable, 1993) and “deviance” (Archer, 1985). . . . Like a person who is deviant or marginalized, a stigmatized person is perceived to represent a departure from normative expectations. However, people can be deviant or become marginalized because of unusual positive characteristics (e.g. extreme wealth) as well as negative ones . . . , whereas people are stigmatized for having some undesirable characteristic. Moreover, even when deviance is associated with a negative quality, it may not involve stigmatization unless the distinguishing mark is associated with generalized inferences about the bearer’s identity. (Dovidio, Major and Crocker, 2000, p. 4)

Deviance, then, is broader than stigma in its conception. Behaviours and attitudes toward a deviant coworker may change not just because of issues related to association but also to changes in trust and liking directly toward the coworker.

Much research on both organizational deviance and stigma focuses on the actor. For example, Ragins (2008) has investigated invisible stigmas in the workplace, specifically focusing on the “disclosure disconnects” that exist when there are differing degrees of disclosure in non-work and work domains. Ragins focused her attention on the actor in her model, the individual who experiences the disclosure disconnect. The current research, however, studies such behaviour from a different angle, that of the perceiver.¹ This focus on the perceiver is particularly relevant for understanding how individuals relate to each other at the workplace, especially since different perceivers have their own unique views of the target (Smith & Collins, 2009) and these differences can lead to different workplace outcomes. As people draw on various sources of information when forming judgements about others, should they have

¹ Certainly, the implications for the individual of his or her behaviours are important, since one’s self-perceptions draw on the perceptions of others (Cooley, 1964; Yeung & Martin, 2003). Further studies in extra-organizational deviance should address the actor, in order to understand the phenomenon from that perspective.
information about non-work-related deviance of their coworkers, they may use that information when forming judgements. On the basis of these judgements, the individual may alter his or her behaviour at the workplace, especially in regards to the target coworker. In a situation of negative extra-organizational deviance, an individual may want to avoid being tarnished by his or her association with the coworker who has engaged in the negative behaviour (Kulik, Bainbridge & Cregan, 2008), but in a positive situation, a rapprochement may be sought in order to reap some of the benefits of association with the target coworker.

The Proposed Model

The three studies conducted for this dissertation have contributed to the development of the model. While the second and third study fleshed out some of the proposed relationships, the findings of the first study, which was exploratory in nature, solidified an understanding of extra-organizational deviance that was then accounted for in the model. The model acknowledges the perceptions individuals have of their coworkers, concentrating specifically on trust, trustworthiness, and liking. It suggests that when an individual interprets a coworker’s extra-organizational behaviours as deviant, that individual reacts both attitudinally and behaviourally. More specifically, it is proposed that changes in perceptions of trust, trustworthiness, and liking occur once an individual learns of a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance. These attitudinal changes will lead to behavioural reactions, both directed towards the coworker in question as well as to the organization itself. These relationships are expected to be moderated by the initial levels of liking for the coworker as well as by the coworker’s perceived competence. The expected relationships are graphically depicted in Figure 1.
This research has been designed to study whether the extra-organizational deviance confirms or denies previous expectations. In a confirming negative situation, where a coworker who is not well liked or trusted engages in negative extra-organizational deviance, it is suggested that reactions will be different from a disconfirming negative situation, where a coworker who is well liked and trusted engages in negative extra-organizational deviance. Similarly, a confirming positive situation, where a coworker who is well liked and trusted engages in positive extra-organizational deviance, will lead to different reactions than a disconfirming positive situation, where a coworker who is not well liked or trusted engages in positive extra-organizational deviance.

This dissertation highlights the steps in the exploration of the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance from the perspective of an individual who is aware of the extra-organizational behaviours of his or her coworker. In the second chapter, the theoretical
framework is described. Chapter Three more fully elaborates on the hypothesized relationships of this research. The fourth chapter explains the research design and results of the exploratory study that was conducted as the first step in this research. Chapter Five covers the research design and results for the vignette study, and Chapter Six presents the third study, a qualitative one. Finally, Chapter Seven contains the overall discussion of results from all three studies and the limitations of the current research. It also highlights the theoretical and practical implications of this research and suggests avenues for future research.
Chapter Two
Extra-organizational Deviance

The term “extra-organizational deviance” describes a phenomenon of deviant behaviour that has an impact on the workplace although it does not occur in the workplace and is generally unrelated to workplace operations. Extra-organizational deviance is distinct from workplace deviance, which is defined as voluntary behaviour that violates significant organizational norms and threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Whereas drinking on the job is an example of workplace deviance (Bennett & Robinson, 2000), excessive drinking after work is an example of extra-organizational deviance. Having an affair with a coworker can be seen as workplace deviance, while having an affair with a neighbour can be seen as extra-organizational deviance.

The current research also considers positive extra-organizational deviance, which refers to behaviours that take place outside of the workplace that deviate from norms in a positive way. The concept of positive workplace deviance has been embraced by management scholars (e.g. Fielding, Hogg & Annandale, 2006; Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004). Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2004: 841) define positive deviance as “intentional behaviours that significantly depart from the norms of a referent group in honourable ways”, and Fielding et al. include behaviours such as high achievement in groups in their understanding of positive deviance. Positive extra-organizational deviance includes behaviours such as excelling in sports or arts or community pursuits, and can also include committing heroic acts, as seen in the lawyer example provided in the previous chapter.

It is important to make a clear distinction between extra-organizational deviance and off-duty conduct, a primarily legal or arbitral term that deals with what employees do outside of
work. Off-duty conduct focuses on the impact of the behaviour on the organization, and is present in a legal sense only when substantial and legitimate business reasons exist for it to be a concern (Brown & Beatty, 2006). In other words, it is not an issue until it presents an issue for the organizational as a whole. The behaviours encapsulated by off-duty conduct would also constitute extra-organizational deviance, but extra-organizational deviance is a broader phenomenon where off-duty conduct has a higher standard for its existence. Further, legally speaking, while it is possible (although very remotely so) that off-duty conduct behaviours could be positive in nature, the vast majority would be negative.

As has been alluded to, the behaviours that constitute extra-organizational deviance range in seriousness and significance, but the common thread is that these behaviours depart from what is generally considered to be the norm. To fully understand extra-organizational deviance, it is appropriate to draw on the deviance literature as a whole.

In general terms, deviance refers to beliefs, behaviours, or traits that violate or deviate from a norm held by a group of people (Goode, 2001). This deviation from norms is likely to induce negative reactions from the members of the group who observe or hear about it, although the negative reactions will vary depending on the degree of the deviance and the power of the individual committing the deviant act, among other things. The current research is concerned not with societal deviance, or classes of behaviours that are widely condemned, but with situational deviance, which deals with instances of deviance in real-life, micro-interactional settings, such as the workplace (Plummer, 1979). Ultimately, however, it is not the deviant act that is of interest here, but rather it is the reaction to that act that is the focus of the current research.
Labelling Theory

In the late 1950s, deviance scholars noted an abundance of work about deviant forms of behaviour, but little work concerning reactions to deviance (e.g. Cohen, 1959; Merton, 1959). Kitsuse (1962) and other labelling theorists (e.g. Becker, 1963) began to focus not on the question of why an individual behaved in a certain way, but rather why that behaviour was judged deviant and what the consequences of that judgement were. In their eyes, deviance is personal attributes or behaviours that people label as deviant. Therefore, deviance is by definition a social process of reaction.

A key aspect of labelling is the audience, since it is the audience who ultimately determines whether the behaviour is labelled deviant (Erikson, 1964). The emphasis on the audience in the labelling perspective allows for variation in what is called deviance, because what one might consider deviant, another might not, and this assessment of deviance may depend entirely on the situation as well as on the power of the perceiver to label the behaviour and make that label stick.

Ashforth and Humphrey (1997) illustrated the importance of labelling theory as a means of providing the social context for constructing and communicating meaning in an organizational setting. They noted that labels have the ability to connote an affective tone (positive or negative) which is then attached to the object being labelled. An individual who views a coworker’s behaviour in a negative light will tend to view the coworker negatively as well; the label attached will serve to reinforce the judgement. Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) indicated how labels can influence behaviour through creating psychological distance between an individual and his or her coworkers as well as altering interpersonal interactions, both negatively (for example, through withdrawal) and positively (for example, through deification).
That an individual’s behaviours are seen as expressing his or her values is consistent with labelling theory. Torelli and Kaikati (2009) found that in different situations, behaviours are assumed to express values, and noted that providing meaning for a counterpart’s behaviour is necessary and important for managing responses in interpersonal situations. Along the same lines, Kelley discussed a tendency for perceivers to prefer simple causal schema, indicating that “personal properties are inferred directly from behaviour without its being interpreted in relation to the situation in which it occurs” (1973: 121). For example, an individual who is perceived to have broken up a marriage, a “homewrecker”, may be vilified by others who have little knowledge of the circumstances.

Labelling theory has been deemed “laissez-faire” in its approach to deviance (Goode, 2001) because the theory suggests that if no audience is present to make a judgement about the behaviour and the individual, neither the behaviour nor the individual can be termed deviant. This aspect of labelling theory is important to consider in the current work. If an individual engages in deviant acts outside of the workplace, it is unlikely that the audience for those acts, those who would interpret them as deviant, would consist of that individual’s coworkers. Under most circumstances, individuals could expect that what happens outside of work would not be observed by those with whom they work. However, should coworkers find out about the individual’s behaviour outside of work, and should they judge that behaviour as deviant, there will be ramifications for the individual and possibly for the coworkers as well. It is important to recognize that although coworkers are likely not the most obvious audience for extra-organizational deviance, their reactions can have a strong impact on individuals who engage in deviant behaviours outside of work.
Reactions to Deviance

Kitsuse (1962) formulated a concise analysis of the process of societal reactions to deviance in which he suggested that deviance is a process by which individuals “(1) interpret behaviour as deviant, (2) define persons who so behave as a certain kind of deviant, and (3) accord them the treatment considered appropriate to such deviants” (Kitsuse, 1962: 248). This framework, which has recently been hailed as “a landmark development on the sociological landscape” (Holstein, 2009: 51), will be used as a starting point to understand the processes individuals go through when considering the extra-organizational deviance of their coworkers. In a workplace situation, Kitsuse’s process would involve learning about the extra-organizational behaviours of an individual and deciding that behaviour was deviant, judging the individual who engaged in those behaviours as deviant, and then treating that person consistently with the judgements made.

Individuals have both attitudinal and behavioural reactions to the extra-organizational deviance of their coworkers. The attitudinal reactions correspond with the second step of Kitsuse’s model in which, after interpreting behaviour as deviant, individuals define people who so behave as a certain kind of deviant. The behavioural reactions correspond with the third step of Kitsuse’s model in which the individuals accord appropriate treatment to those who engaged in the deviant behaviour.

A final distinction to make in terms of reactions to deviance, particularly as it relates to behavioural reactions, is whether the reactions are inclusive or exclusive (Orcutt, 1973). Inclusive reactions attempt to control the individual with the deviant behaviour, and exclusive reactions reject the individual from the group. At the workplace, both inclusive and exclusive reactions to extra-organizational deviance are possible. For example, consider drug abuse as a
form of negative extra-organizational deviance. An inclusive reaction at the workplace would be a coworker’s encouragement that the employee make use of a rehabilitation process, and an exclusive reaction would be that coworker refusing to work with the drug abuser.

Person Perception and Expectations in Reactions to Deviance

Research in the process by which individuals form perceptions of others has focused on two dimensions: social and intellectual desirability (De Bruin & Van Lange, 2000). These two factors correspond to the central moderators in the proposed study: liking and competence. Social desirability is conceptually linked to morality (Joireman, Kuhlman, Van Lange, Doi & Shelley, 2003; Reeder & Coovert, 1986), which is further linked to extra-organizational deviance. Both dimensions in the area of person perception resonate for the current research: extra-organizational deviance has not only a morality component, but also an ability or competence component once it is considered in the workplace.

The category diagnosticity approach (Skowronski & Carlston, 1989) considers both ability and morality, and suggests that a negativity bias is characteristic of morality judgements and positivity biases are characteristic of ability judgements. As the proposed research considers both negative and positive extra-organizational deviance, an understanding of these different cognitive biases is necessary. A negativity bias suggests that more attention is paid to negative information than to positive or neutral information, in part based on the expectations about the way individuals should behave in certain situations (Skowronski & Carlston, 1989). Reeder and Brewer (1979) suggested that individuals see negative information as highly diagnostic, and Smith and Collins (2009) proposed that it is difficult for individuals to avoid making negative judgements on the basis of negative information. Such reasoning would indicate that negative extra-organizational deviance would have more of an impact on an individual’s perceptions of
his or her coworker than positive extra-organizational deviance. However, simultaneously considering negative and positive information across both private and public spheres (e.g. negative extra-organizational deviance combined with competence or positive extra-organizational deviance combined with a lack of competence) will lead to further understanding of the dynamics between private and public life.

Research has found that individuals consider morality information more diagnostic in their judgements than competence information (e.g. Reeder & Coover, 1986). De Bruin and Van Lange (1999, 2000) found that participants in their study would search for morality information before competence information when selecting information for impression formation, and that morality information had a greater impact on global impressions than competence information. It is possible, then, that despite a high level of competence at work, perceptions will be coloured by information about negative extra-organizational deviance. Additionally, knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will put emphasis on a negative overall evaluation which can certainly affect the type of reaction to that coworker.

Expectations about a coworker’s behaviour in general will elicit certain reactions from an individual. Expectations about others’ behaviour can be either target-based or category-based: category-based expectations indicate how an individual is expected to behave based on belonging to a group, and target-based expectations indicate how an individual is expected to behave based on his or her previous actions (Jones & McGillis, 1976). Each of these expectations should be considered in terms of extra-organizational deviance, as category-based expectations correspond to broader level expectations about how behaviour deviates from norms and target-based expectations deal with the coworker in question and his or her prior behaviours.
Target-based expectations are most significant to the proposed research because they focus on the level of the individual. When dealing with new knowledge (such as extra-organizational deviance) that fits with previous expectations, prior thoughts or feelings that an individual has for that coworker will likely be applied to the situation (Skowronski & Carlston, 1989). That is, if an individual does not have high expectations for a coworker’s conduct, negative extra-organizational deviance would solidify previous negative thoughts about that coworker. However, should a situation not conform to expectations, other thoughts or feelings will be activated such that if an individual does have high expectations for a coworker’s conduct, negative extra-organizational deviance may lead to a reassessment of that coworker, most likely resulting in a negative view of that coworker. The example of the Nortel executive who assaulted a young woman demonstrates the role of expectations in changing perceptions. Through a website, a number of Nortel employees commented on the situation with the executive, with some postings indicating that the negative extra-organizational deviance confirmed negative thoughts about the individual in question and other postings indicating surprise and ultimately disappointment with the individual (www.allaboutnortel.com).

In situations of positive extra-organizational deviance, an individual’s high expectations of a coworker’s conduct would be reinforced by the positive behaviour, but should an individual have low expectations of a coworker’s conduct, positive extra-organizational deviance may lead to a positive reassessment of that coworker. Such reassessments are associated with certain reactions in which a more positive reassessment of the coworker would lead to an inclusive reaction to the deviance and a more negative assessment would lead to an exclusive reaction to the deviance.
Chapter Three

Reactions to a Coworker’s Extra-organizational Deviance: Hypotheses²

In examining the labelling theory as well as the labelling process set out by Kitsuse (1962) in the context of extra-organizational deviance, both attitudinal reactions and behavioural reactions will be discussed. It is important to understand the complexities of these different aspects of the process in order to more fully understand the impact of extra-organizational deviance in the workplace.

Attitudinal Reactions

Attitudinal reactions to extra-organizational deviance evolve from assessments of the situation at hand. Often, individuals will equate the behaviour with the actor, seeing the positive or negative behaviour as a reflection of the coworker him- or herself. Further, Jones and Davis’ (1965) correspondent inference model suggests that a perceiver can take a trait concept used to describe an act and assign that trait to the actor. For example, should a perceiver think that smoking is foolish, the smoker would be considered a fool. As such, a negative or positive interpretation of the extra-organizational deviance in question will lend itself to a negative or positive evaluation of the coworker. The processes around these assessments are explored by examining three key factors in coworker relations: trust, trustworthiness, and liking.

Trust

One of the attitudinal reactions of primary importance to the current research is trust. The role of trust deserves more attention in order to understand the reaction to extra-organizational deviance from a coworker’s perspective. Trust is an essential organizational variable, said to be the “single most important element of a good working relationship” (Fisher & Brown, 1988: 107). While the plethora of definitions and conceptualizations has created

² A summary of all hypotheses can be found in Table 1.
confusion (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007), the primary components of trust that emerge are first an intention to accept vulnerability and secondly, positive expectations. For example, trust has been defined as “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another” (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998: 395). Trust then can be compromised with knowledge of questionable behaviours, since that knowledge may make the acceptance of vulnerability difficult and expectations may be violated. In the present research, it is proposed that once individuals interpret their coworker’s negative behaviour as deviant, they will define their coworker as a certain kind of deviant, in this case as someone who may be less trustworthy. Once having defined a coworker as not as worthy of trust, an individual may respond exclusively to that coworker, for example by withdrawing from that coworker. On the other hand, with a case of positive behaviour, a coworker may inspire trust, which could lead to a different type of reaction.

Research on trust in the workplace has focused on behaviours that occur in the workplace, but the question that remains for the present research is whether behaviours that occur outside of the workplace have an impact on trust in the workplace. As such, the context of trust is important: it is not a question of how much trust exists between an individual and another party, but a question of which ways an individual trusts another party. Salam (2000) suggested that leaders can be competent and trusted in one domain but not in another. This finding is particularly relevant for the current research, as it suggests that individuals are capable of separating one area from another when making trust judgements about others.
Certain definitions of trust incorporate a moral component which is relevant to the current research because of the consideration of extra-organizational deviance. Hosmer (1995: 399) defined trust as “the expectation…of ethically justifiable behaviour – that is, morally correct decisions and actions based upon ethical principles of analysis.” Barber (1983: 164-165) spoke of trust as “socially learned and socially confirmed expectations that people have of each other, of the organizations and institutions in which they live, and of the natural and moral social orders that set the fundamental understandings of their lives.” If there are moral expectations in trusting another, acts deemed immoral and as such deviant by one individual could diminish trust of the individual who engaged in said acts, no matter the context. Similarly, acts that are seen as heroic or morally exemplary could increase the trust of the individual who engaged in those acts.

\[ H1a: \text{Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will lower the amount of trust an individual has for that coworker.} \]

\[ H1b: \text{Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase the amount of trust an individual has for that coworker.} \]

Trustworthiness

Conceptually distinct from trust is the related structure of trustworthiness. Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995), for example, suggested in their model that trustworthiness embodies characteristics of the trustee (ability, benevolence and integrity) that are antecedents of trust. People must be trustworthy before others are willing to be vulnerable and expect positive outcomes of them. There is some reciprocity involved as well: Flores and Solomon (1998: 209) expressed that “in the ideal case, one trusts someone because she is trustworthy, and one’s trustworthiness inspires trust”.

---

3 Although all deviance is not immoral, most immoral behaviours are deviant, in that they violate societal norms about what is good and right. The two concepts are highly related (Lauderdale, 1976; Seabright & Schminke, 2002) and are often used interchangeably.
In their meta-analysis of the relationship of trust and trustworthiness with risk taking and job performance, Colquitt et al. (2007) found that the components of trustworthiness, ability, benevolence and integrity had significant, unique relationships with behavioural outcomes such as risk taking, and further were significant predictors of affective commitment. Thus they suggest that not only is trust a key to organizational outcomes, but trustworthiness is an important component as well (Colquitt et al., 2007).

Two of the dimensions of trustworthiness, ability and integrity, correspond to intellectual and social desirability respectively. The other dimension, benevolence, draws on the interpersonal relationship by understanding one’s belief that another wants to do good to him or her (Mayer et al., 1995). The interplay of these dimensions in any evaluations of trustworthiness is a complex, with certain dimensions being more important at different points in time and in different situations (Mayer et al., 1995). In situations of extra-organizational deviance, the evaluation becomes even more complex as individuals need to consider a work-related aspect (ability), a deviance-related aspect (integrity), and a relationship-related aspect (benevolence) in their consideration of a coworker’s trustworthiness. As indicated previously, information relating to integrity is seen as being more diagnostic than information relating to ability (Reeder & Coovert, 1986), so an overall evaluation of trustworthiness in a situation of extra-organizational deviance is expected to draw on the nature of the deviance itself.

H2a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will lower an individual’s perception of that coworker’s trustworthiness.

H2b: Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase an individual’s perception of that coworker’s trustworthiness.
Liking

Amicable coworker relations have benefits for the coworkers involved, for others around them, and for the organization as a whole. Positive coworker relationships have been linked to increased job satisfaction (Ducharme & Martin, 2000) and organizational commitment (Leiter & Maslach, 1988), as well as lowered absenteeism (Scott & Taylor, 1985) and burnout (Leiter, 1988). Although liking one’s coworker is important at work, there is little incentive for these relationships to exist outside of work. Similar to trust, liking is context-specific: a coworker can be enjoyed and liked as a person with whom to work without being someone with whom one socializes outside of work.

Even as coworkers like each other at work, there are opportunities for behaviours outside of work to interfere in that relationship. In a study of workplace friendship deterioration, Sias, Heath, Perry, Silva, and Fix (2004) found that distracting life events, such as problems with a spouse or excessive alcohol use, led to workplace relationships becoming strained. An individual who does not like or agree with coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance may like that individual less; similarly, liking a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance may lead an individual to like the coworker more. Such reasoning is consistent with individuals’ preferences for simple causal schema: “the good act is caused by the good person, and the bad act, by the bad one” (Kelley, 1973: 121). In other words, if an individual does not like what a coworker does, even if outside of work, he or she is less likely to like that coworker; and if he or she does like what a coworker does outside of work, he or she is more likely to like the coworker.

\textit{H3a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will lower the liking an individual has for that coworker.}
**H3b:** Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase the liking an individual has for that coworker.

Moderators of Attitudinal Reactions

Two factors in particular, liking and competence, are thought to moderate the relationship between a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and the attitudinal reactions an individual has. The importance of likeability in evaluations of deviants was highlighted in a study of despicability in the workplace. Bown and Abrams (2003) found that likeable deviants (those who went against the norms of the workplace) were evaluated significantly more positively than unlikeable deviants. The inclusion of competence as a proposed moderator of extra-organizational deviance is necessary because it allows for the work-related aspect of the phenomenon to play a role. That is, the coworker’s competence in a work domain may supersede any behaviours that occur outside of the work domain.

Research in person perception has shown that individuals do not want to compromise their previously held opinions of others (Crocker, Hannah & Weber, 1983). In situations dealing with extra-organizational deviance, individuals will tend to be consistent with their opinions, such that if there were high levels of liking for a coworker beforehand, the effects of the extra-organizational deviance will be somewhat attenuated. A similar situation is expected if an individual views a coworker as highly competent.

**H4a:** An individual’s high initial levels of liking for a coworker will moderate the relationship between that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and attitudinal reactions to the extra-organizational deviance, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.
**H4b:** An individual’s high initial competence evaluation of a coworker will moderate the relationship between that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and attitudinal reactions to the extra-organizational deviance, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.

**Behavioural Reactions**

Consistent with labelling theory, through their attitudinal reactions, individuals define their coworkers as certain kinds of deviants, in this case as people who are trusted, liked or deemed trustworthy. The behavioural reactions allow individuals to accord a certain type of treatment to these coworkers. It is expected, then, that there will be a relationship between the attitudinal reactions and behavioural reactions.

**H5:** Attitudinal reactions to a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance are positively related to an individual’s behavioural reactions to that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance.

As indicated previously, behavioural reactions to deviance can be classified as inclusive, in which there is an attempt to control the individual who committed the deviant act, or exclusive, in which the individual who committed the deviant behaviour is rejected. The process of labelling may serve to enhance the contrast between individuals and those whom they label (Hogg & Abrams, 1990). As such, individuals are motivated to withdraw from those whom they have negatively labelled so as to preserve their own self-image. On the other hand, in situations of positive deviance, individuals are motivated to become closer with the deviant in order to enhance their own image (Fielding et al., 2006).

Further, Wojciszke, Brycz and Borkenau (1993) suggested that positive and negative evaluations act as cues for approach or avoidance in interpersonal interactions. It is expected that knowledge of negative extra-organizational deviance will have a strong negative effect and
will therefore cue avoidance whereas knowledge of positive extra-organizational deviance would cue approach. The impact of extra-organizational deviance on an individual’s tendency to withdraw from a coworker is exacerbated in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, in which the individual will want to distance him- or herself from the coworker and the behaviour so as to protect his or her own self-image and avoid a courtesy stigma (Goffman, 1963), and attenuated in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance, in which protection of an individual’s self-image will not be an issue.

In dealing with behavioural reactions, helping is examined as both an inclusive and exclusive reaction, where the removal of helping behaviours constitutes an exclusive reaction. An individual’s psychological withdrawal from the coworker and the organization is also examined as an extension of an exclusive reaction in order to understand if the exclusionary reaction to the individual who has engaged in extra-organizational deviance extends to the organization as well.

Helping

Helping is particularly informative to examine in an extra-organizational deviance context because it can represent both inclusive and exclusive reactions. Helping is a discretionary behaviour (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998) that does not have to be engaged in by employees in an organization. In this sense, when helping behaviours occur they correspond to an inclusive reaction. Presumably, when the behaviours do not occur in a situation in which they might be reasonably expected to occur (e.g., someone asks for help and does not get it), they correspond to an exclusive reaction.

Helping incorporates behaviours that correspond to organizational citizenship behaviours, such as altruism, courtesy, peacekeeping and cheerleading (Organ, 1988). Although the
dimensions are conceptually different, several researchers (e.g. Podsakoff, Mackenzie and colleagues, 1990, 1997) have found that managers tend to group these behaviours together into a single dimension of helping. In a study of nurses and support staff, Anderson and Williams (1996) found that relationship quality was directly and positively linked to helping behaviours. One aspect of Anderson and Williams’ measure of relationship quality dealt with the extent to which the relationship partner behaved appropriately in certain circumstances, and although this aspect was not looked at independently of the rest of the measure of relationship quality, it is reasonable to infer that helping behaviours are more likely to be demonstrated towards those who behave appropriately. In the case of negative extra-organizational deviance, the inappropriate behaviour would be more likely to lead to a reduction in helping behaviours, whereas for positive extra-organizational deviance, helping behaviours would likely be enhanced.

H6a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will decrease the helping behaviours an individual demonstrates towards that coworker.

H6b: Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase the helping behaviours an individual demonstrates towards that coworker.

Psychological Withdrawal

An individual’s tendency to withdraw from a coworker who has engaged in negative extra-organizational deviance is related to that individual’s fear of a courtesy stigma. According to Goffman (1963: 30), “the tendency for a stigma to spread from the stigmatized individual to his close connections provides a reason why such relations tend either to be avoided or to be terminated.”

Distancing is one type of withdrawal that has both psychological and physical elements. Eidelman and Biernat (2003) studied the derogation of deviant group members (“black sheep”),
finding that individuals pursued distancing strategies, such as group disidentification (where an individual creates distance from an unfavourable target in a way that protects him- or herself), to move away from the deviant group members. The study participants were motivated to protect their personal identities (versus their group identities), and the deviant group members were seen to threaten the personal identities of those who made up the group.

In a study of police officers and deviant behaviour, Haarr (1997) found that other officers on the police force would react negatively to the members who were engaging in behaviours that would “give the department a bad name”. At a certain point, individuals will be less inclined to identify with an organization that supports such membership, however tacitly. As such, it is reasonable to expect heightened withdrawal behaviours from those individuals.

To this point, the current research has concentrated on the relationships between coworkers in an organization. However, it is possible that the extra-organizational deviance of a coworker will affect not only the individual’s relationship with the coworker in question, but also the individual’s relationship with the organization. According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), an individual’s sense of self is comprised of a personal identity and a social identity. Social identity is derived from group memberships, including, and for the proposed research most importantly, the organization. In that an individual defines him or herself at least partly in terms of organizational membership, that individual will want to make sure that others in the organization, through their actions, do not threaten the integrity of the organization (Abrams, Marques, Bown & Henson, 2000). Working alongside a coworker who has engaged in deviant acts, even if those acts took place outside the workplace, may lead an individual to question his or her role within an organization that supports such membership.
Psychological withdrawal behaviours generally occur when a work environment is uncomfortable (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey & Toth, 1997), and it typically precedes physical withdrawal (Sagie, Birati, & Tziner, 2002). Similar to psychological withdrawal, an individual’s physical withdrawal process in an organization can be prompted by a number of factors. Lee and Mitchell (1994) proposed a model of turnover in which certain events serve as shocks to the system and induce employees to consider turnover decisions. A shock generates information about a person’s job and is interpreted through that person’s own set of beliefs as well as through the organization’s culture (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance may serve as one such shock, in that it may cue an individual’s assessment of that coworker and that coworker’s place in the organization. Further, to the extent that the individual identifies with the coworker and with the organization, the shock generated by knowledge of the extra-organizational deviance would prompt a reconsideration of that identification, which may lead to withdrawal from the organization. Positive extra-organizational deviance, on the other hand, will not be a shock so will not generate the same effect.

**H7: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will increase an individual’s tendency to psychologically withdraw.**

**Moderators of Behavioural Reactions**

Similar to attitudinal reactions, behavioural reactions to extra-organizational deviance are moderated by both the initial liking of the coworker in question as well as by his or her competence. As indicated previously, these two dimensions correspond with two main factors of person perception, social and intellectual desirability (De Bruin & Van Lange, 2000). How much that coworker is liked will serve to temper or exacerbate the tendency to react inclusively
or exclusively, as will the competence of the coworker in question. The moderating effects of liking and competence will be examined for both negative and positive extra-organizational deviance.

Liking

Whether an individual likes or dislikes his or her coworker will affect that individual’s behavioural reactions to the coworker’s extra-organizational deviance. Liking has been shown to positively affect supervisors’ treatment of subordinates (Turban, Jones & Rozelle, 1990); other research has shown that supervisors are more inclined to punish subordinates they dislike as compared to those they like (Dobbins & Russell, 1986) and forgive those who they like as compared to those they dislike (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). Although dealing with supervisor-subordinate relationships, these examples show the powerful impact liking can have on organizational behaviour. It is reasonable to expect a similar impact on coworker relationships.

Negative impressions that are a result of morality information, such as is the case with negative extra-organizational deviance, are more durable than positive impressions (Reeder & Coovert, 1986). Consistent with Wojciszke et al. (1993), a combination of negative extra-organizational deviance and lack of liking would cue an avoidance or withdrawal response. To be more specific, a situation in which an individual does not like the coworker in question and then finds out that the coworker has engaged in extra-organizational deviance is likely to prompt an exclusive reaction, one that would lead to the avoidance of and withdrawal from the coworker in question. In the case of an individual liking a coworker who has engaged in extra-organizational deviance, the positive evaluation of liking will cue an approach (or inclusive) response in which the individual would try to help the coworker deal with the situation at hand.
When dealing with positive extra-organizational deviance, an individual who likes a coworker will expect such behaviours, so the behavioural reaction will be muted at best. 

*H8: High initial levels of liking of a coworker will moderate the relationship between extra-organizational deviance and behavioural reactions, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.*

Competence

Competence information plays a prominent role in people perception (De Bruin & Van Lange, 2000; Wojciszke et al., 1993). Drawing on the schematic model of dispositional attribution (Reeder & Brewer, 1979) and the cue-diagnosticity model of impression formation (Skowronski & Carlston, 1987), Wojciszke et al. (1993) note that when dealing with competence, positive behaviours are more diagnostic than negative behaviours. That is, competent performances are thought to be produced only by highly competent people, but even those people may fail sometimes. Thus, the emphasis will be on the positive behaviours. It is possible, then, that a coworker’s competence could overshadow any negative evaluations that might come as a result of that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance.

In a situation of negative extra-organizational deviance, should the competence of the coworker be high, this fact may surpass the negative reaction to the deviant act. That is, individuals may be able to separate a coworker’s behaviour in his or her personal life from behaviour in the domain that concerns them: the workplace. Because of the high competence of the coworker, an individual may be more willing to react inclusively, that is by helping the coworker in question. A competent coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance conforms to expectations of overall positive behaviours. Further, because of the overall positive situation,
the individual may still be more inclined to demonstrate additional helping behaviours to the
coworker.

*H9: A coworker’s high initial levels perceived competence will moderate the relationship
between extra-organizational deviance and behavioural reactions, such that reactions to
negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-
organizational deviance will be heightened.*
## Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will lower the amount of trust an individual has for that coworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase the amount of trust an individual has for that coworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will lower an individual’s perception of that coworker’s trustworthiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase an individual’s perception of that coworker’s trustworthiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will lower the liking an individual has for that coworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase the liking an individual has for that coworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: An individual’s high initial levels of liking for a coworker will moderate the relationship between that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and attitudinal reactions to the extra-organizational deviance, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: An individual’s high initial competence evaluation of a coworker will moderate the relationship between that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and attitudinal reactions to the extra-organizational deviance, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Attitudinal reactions to a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance are positively related to an individual’s behavioural reactions to that coworker’s extra-organizational deviance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will decrease the helping behaviours an individual demonstrates towards that coworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b: Knowledge of a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will increase the helping behaviours an individual demonstrates towards that coworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Knowledge of a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance will increase an individual’s tendency to withdraw from the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: High initial levels of liking of a coworker will moderate the relationship between extra-organizational deviance and behavioural reactions, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: A coworker’s high initial levels perceived competence will moderate the relationship between extra-organizational deviance and behavioural reactions, such that reactions to negative extra-organizational deviance will be attenuated and reactions to positive extra-organizational deviance will be heightened.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four

Study One: Methodology and Results

The current research was conducted using three studies: an exploratory study, a vignette study, and a qualitative study. The research design is mutually reinforcing: the qualitative research facilitates the quantitative research, which in turn facilitates the qualitative research (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). In this research, the first study established a more concrete understanding of the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance and its impact on the workplace. The second study builds on the first by considering potential reactions to real coworkers’ extra-organizational deviance. The third study builds on the second by following up on actual examples of a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance that the individual has experienced in his or her work life. The methods and results for the first study are presented in Chapter Four; the methods and results for the second are presented in Chapter Five; and Chapter Six contains the third study.

Study One

The purpose of this study was to investigate the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance and its impact on the workplace. The core research question focused on the existence of extra-organizational deviance, and, with the establishment of its existence, how the behaviours in a coworker’s personal life might intersect with his or her professional life. With a focus on the relatively new area of extra-organizational deviance that has not yet been explored in organizational behaviour literature, a qualitative approach was deemed most appropriate to investigate the phenomenon. This approach is considered fitting and quite likely fruitful when little is known about a phenomenon in organizational literature (Edmondson & McManus, 2007).
Participants

There were twelve participants, seven women and five men, all of whom have worked in managerial or professional roles for at least five years. The average age of participants was 39.8. Participants were recruited by word of mouth, and represented a wide variety of industries (e.g. transportation, education, communications, healthcare).

Procedure

This research involved a series of semi-structured, individual interviews in which participants were asked a variety of questions about the interplay of personal and professional lives. Certain specific questions were asked of each participant by the researcher, but variations existed in the interviews in situations in which the participants were encouraged to elaborate on previous answers. All participants consented to the interviews being recorded. The interview protocol can be found in Appendix B.

Results

The interview transcripts were reviewed for the emergence of themes relating to the different types of extra-organizational deviance the participants had experienced, along with the reactions they had to the situations they were presented with. A summary of the results and corresponding quotations can be found in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Sample Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge of coworker’s behaviours outside of work | All participants were aware of at least some behaviours that their coworkers engaged in outside of work. | -during the week I pretty much know most things they do and on weekends if they’re close to me I’d know quite a bit  
-I have a fair understanding of what they do in their personal life and who they are in their personal life  
-I know a fair bit about what my coworkers are doing outside of work |
| Nature of extra-organizational deviance | The range of behaviours talked about by participants is extensive. | -extra-marital relationships  
-alcohol abuse  
-visits to strip clubs  
-child-rearing practices  
-religious extremism  
-swinging  
-child pornography |
| Relationship between work and non-work behaviours | Participants acknowledged some difficulty in reconciling different behaviours in the two domains. | -because of the notion of integration, when they’re doing something weird in their personal or social lives, then that’s why you do suspect them  
-people are judged by the company they keep and success in terms of success in the workplace, unfortunately for better or worse, has a lot to do with who you hang out with and what kind of company you keep  
-it’s kind of surprising that a person can carry themselves that way and then act a completely different way outside the office |
| Reactions to extra-organizational deviance | Participants talked about both inclusive and exclusive reactions when discussing how they would react to a specific scenario. | -I might even try to find out if there’s anything I can do to help [inclusive]  
-in order to maintain the trust I would have to talk to the person about it [inclusive]  
-not wanting to get caught in the middle of it, I’d try to avoid the subject or sometimes avoid the person [exclusive]  
-I would distance myself from them [exclusive]  
-my general reaction would be a little bit of withdrawal, not trying to correct her or anything, but I would probably just withdraw and just do the bare necessities [exclusive]  
-it would be a tidbit of gossip [exclusive] |
| Role of liking | Participants noted that their reaction to the coworker in question would be dependent on the level of liking. | -probably the degree of disengagement would be greater for the person I disliked and less for the person I did like  
-for me it would probably piggyback on each other…it would take a fair bit of energy on my behalf to treat them equally.  
-it would probably make me dislike them even more  
-maybe a good enough friend I would take it in my own hands and either try to help them or talk to them and see what’s going on |
| Role of competence | Similar to liking, participants’ reactions to their coworkers would be dependent on the coworker’s competence. | -I think it would be dependent on how I perceived that person’s work or how I felt we all worked together  
-if the person who I think is incompetent did something reprehensible I would have even less faith in the work that they did |
Knowledge of Extra-organizational Deviance. All participants knew at least in general terms about some extra-organizational behaviours of their coworkers. Further, based on this knowledge, individuals made judgements about these behaviours, although they often acknowledged that it was not necessarily appropriate (e.g. “not my place to judge”, “as hard as I tried to view them as professionals your mind would kind of drift back to how they were acting [outside of work]”). Participants also carried forth the judgements about the behaviour to the judgements of the coworker in question (e.g. “that’s always a terrible thing and therefore that person is a terrible person”). Additionally, participants indicated that they felt there was a relationship between who their coworkers are and what those coworkers do outside of work (e.g. “because of that notion of integration, when they’re really doing something weird in their personal or social lives, because our lives are ideally integrated, then that’s why you do suspect them”).

Nature of Extra-organizational Deviance. Participants were asked about their knowledge of specific examples of “questionable behaviour” in which their coworkers engaged in their personal lives. A wide variety of behaviours were listed, ranging from money mismanagement (e.g. incurring a lot of personal debt) to parenting issues (e.g. spanking children). Two types of behaviours were mentioned by a many respondents: drinking (especially excessive drinking) and sexual behaviours (e.g. extra-marital affairs, promiscuity, swinging). Participants were asked to think about the impact of a coworker’s immoral behaviour versus illegal behaviour, and there were some differences in perceptions of the two, with some participants feeling more strongly about the immoral behaviour of coworkers (e.g. “I think that immorality would make a real…would make more of an impact on me”) while others felt more strongly about illegal behaviours (e.g. “for me, the way I am, I just can’t really excuse a lot of illegal activity”).
Although infrequent, some participants did mention positive behaviours throughout the interviews, so the questions were appended in order to encourage participants to consider positive behaviours in addition to negative behaviours.

Reactions to Extra-organizational Deviance. Participants’ responses to the scenario of a coworker they trusted engaging in reprehensible behaviours included both exclusive and inclusive reactions. Exclusive reactions included taking coworkers who engaged in these behaviours less seriously, regarding them with more suspicion (e.g. “it makes me trust their work less”), avoiding them and the subject (e.g. “not wanting to get caught in the middle of it I’d try to avoid the subject or sometimes avoid the person”), withdrawing from them (e.g. “I would distance myself from them”), gossipping about them (e.g. “it would be a tidbit of gossip”), and changing any kind of personal relationship with them (e.g. “I would distance them on a personal level”). In certain situations, some participants would have a more inclusive reaction to the extra-organizational deviance, taking the opportunity to speak to the coworker about the behaviour and trying to help them deal with it (e.g. “I might even try to find out if there’s anything I can do to help”). Additionally, in some situations, it was thought that extra-organizational deviance could increase interaction between individuals and their coworkers (for example, if a shared extra-organizational deviance was found, or through the idea of living vicariously through the coworker and his or her activities: “People outside of work might be crazy partiers and sometimes that raises them in the esteem of their coworkers…all of a sudden you see them in a new light, you see them as the daredevil or you see them as this wild child and maybe it’s part of you wanting to be that person but you can’t”).

When questioned about liking, participants suggested that they would respond more harshly to coworkers they did not like who engaged in reprehensible behaviours than they would
for coworkers they liked (e.g. “if they’re not of sound character…then I might be less likely to be lenient and that’s probably not fair because you’re supposed to deal with people in a fair way, right? If they’ve done something wrong and it’s the same act between two people and one person you don’t like as much and one person you like more…you’re supposed to treat them a certain way but with human bias it does affect the way you handle certain people”). Indeed, a relationship emerged between liking and inclusive or exclusive reactions, with participants indicating they would be more likely to help a coworker they liked deal with the situation of extra-organizational deviance and more likely to avoid and withdraw from a coworker they did not like (e.g. “If it was someone I cared about I think that I would probably sit down and have a chat with them” versus “If it was somebody that I was suspicious about or not liking a lot anyway it would probably become a big barrier”). However, certain participants indicated that a friendship may change to a more professional relationship as a result of finding out about extra-organizational deviance (e.g. “the biggest change would probably be in my social relationship with them”). Additionally, not liking someone may increase the chance of reporting the behaviour to a supervisor (e.g. “if I didn’t like the person it would be much easier for me to go to the employer and say ‘you know, so and so’s doing this’”).

Participants were questioned about the role of competence in reactions to extra-organizational deviance, and it emerged that competence does indeed act as a moderator, in that the response to the coworker would not be as harsh for competent coworkers as compared to incompetent coworkers (e.g. “if the person who I think is incompetent did something reprehensible I would have even less faith in the work that they did”).

It is important to note that there are variations in reactions to extra-organizational deviance, with certain activities deemed less acceptable (e.g. child pornography being less
acceptable than cheating on income tax). The personal characteristics of the coworker in question may also play a role in the reaction to the extra-organizational deviance (e.g. it is more acceptable for a single person to be sexually promiscuous than someone who is married to have an affair).

Discussion

This exploratory study solidified the concept of extra-organizational deviance as a social phenomenon with the potential to have very real workplace implications. Supporting the labelling process suggested by Kitsuse, this study pointed strongly to the relationship between a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance and an individual’s changed perceptions of, and reactions to, that coworker.

Two specific insights from this study reinforced the current conceptualization of extra-organizational deviance. First, positive extra-organizational deviance was found to be an issue alongside negative extra-organizational deviance. Through the course of the interviews, positive behaviours were discussed sufficiently frequently to indicate their importance in the study of extra-organizational deviance. Further, the inclusion of positive extra-organizational deviance is in keeping not only with the conceptualizations of deviance itself, but also with the renewed emphasis on positive organizational scholarship. The second insight, which is linked to the first, is the inclusion of inclusive reactions to deviance in the model. Because the model includes positive extra-organizational deviance, it was recognized that inclusive reactions could occur, and ultimately not just in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance. These two insights have been incorporated into the current model, and allow for a more robust understanding of the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance.
Chapter 5

Study 2: Methodology and Results

The study presented in this chapter builds on the results of the exploratory study, seeking to develop a more thorough understanding of the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance through more focused research.

Study 2

It is important to understand extra-organizational deviance in the context in which it occurs, the workplace. This study is a pretest-posttest design that allows for a greater understanding of the changes to an individual’s perceptions of a coworker when knowledge of extra-organizational deviance is discovered.

Participants

Participants for this study were primarily recruited through a large Canadian professional association dedicated to the advancement of the human resource profession, and one of its related local chapters in southern Ontario. Potential study participants were informed of the study in a monthly newsletter sent out by the association, as well as in a more targeted email sent out to members of the local chapter. Additionally, mature students who work full-time and were engaged in part-time studies at two Canadian universities were also contacted by email and invited to participate. Snowball sampling was encouraged. That is, participants were asked to identify other individuals who fit the target population (business people with a number of years of work experience). Participation was voluntary; no reimbursement was offered.

A total of 179 participants completed the first questionnaire, which was considered complete when participants noted their email address in order to receive the second questionnaire. A total of 120 participants completed the second questionnaire, representing an
attrition rate of 33%. The sample was 68% female, which is representative of population of the primary population that was targeted (Dobson, 2009; Statistics Canada, 2006). The majority of participants (50.8%) were between 26 and 35 years old, with another 24.1% falling between 36 and 45 years old. Participants came from a wide variety of industries including education, law, healthcare, consulting, and government.

Procedure

Data were collected from participants at two stages, separated by one week. Participants completed both questionnaires online, although the initial invitation to participate indicated that a hard copy could be sent out if participants preferred it to the online version of the questionnaire. The opening web page of each questionnaire explained the purpose of the research and provided instructions for completion. Participants were assured of their anonymity, and of the fact that the identifying information that was collected (birth date and mother’s maiden name) to link the two questionnaires would be removed and destroyed once the questionnaires were matched. Participants signalled their consent by proceeding with the questionnaire.

At Time 1, participants were asked to list three coworkers from their workplace. No further instructions were given about gender, organizational level, or any other characteristics in order to allow participants to choose the first three that came to mind. The questionnaire program was designed to filter these responses so participants would answer their remaining questions about only one coworker, who was the second coworker listed. Participants were asked a number of questions about their coworker, and about their own workplace behaviours. At the end of this questionnaire, participants were asked to fill in their email address in order to receive the next questionnaire one week later. Participants were asked to remember the coworker whom they had answered questions about because they would be answering questions

---

4 No participants requested this option.
about this person in the next survey. In total, this questionnaire took between 10 and fifteen minutes to complete.

At Time 2 (one week later), participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions (lifesaving, n=29; triathlon, n=30; affair, n=30; drug charges, n=31). Participants were prompted by email to complete the second questionnaire. The email contained the internet link to the questionnaire for the condition to which the participant had been assigned. Once again, participants had an information page and an opportunity to signal their consent to participate by beginning the second questionnaire. In it, they were asked to name the coworker they responded about in their earlier questionnaire.5 Participants were then presented with one of four vignettes presenting the coworker in question engaging in either positive or negative extra-organizational deviance. Participants were asked to think about the coworker named as having engaged in the extra-organizational deviance presented in the scenario, and then respond to the same set of questions asked in the first questionnaire. The same vignette reappeared at the top of every page of the survey, providing a constant reminder of the situation. In total, this questionnaire took between 15 and 20 minutes to complete.

All of the data were collected through surveys and as a result are susceptible to common method bias. However, steps were taken to limit common method bias (e.g. psychological separation of measurement and anonymity of respondents) (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The focus of the research is perceptions that individuals have of their coworkers, so single source data are appropriate here.

---

5 In their email about the second questionnaire, participants were reminded that they would need the name of the coworker they discussed in the first questionnaire. At that time, they were told to contact the researcher if they forgot the name, and the name would be provided to them.
Materials

Four vignettes were created for use in this study, two representing situations of positive deviance and two representing situations of negative deviance. The vignettes can be found in Appendix E. The situation in each vignette was based on an extra-organizational deviance scenario that was shared as part of Study One or that had been reported in a national newspaper, so they were all drawn from actual examples of extra-organizational deviance. Due to the sample size, the four conditions represented by the four vignettes were collapsed into two conditions, positive and negative extra-organizational deviance (n=59 and n=61 respectively). There were no significant differences found between the two positive and two negative conditions, so collapsing them is appropriate.

Vignettes ask participants to respond to hypothetical scenarios, not real-life situations that they have experienced. However, vignettes are often used in attribution research (e.g. McGraw, 1987; Schmidt & Weiner, 1988) and in research on transgressions (e.g. Giacalone & Payne, 1995; Maule & Goidel, 2003) or ethics (e.g. Gunz & Gunz, 2002) to capture situations that might otherwise be inaccessible due to social desirability and other concerns. Robinson and Clore (2001) found that vignette methodologies generate similar emotional responses to “real” scenarios and because the vignette anchors participants in an actual situation it reduces the possibility of an unreflective reply (Bryman & Teevan, 2005).

Measures

As indicated previously, the measures used in the questionnaires were essentially identical, with the only differences being that demographic information was asked in the first questionnaire and the importance of the focal issue was asked in the second questionnaire. The internal consistencies for the scales are reported in Table 3. With the exception of the
psychological withdrawal scale, all scales used a seven-point Likert scale anchored with “Strongly Disagree” (1) and “Strongly Agree” (7). The psychological withdrawal scale was a seven-point frequency scale anchored with “Never” (1) and “Daily” (7).

**Trustworthiness.** The measure for trustworthiness was drawn from Mayer and Davis’s (1999) trustworthiness scale, covering the three dimensions of ability (six items), benevolence (five items) and integrity (six items). Sample items include “My coworker (name inserted through website) is well qualified” (ability), “My needs and desires are very important to [my coworker]” (benevolence), and “Sound principles seem to guide [my coworker]’s behaviour” (integrity).

**Trust.** A six-item measure for trust was adapted from Cook and Wall (1980). Sample items include “I can trust [my coworker] to lend me a hand if I need it” and “If I got into difficulty at work I know [my coworker] would try and help me out.

**Liking.** The three item liking measure was adapted from Wayne, Kacmar and Ferris’ coworker satisfaction measure (1995). Sample items include “Working with [my coworker] is a pleasure” and “I get along well with [my coworker]”.

**Perceived Competence.** Perceived competence was measured with two items: I am often concerned about whether [my coworker] can handle the job” (reverse coded) and “[My coworker] seems to do an efficient job.”

**Helping.** The helping scale (comprised of seven items) was drawn from Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie’s larger scale measuring organizational citizenship behaviours (1997). Sample items included “I willingly share my expertise with [my coworker]” and “I encourage [my coworker] when he/she is down”.
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Psychological Withdrawal. The psychological withdrawal items (eight in total) were drawn from Lehman and Simpson (1992). While measuring psychological withdrawal, the scale includes specific behaviours including “Chatting with other coworkers about non-work topics” and “Spreading rumours or gossip about coworkers”. This measure assesses the frequency of behaviour.

Control Variables

Sex. Sex of the participant was used as a control variable because of its possible impact on the results. Social identity theory focuses on how individuals’ identity group memberships shape their outlook and understanding of different settings (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). In a study of reactions to the way Anita Hill was treated at the Clarence Thomas US Supreme Court hearings, Montgomery, Kane and Vance (2004) found that males and females have different thresholds at which they perceive uncivil behaviour. They found that perceptions may be affected by social identification with the perpetrators or targets of the uncivil behaviour. In Montgomery et al.’s study, to the extent that the perceiver shared a salient social identity (such as gender) with the target of the uncivil behaviour, the more likely the perceiver would be to judge the behaviour harshly. To the extent that the perceiver shared a salient social identity with the perpetrator, the less likely the perceiver would be to judge the behaviour harshly.

Importance of Focal Issue. If the extra-organizational deviant act holds particular significance for the participant, he or she is likely to react more strongly to the behaviour in question. To use a drinking and driving example, if an individual who has lost a family member to a drunk driver finds out that a coworker has been arrested for drinking and driving, he or she might judge the actor more harshly than another individual without such personal experience. This type of judgment is often controlled for in jury selection, as prospective jury members are
questioned about any personal connection they might have to the crime that they will potentially judge. Similarly, if an individual has engaged in the target transgression him- or herself, that individual is likely to be more lenient in judging the transgression (Scott & Jehn, 2003). The importance of the focal issue to the study participant was addressed using items based on Wark and Krebs’ (2000) study of moral dilemmas, in which they asked participants the extent to which they had experienced the specific type of dilemma in their own lives and whether they deemed it significant.

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations for study variables can be found in Table 3. As mentioned previously, internal consistencies for the scales are reported on the diagonal of the correlation table.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations from Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trustworthiness T1</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trustworthiness T2</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trust T1</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trust T2</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liking T1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Liking T2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Helping T1</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Helping T2</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Withdrawal T1</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Withdrawal T2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perceived Competence T1</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Perceived Competence T2</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values are the mean of reported scores on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Values on the diagonal are the coefficient alphas.

** p < .001, *p < .01
An independent samples t-test was run for the control variables, and gender had no impact on any of the study variables. Similarly, the importance of the focal issue was found to be not significant for the study variables.

**Attitudinal reactions.** A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of trust, trustworthiness, liking, and perceived competence before and after participants read a scenario about their coworkers engaging in extra-organizational deviance. The results are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Changes in Individual’s Perceptions of Coworkers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Deviance</th>
<th>Positive Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>35.17 (7.17)</td>
<td>32.41 (7.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>93.57 (16.45)</td>
<td>87.30 (19.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>17.72 (3.46)</td>
<td>16.44 (4.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Standard deviations are reported in brackets underneath the means. A positive difference indicates that the attitude was higher at Time 1 than Time 2.

*p <.01. **p <.001

In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, there was a significant difference in the trust scores at Time 1 (M=35.17, SD=7.14) and Time 2 (M=32.41, SD=7.87); t(58)=4.464, p < .001. There was a significant difference in the trustworthiness scores at Time 1 (M=93.57, SD=16.45) and Time 2 (M=87.30, SD=19.20); t(53)=4.323, p < .001. There was a significant difference in the liking scores at Time 1 (M=17.72, SD=3.46) and Time 2 (M=16.44, SD=4.17); t(60)=3.217, p < .01. These results support Hypotheses 1a, 2a, and 3a. These results suggest
that a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance does have a negative impact on the
perceptions that an individual has of that coworker.

In situations of positive extra-organizational deviance, there was no significant difference
in the trust scores at Time 1 (M=35.14, SD=6.55) and Time 2 (M=35.39, SD=6.62); t(56)=-0.75,
p >.05. There was no significant difference in the trustworthiness scores at Time 1 (M=93.69,
SD=15.97) and Time 2 (M=93.43, SD=15.14); t(57)=.357, p >.05. There was no significant
difference in the liking scores at Time 1(M=17.90, SD=3.50) and Time 2 (M=17.59, SD=3.31);
t(58)=1.587, p >.05. Hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 3b are not supported. These results suggest that a
coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will have little impact on the perceptions that
an individual has of that coworker.

**Moderators of attitudinal reactions.** It was hypothesized that high initial levels of liking
and competence would moderate the relationship between extra-organizational deviance and the
attitudinal reactions (trust, trustworthiness, and liking) to that deviance. Because most work
relationships are positive (Baldwin, Bedell, & Johnson, 1997; Gersick, Bartunek, & Dutton,
2000) and little variance may be found when looking at particularly liking but also competence,
both liking and perceived competence were operationalized as dichotomous variables. The
variables were dichotomized by separating the high levels of each variable from the lower levels
of the variable. That is, values of “agree” and “highly agree” (6 and 7 on the scale used for the
variables) were used to represent the high levels for each variable.

As both the independent variable (extra-organizational deviance) and the moderator
(liking or competence) were categorical, dichotomous variables, a 2x2 ANOVA is appropriate
for assessing the moderating effect (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Moderation is indicated by an
interaction. For liking as a moderator, the interaction effect is not significant for trust ($F(1,114)$
= 0.09, p > .05), trustworthiness ($F (1,112) = 0.23, p > .05$), and liking ($F (1,116) = 0.012, p > .05$) in a between-subjects design. For competence as a moderator, the interaction effect is not significant for trust ($F (1,114) = 0.464, p > .05$), trustworthiness ($F (1,116) = 0.003, p > .05$), and liking ($F (1,113) = 3.038, p > .05$) in a between-subjects design.

Further analysis was done in a within-subjects design with some significant results. Paired t-tests were conducted once again, but for the four conditions representing positive and negative extra-organizational deviance and initial high levels of liking (dichotomized), and then for the four conditions representing positive and negative extra-organizational deviance and initial high levels of competence (dichotomized). Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

**Table 5**

*Changes in Individual Attitudes by Types of Deviance and Differences in Liking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Negative Deviance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Deviance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low initial liking (n=17)</td>
<td>High initial liking (n=44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low initial liking (n=17)</td>
<td>High initial liking (n=42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>27.75 (8.61)</td>
<td>25.94 (9.39)</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
<td>37.93 (4.06)</td>
<td>34.81 (5.43)</td>
<td>3.11***</td>
<td>26.80 (6.59)</td>
<td>28.00 (7.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>75.53 (19.82)</td>
<td>67.00 (21.62)</td>
<td>8.53***</td>
<td>100.51 (7.76)</td>
<td>95.10 (13.34)</td>
<td>5.41**</td>
<td>74.59 (13.98)</td>
<td>76.12 (14.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>13.41 (3.50)</td>
<td>12.41 (3.87)</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>19.38 (1.42)</td>
<td>18.00 (1.33)</td>
<td>1.38**</td>
<td>13.35 (2.96)</td>
<td>13.65 (3.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Standard deviations are reported in brackets underneath the means.*  
*A positive difference indicates that the attitude was higher at Time 1 than Time 2.  
*A negative difference indicates that the attitude was lower at Time 2 than Time 1 or that more withdrawal behaviours were engaged in at Time 2 than Time 1.  
**$p < .01$.  
***$p < .001$.  
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Table 6
Changes in Individual Attitudes by Types of Deviance and Differences in Perceptions of Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Negative Deviance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Deviance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low initial</td>
<td>High initial</td>
<td>Low initial</td>
<td>High initial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competence</td>
<td>competence</td>
<td>competence</td>
<td>competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td>(n=38)</td>
<td>(n=32)</td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>31.43 (9.41)</td>
<td>37.70 (8.98)</td>
<td>35.42 (4.99)</td>
<td>2.14**</td>
<td>33.00 (7.16)</td>
<td>32.90 (6.73)</td>
<td>0.97*</td>
<td>37.69 (4.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>85.82 (21.74)</td>
<td>76.82 (23.82)</td>
<td>98.91 (8.79)</td>
<td>94.50 (11.38)</td>
<td>4.41*</td>
<td>87.03 (10.04)</td>
<td>86.91 (13.78)</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>16.39 (4.13)</td>
<td>14.83 (4.65)</td>
<td>18.53 (2.73)</td>
<td>1.11*</td>
<td>16.65 (3.92)</td>
<td>16.38 (3.63)</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>19.37 (2.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard deviations are reported in brackets underneath the means. * A positive difference indicates that the attitude was higher at Time 1 than Time 2. * A negative difference indicates that the attitude was lower at Time 2 than Time 1 or that more withdrawal behaviours were engaged in at Time 2 than Time 1. **p < .01. ***p < .001

The within-subjects analysis demonstrates partial support for Hypothesis 4a. In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, high initial liking has a negative, significant impact on trust, trustworthiness, and liking while low initial liking is only significant for trustworthiness.

The moderation effect is evident, but not in the direction hypothesized. In situations of positive extra-organizational deviance, liking does not play a moderating role, except for in the case of high initial liking and liking, where it has a negative impact in a positive situation. This result is worthy of further exploration.

Hypothesis 4b was not supported in a within-subjects design. In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, neither high nor low competence played a role in that there were significant decreases in trust, trustworthiness, and liking in both conditions. In situations of positive extra-organizational deviance, there were no significant changes to any of the variables in either condition.
Figure 2. Changes in trust in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance for low initial liking and high initial liking conditions.

Figure 3. Changes in liking in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance for low initial liking and high initial liking conditions.

Figure 4. Changes in liking in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance for low initial liking and high initial liking conditions.
Linking attitudinal and behavioural reactions. A regression analysis was conducted to assess the relationship between attitudinal reactions and behavioural reactions. The results are presented in Table 7. Hypothesis 5 is partially supported. Although liking at Time 2 predicted helping, neither trust nor trustworthiness is a significant predictor. However, this model does explain a significant amount of variance in helping behaviours at Time 2 ($R^2 = .32$, $F(3, 102) = 13.55, p < .001$. The regression analysis for psychological withdrawal found no significant relationships for trust, trustworthiness, or liking.

Table 7

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Helping Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust at Time 2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking at Time 2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness at Time 2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05., n=120

Behavioural reactions. Paired-samples t-tests were conducted to compare levels of helping and psychological withdrawal before and after participants read a scenario about their coworkers engaging in extra-organizational deviance. The results are presented in Table 8.
Table 8
*Changes in Individual’s Behaviours Towards Coworkers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviours</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Difference of Means (T1 – T2)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Difference of Means (T1 – T2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>39.97 (5.72)</td>
<td>38.61 (6.03)</td>
<td>1.36*&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40.33 (5.23)</td>
<td>40.11 (4.88)</td>
<td>0.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Withdrawal</td>
<td>25.64 (6.81)</td>
<td>25.98 (8.01)</td>
<td>-0.34&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.23 (6.91)</td>
<td>27.32 (6.86)</td>
<td>-1.09&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard deviations are reported in brackets underneath the means. *A positive difference indicates that the behaviour was more likely to occur at Time 1 than Time 2. A negative difference indicates that more withdrawal behaviours were engaged in at Time 2 than Time 1. *<sup>p</sup> < .05.

In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, there was a significant difference in the helping scores at Time 1 (M=39.97, SD=5.72) and Time 2 (M=38.61, SD=6.03); t(58)=2.444, p < .05. There was no significant difference in the psychological withdrawal scores at Time 1 (M=25.64, SD=6.81) and Time 2 (M=25.98, SD=8.01); t(58)=-.683, p > .05. These results support Hypotheses 6a but do not support Hypothesis 7. These results suggest that an individual will be less inclined to help a coworker who has engaged in negative extra-organizational deviance. The spillover to the organization, though, does not seem to be a factor.

In situations of positive extra-organizational deviance, there was no significant difference in the helping scores at Time 1 (M=40.33, SD=5.23) and Time 2 (M=40.11, SD=4.88); t(56)=.482, p > .05. Hypothesis 6b is not supported. This result suggests that a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance will have little impact on the helping behaviours an individual directs towards his or her coworker. Interestingly, there was a significant difference in the psychological withdrawal scores at Time 1 (M=26.23, SD=6.91) and Time 2 (M=27.32, SD=6.86); t(56)=−2.483, p < .05. This relationship was not hypothesized, but is worthy of
further consideration. That an individual has a tendency to withdraw psychologically from the organization when a coworker engages in positive extra-organizational deviance is an interesting one that will be explored in more detail in the discussion.

_Moderators of behavioural reactions._ As with attitudinal reactions, it was hypothesized that high initial levels of liking and competence would moderate the relationship between extra-organizational deviance and the behavioural reactions (helping and psychological withdrawal) to that deviance. A between subjects design revealed no significant effects for liking as a moderator on helping ($F(1,115) = 0.002$, $p > .05$) or psychological withdrawal ($F(1,113) = 0.403$, $p > .05$). Similarly, no significant effects were found for competence as a moderator of helping ($F(1,115) = 0.048$, $p > .05$) or psychological withdrawal ($F(1,113) = 3.038$, $p > .05$).

Once again, a within subjects analysis was conducted. Paired t-tests were used for the four conditions representing positive and negative extra-organizational deviance and initial high levels of liking (dichotomized), and then for the four conditions representing positive and negative extra-organizational deviance and initial high levels of competence (dichotomized). Results are presented in Tables 9 and 10 and Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8.

The within-subjects analysis partially supports Hypotheses 8 and 9. Helping decreases in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance and high initial liking, but not low initial liking. In a situation of high initial liking and positive extra-organizational deviance, psychological withdrawal increases, but this is not the case for low initial liking. Similar patterns occur for high initial competence and helping, such that helping behaviours decline in situations of negative deviance for high initial competence but not low. Psychological withdrawal, on the other hand, increases in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance for low initial competence but not high.
### Table 9

*Changes in Individual Behaviours by Types of Deviance and Differences in Liking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Low initial liking</th>
<th>High initial liking</th>
<th>Low initial liking</th>
<th>High initial liking</th>
<th>Paired Difference of Means (T1 – T2)</th>
<th>Paired Difference of Means (T1 – T2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>(6.58)</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>(7.37)</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>(4.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological withdrawal</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>(6.71)</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>(8.12)</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>(6.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Standard deviations are reported in brackets underneath the means. *A positive difference indicates that helping behaviour was more likely to occur at Time 1 than Time 2 or that fewer withdrawal behaviours were engaged in. A negative difference indicates that helping behaviour was less likely to occur at Time 2 than Time 1 or that more withdrawal behaviours were engaged in at Time 2 than Time 1.*

*p < .05.

### Table 10

*Changes in Individual Behaviours by Types of Deviance and Differences in Perceptions of Competence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Low initial competence</th>
<th>High initial competence</th>
<th>Low initial competence</th>
<th>High initial competence</th>
<th>Paired Difference of Means (T1 – T2)</th>
<th>Paired Difference of Means (T1 – T2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>37.91</td>
<td>(6.65)</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>(7.14)</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>(4.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological withdrawal</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>(7.02)</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>(7.86)</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>(6.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Standard deviations are reported in brackets underneath the means. *A positive difference indicates that helping behaviour was more likely to occur at Time 1 than Time 2 or that fewer withdrawal behaviours were engaged in. A negative difference indicates that helping behaviour was less likely to occur at Time 2 than Time 1 or that more withdrawal behaviours were engaged in at Time 2 than Time 1.*

*p < .05.*
Figure 5. Changes in helping in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance for low initial liking and high initial liking conditions.

Figure 6. Changes in psychological withdrawal in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance for low initial liking and high initial liking conditions.

Figure 7. Changes in helping in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance for low initial competence and high initial competence conditions.
Discussion

As predicted, individuals have both attitudinal and behavioural reactions to the extra-organizational deviance of their coworkers. As they described different behaviours, the vignettes opened opportunities for respondents to interpret behaviours as deviant, as suggested by Kitsuse (1962). Changes in attitudes and behaviours after knowledge of behaviours can be used to support the idea of the importance of labelling behaviours as deviant. The results of this study show particularly the impact of negative deviance. No significant change in perceptions of coworkers occurred as a result of positive deviance. Knowledge of negative deviance, however, significantly reduced the levels of trust, trustworthiness and liking of the coworker. Trust thus was compromised with knowledge of questionable behaviours. The present research showed that once individuals interpret their coworker’s behaviour as negatively deviant, they defined their coworker as less trustworthy. Individuals do use negative information to make judgements (Reeder & Brewer, 1979; Collins & Smith, 2009). Negative extra-organizational deviance does have more of an impact on an individual’s perceptions of his or her coworker than positive extra-organizational deviance.
Once a behaviour has been interpreted as deviant, behavioural reactions considered appropriate for the coworkers who engaged in those actions develop (Kitsuse, 1962). Once again, the difference between negative and positive forms of deviance is obvious. The willingness to help a coworker who has engaged in negative extra-organizational deviance declines, but the same does not hold true for positive extra-organizational deviance. Psychological withdrawal presents a more complex situation, in that it is not affected by negative extra-organizational deviance, but it actually increases in situations of positive extra-organizational deviance. There were no hypothesized relationships for psychological withdrawal and positive extra-organizational deviance, but these interesting findings are worthy of some consideration. The measure of psychological withdrawal that was used includes items that encapsulate such behaviours as chatting with coworkers about non-work related topics. It is possible then, that the psychological withdrawal findings indicate a rapprochement to the coworker in question rather than a withdrawal from the organization itself. However, it is also possible that a coworker’s positive extra-organizational deviance could represent a lack of such positive behaviours in an individual’s own life, and that individual may distance him- or herself from that coworker for ego-protective reasons or for jealous motives.

Initial levels of liking and perceived competence had some moderating effects in a within-study design of individuals’ perceptions. In situations of negative deviance, if an individual had low initial liking for his or her coworker, only trustworthiness decreased, but if an individual had high initial liking for a coworker, trust, trustworthiness, and liking all decreased. It is possible that individuals hold different standards for those they like than for those who they do not like so the impact of a negative event is larger because of the violation of expectations of behaviour. In situations of negative deviance, competence did not affect the decrease in
perceptions, providing further support for the supremacy of morality information over competence information, and negative information over positive, in person perception.

Initial levels of liking and perceived competence also had some moderating effects on helping and psychological withdrawal. In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, helping significantly decreased for the high initial liking and competence conditions, which again could speak to the violation of expectations. The finding that low liking and competence did not affect helping behaviours is consistent with the idea that finding out about a coworker’s negative extra-organizational deviance only matters when the expectations for that coworker are higher.

The persistence of changed perceptions was not tested as part of this study, and it is possible that the moderating effects of liking and competence would have more impact over time. That is, as the immediacy of the knowledge of deviance passes, initial perceptions of liking and competence may play more of a moderating role.
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Study Three: Methodology and Results

The third study allowed for further exploration of real situations of extra-organizational deviance that the participants in the second study have experienced. For this study, detailed probing of the specific situations further clarified the actual experiences of extra-organizational deviance and its impact on the workplace.

Participants

Participants for the third study were solicited through Study Two. At the end of Study Two, participants were asked if they have had direct experience with extra-organizational deviance, positive or negative, in their workplace. Participants were asked to tell their story and provide contact information in order for the researcher to follow up with the participant. A total of 30 individuals responded with a situation but only 24 of them dealt with extra-organizational deviance. The other accounts dealt with situations more appropriately described as organizational deviance, such as fraud. Of the 24 situations that constituted extra-organizational deviance, only 21 provided contact information. All of these participants completed Study Three (17.5% of Study Two respondents). This response rate was lower than was hoped, but the subject matter is not necessarily one that people are comfortable talking about. Due to the sensitive nature of the material being discussed and the participants’ interest in privacy, participants were given the option to answer a series of questions through email or through an interview. Six participants completed email interviews and fifteen participants completed live interviews.
Procedure

Because each participant had written about their experience with extra-organizational deviance as part of the previous study, the interview questions were tailored to each participant. However, the questions all followed the same general format: the participant was asked about the nature of the extra-organizational deviance and to explain it in full detail if possible, his or her reactions to the extra-organizational deviance, how the perceptions of the coworker may have changed, and how the relationship with the coworker may have changed. Each participant was asked about the organization, and how their relationship with the organization as a whole may have changed as a result of the extra-organizational deviance of a coworker. An example of an individual’s extra-organizational deviance and the corresponding questions for Study Three can be found in Appendix H.

Results

Because these interviews were more free-ranging, drawing specifically on an experience of extra-organizational deviance, the results for this study are not as easily classified as were those of the first study. Similar to that study, the transcripts of interviews were reviewed for themes, in this case for those that were addressed in the second study, as a way to triangulate the research and provide additional context for the results of Study Two. Reactions to behaviours that could be labelled as specifically negative or positive deviance were markedly different, and each will be explored.

It is important to note that on a general level, without reference specifically to either negative or positive labelling of behaviours, participants expressed an expectation that personal and professional lives do mix. Individuals are aware of their coworkers’ personal stories, and in some cases the information that coworkers share is thought to enhance the workplace. On the
other hand, a desire for separation of the workplace and beyond the workplace also emerged: behaviours outside the workplace were also seen as none of the organization’s business.

**Negative extra-organizational deviance.** The respondents of Study 3 were more likely to discuss behaviours that were morally objectionable than they were to mention praiseworthy behaviours. Examples of extra-organizational deviance included extra-marital affairs, drug use, gambling, excessive drinking, and promiscuity. The perception of coworkers’ behaviour as negatively deviant clearly has a strong impact on attitudes and some behaviours of their workplace colleagues.

In keeping with a focus on interpersonal reactions, and consistent with the Study Two, loss of trust, respect, discomfort and a desire to avoid the deviant colleague or withdraw from the organization were all mentioned repeatedly. The loss of trust was the most prominent theme in situations of extra-organizational deviance (e.g. “I seem to have doubts about trusting him with critical projects. . . I have a mistrust that he will do the jobs to a level and satisfaction that I would expect and that the organization would expect”; “I wouldn’t trust her to care for a house plant of mine”). Participants also expressed misgivings about and a loss of respect for the judgements, maturity and ethics of coworkers who had engaged in negative extra-organizational deviance (e.g. “I lost respect for him. It made it hard for me to take him seriously on future projects”; “it was more of a situation of ‘you have really poor judgement’”).

As found in Study 2, competence does play a role in the understanding the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance, although thoughts about the exact nature of that role were paradoxical. Some participants indicated that competence would affect other perceptions negatively (e.g. “Some of it [the reaction] relates to a suspicion that his abilities to do a high level job and manage are compromised due to his extra-curricular activities. I'm more likely to
form an opinion as to his overall competence and would say that his motives and his trustworthiness are lower than I would expect to award additional levels of responsibility to”), but this was not the case for many participants (e.g. “It doesn't change my willingness to give them stuff or to engage them on projects or to trust them with things because I know what they're capable of”). Ultimately, many of the respondents of Study 3 did not question the competence of their coworkers they considered to be deviant, even though they did not trust or respect them.

Another reaction to the perception of negative extra-organizational behaviours was an increase in helping behaviours (e.g. “I think on an ad hoc basis everyone is gently providing assistance to try to reengage this person to a higher performance level.”). Although other respondents mentioned that they would quit if they could, so shocked and upset were they by their coworkers’ extra-organizational deviance, the prime focus of participants in the study was to help out their coworkers if that was possible.

Positive extra-organizational deviance. The reactions to behaviours that are perceived as positive deviance are markedly different from reactions to negative deviance, as was shown in Study 2. Examples of positive extra-organizational deviance included saving a child’s life, defending a weaker person, taking on commitments in the community, and donating time, money and organizational skills to a worthy cause. Because positive deviance was mentioned much less by the respondents, fewer examples were forthcoming. Nevertheless, recognition of positive effects emerged from the discussion.

The participants expressed the view that trust and respect increase for the coworker who engages in positive extra-organizational deviance, but this increase in positive evaluations does not necessarily translate into the work role. Participants also indicated that they are more willing to help out their coworkers who engage in these positive behaviours. Participants noted that
these coworkers could be sources of personal inspiration. There is a recognition that the positive behaviours that are engaged in outside of work represent a more well-rounded portrait of the coworker in question (e.g. “Here are many people who truly do valuable work on their own time and are far more interesting than they may appear at work.”).

Impact on organization. A key result in this study deals with the impact of extra-organizational deviance on the organization itself. The impact of such behaviours on the workplace makes intuitive sense, but this study provides some context to better explain the relationship. The effect of negative extra-organizational deviance was recognized as having the potential of “dragging the team down” and harming the organization itself (e.g. “It does a lot of damage to the team, to the morale, to a sense of what's right and wrong which is a definite need in the workplace”; “He makes decisions that can have negative consequence on himself and others and I don't want to risk his, what I perceive as a flawed decision process and a negative decision process, on my organization and my other staff and myself”). On the other hand, positive extra-organizational deviance was seen to have a positive impact on the workplace (e.g. “there's a lot of positive effect that happens in the workplace because of people doing things outside of work”).

Discussion

This study provided additional support for the findings of the previous studies, including and most obviously the considerable impact of negative extra-organizational deviance in the workplace. The detrimental effects of negative extra-organizational deviance on trust are reinforced through this study. This study also underscored the complexities in mixing personal and professional lives, particularly as it relates to assessments of competence and its resulting impact on other aspects of the workplace. Although there are some indications that competence
might play a moderating role, there are no clear patterns which emerge with competence, which adds to some perplexities of the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance.

One theme emerged in this study that was not necessarily possible in the other studies, which is the very real impact that extra-organizational deviance, both positive and negative, can have on the workplace itself. Because the participants in these studies were drawing on actual experiences, they were able to speak to the ways in which employees’ behaviour outside work can affect the organization as a whole. Extra-organizational deviance is not confined to the interpersonal relationship of the actor and perceiver; larger implications relating to the organization are also a part of this phenomenon.
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Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the three studies have illuminated the concept of extra-organizational deviance and its importance in organizational settings. Most importantly, this research has established extra-organizational deviance as a workplace phenomenon with real implications for interpersonal relationships at the workplace. The separation of personal and professional lives is not possible, and maybe not even desirable, so it is necessary for individuals and organizations to understand the ways in which deviant behaviours outside of work affect what happens at work.

Discussion of All Studies

This group of studies represents the first thorough examination of extra-organizational deviance that I am aware of in this field. There are some strong, interesting findings that have confirmed past research in labelling, person perception, and workplace relations, alongside findings that raise possibilities for research moving forward.

The primary finding of this research, aside from the existence of extra-organizational deviance itself, is the substantial differences in the reactions to positive and negative extra-organizational deviance. All three studies confirmed that not only was negative extra-organizational deviance a more prominent occurrence in terms of the type of extra-organizational deviance, but it also had more pronounced impacts on the workplace than positive extra-organizational deviance. In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, individuals judged their coworker very negatively across the board. Trust, liking and perceptions of trustworthiness decreased markedly. This pattern also extended to behavioural reactions: helping behaviours also declined in situations of negative deviance. Perceptions of competence were not
substantially altered by the knowledge of negative deviance, although personal anecdotes in the qualitative part of this research suggested some paradoxical findings on this variable.

The impact of positive extra-organizational deviance was muted at best in these three studies. Although it was expected that positive extra-organizational deviance would have a positive impact on attitudes and behaviours, the results of Study Two did not support this prediction. However, anecdotal evidence from Study Three provided some support from actual workplace situations of increases in trust, liking and trustworthiness, and suggested a positive influence on the workplace environment. Based on the results of this study, it is reasonable to expect that positive extra-organizational deviance can have a significant impact in the workplace. It is important, therefore, to further develop the construct of positive extra-organizational deviance in order to more fully consider its impact.

Consistent with labelling theory, the intention of the three studies was to focus on the perceiver to understand how individuals deal with a coworker’s deviant behaviour that occurs outside work. The process of labelling proposed by Kitsuse (1962) received support through all of the studies. The first part of Kitsuse’s model involves interpreting behaviour as deviant, and Studies One and Three in particular provided support for this step. Study Two provided scenarios of exceptional behaviours, which were not defined as positive or negative, normal or deviant, and here too the respondents, in changing their attitudes and behaviours, interpreted these behaviours as deviant. This necessary step of interpretation encourages and allows for variation in what is considered deviance. The wide variety of behaviours that participants discussed in the interviews of the first and third studies suggests that the process of interpreting behaviour as deviant is something that is not difficult to do. The next step of the labelling process concerns defining people who engage in behaviours which have been interpreted as
deviant as a certain kind of deviant. Judgements made as part of this step in the process constitute attitudinal reactions to deviance, and this step was supported by the findings from all three studies. In particular, in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, individuals perceived their coworkers as less trustworthy, and they liked and trusted their coworkers less as well. The final step of the labelling process deals with according the appropriate treatment to the deviants. While the “appropriate treatment” was hypothesized to entail behavioural reactions of withdrawal and changes in helping, the findings suggested more that appropriate treatment in a workplace may be more social and psychological disrespect, distrust and disapproval while continuing to adhere to the expectations of workplace requirements of tolerating the coworker, regardless of the deviance. Thus Kitsuse’s third step also received support in all three studies.

Limitations

There are some limitations in this research that need to be acknowledged. First, there is a lack of control in the research setting because, especially in Study Two, this research was conducted in settings that were extremely varied. This lack of control means that there was a restriction of range for certain variables such that these variables could not be as cleanly assessed as if they had been manipulated in a more controlled setting. One example of variables that would benefit from greater control is liking and competence: in the current research, the participants had a generally high level of liking and perceived competence for their coworkers, so the effects of both competence and liking may not have been as easily assessed as if these variables had been manipulated in a laboratory setting. It is possible to manipulate both these variables experimentally in studies of person perception (e.g. Finkel, Campbell, Brunell, et al., 2006); a laboratory setting would be appropriate as a next step in this research.
The within-subjects design of Study Two raises concerns about history (that is, outside events occurring that might have an impact on the results, such as the coworker in question behaving in such a way that the individual’s perception of that coworker was altered in the intervening time between the questionnaires). However, the possible negative effects of this issue were attenuated through the specific instructions participants received to focus on the vignette and picture their coworker in that particular situation. The time lapse of one week allowed for separation of the measures, but was not too lengthy a time as to allow for significant history effects.

A further limitation is the use of vignettes in Study Two. The vignettes represent artificial situations to which it may be difficult for participants to react. For example, it might be hard to imagine an older, sedentary coworker being a nationally-ranked triathlete. The third study addressed such concerns about artificiality by focusing on situations drawn from real life experiences.

Theoretical Implications

The research makes several important contributions, the first being that it explores this workplace occurrence and establishes it as an area worthy of study. While the topic of extra-organizational deviance is becoming more prevalent in the popular press, the field of organizational behaviour has yet to explore this important and growing phenomenon. Further, while the popular press focuses on the reputational experience of the organizations when dealing with extra-organizational deviance (e.g. Hymowitz, 2007), this study looks at the coworker relationship in order to understand the impact that a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance can have on other individuals at the workplace.
Another major contribution is the application of labelling theory in an organizational setting. Ashforth and Humphrey (1997) noted the need to pursue organizational research that examines the dynamics of labelling when dealing with novel or ambiguous social objects. In studying extra-organizational deviance and the processes around its perception, the current research answers Ashforth and Humphrey’s call. This research adds to the body of research that shows how labelling processes have an impact in organizations.

Finally, by focusing on extra-organizational deviance, this research has examined another aspect of the potential difficulties in reconciling personal and professional lives. While much work has been done on work-family issues, the particular dynamic studied here has not previously been explored.

**Practical Implications**

The results of this research present an interesting challenge for organizations. In situations of negative extra-organizational deviance, the resulting negative perceptions could drive a wedge in workplace relationships, which could be a difficult thing to manage. Situations of positive extra-organizational deviance could also take the focus away from work. While it may be appropriate to suggest that employees refrain from discussing their activities outside of work, it is not realistic because it is apparent that knowledge of extra-organizational deviance is going to surface at the workplace. Furthermore, a blanket ban on discussing activities outside of work could have a number of other negative consequences as well, especially since, as expressed in the third study, many people want to know about what goes on in their coworkers’ lives outside of work, and workplace morale may actually benefit. What is necessary, then, particularly in cases of negative extra-organizational deviance, is an understanding of the consequences not only from a potentially legal standpoint but also with an eye to preventing (or
repairing) harm to the interpersonal relationships in the workplace. For example, managers may need to encourage the rebuilding of trust if it is negatively affected. More rigorous hiring policies might also deal with some of these issues on the front end.

Another practical implication of this research is that individuals need to be aware that coworkers’ knowledge of what they do outside of work can result in negative evaluations, particularly as it relates to trust, trustworthiness and liking. It can also result in fewer helping behaviours being demonstrated to that person. What happens outside of work does not stay outside of work.

The idea that one individual’s behaviour in his or her personal life can affect another individual’s behaviour in his or her professional life is captivating, and becomes even more so when one considers the potential ramifications at the organizational level. Levinson (1965) suggested that through transference, people generalize their feelings about individuals within the organization to the organization as a whole. An individual’s negative evaluation of his or her coworker could colour his or her perceptions of the organization. For the organization itself, the risk of having employees who are negatively evaluated is the potential dissatisfaction of employees who have to work alongside them. Situations of positive extra-organizational deviance are not necessarily beneficial for the organization, since there is not an equivalent positive impact and there may even be a negative one if employees’ focus is taken off work.

Future Research Directions

There are a number of different areas that should be pursued in order to have a greater understanding of the phenomenon of extra-organizational deviance. First, the phenomenon should be studied from the point of view of the actor, not just the perceiver. One question that could be addressed is how an individual’s performance at work is affected by that individual’s
extra-organizational deviance. For example, it is plausible that a situation of negative extra-organizational deviance could result in improved performance (the individual compensates for negative extra-organizational deviance by improving performance at work), status quo, or decreased performance (the negative extra-organizational deviance is detrimental to work performance). The dynamics that lead to one result or another should be examined. Also from the point of view of the actor, it is important to understand the meta-perceptions (Kenny, 1994) that exist; that is, how the actor reacts to his or her coworkers reacting to him or her. Previous research has demonstrated the importance of meta-perception: research on disclosure for gay men and lesbians has found that reactions from coworkers are significantly related to a number of job attitudes held by the gay men and lesbians who disclose (Griffith & Hebl, 2002). In terms of extra-organizational deviance, it would be valuable to investigate the ways in which the deviants’ attitudes are affected by the way their coworkers react to them.

An additional avenue of research deals with the disclosure of extra-organizational deviance, more specifically how an individual finds out about the extra-organizational deviance of his or her coworker. It is possible that reactions to a coworker’s extra-organizational deviance will depend on the way in which an individual is informed of it. For example, in a situation of negative extra-organizational deviance, a coworker may be more likely to help out a coworker who self-discloses than a coworker for whom the information is found out in a less direct manner. Confession, specifically including remorse, has been found to be an effective positive impression formation strategy (Gold & Weiner, 2000) which should be investigated in situations of negative extra-organizational deviance. In a positive extra-organizational deviance situation, modesty concerns may dictate that individuals should not “toot their own horns” but allow others to do that for them.
It will also be important to explore the individual and organizational factors that have an impact on extra-organizational deviance as well as the reactions to it. For example, the organizational role of both the perceiver and the actor may affect perceptions of extra-organizational deviance. Previous research has found that subordinates judge superiors more harshly than they judge their peers or their own subordinates (Erber & Fiske, 1984), while other research has found that powerholders are particularly susceptible to stereotyping their subordinates in negative and unfounded ways (Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske & Yzerbyt, 2000). At the organizational level, factors such as organizational culture or industry could be examined. An organizational culture that is closed and judgemental would lead to different relationships for experiences of extra-organizational deviance than a culture that is open and supportive.

Finally, the differences and similarities between organizational deviance and extra-organizational deviance need to be assessed. Reactions of coworkers have not been a primary focus of organizational deviance literature, so labelling theory has not been applied in this area. Since the usefulness of the framework has been established for extra-organizational deviance, it would be appropriate to apply the framework in situations of organizational deviance in order to understand whether the findings would be consistent for deviance at work as well as for deviance outside of work. One study that dealt with both work- and non-work-related transgressions found that work-related transgressions were perceived as more serious than non-work-related transgressions (Riordan, Marlin & Kellogg, 1983). However, the results of the current research indicate that there are indeed effects of extra-organizational deviance, even if they may not be perceived as being as serious as organizational deviance.
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Appendix A: Letter of Information – Study 1

Dear {participant},

I am currently studying organizational behaviour in the doctoral program at the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto. My research focuses on the interplay of personal and professional life. This is a pilot study, where a small number of people will be interviewed. I would very much appreciate your assistance by taking about 20-30 minutes to answer some questions I have for you. With your permission, I will tape our interview.

You will be given an identifying number and your name will not be connected to the information collected in the interview in any way. The information collected will be used only for the purpose of this research. Confidentiality is totally assured. No individual data will be presented in my research report, and no one’s identity will be revealed. Only I will have access to the full interviews; they will be kept encrypted on a secure computer. If you agree to have your interview taped, the tapes will be destroyed once the information has been transcribed.

Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the research at any time without penalty. While I would appreciate you answering all of the questions in the interview, please feel free to disregard any question you do not want to answer. Once the study is completed, a copy of the results will be available to you.

If you are willing to take part in this study, please complete the attached consent form. If you have any questions about this study and your participation, please contact me at 416-978-7019 or at rowbotham@rotman.utoronto.ca. Professor Hugh Gunz, my supervisor, can be reached at 905-828-5461 or at hugh.gunz@utoronto.ca. Additionally, you can contact Dean Sharpe at the University of Toronto’s Research Ethics Board at 416-978-5855 with any questions. Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kate Rowbotham
PhD Candidate
Rotman School of Management
Appendix B: Interview Protocol – Study 1

Participants will receive a copy of the information letter and a consent form to sign and return to the researcher. Participants will be reminded that their responses are strictly confidential and will be kept anonymous. The interview will be free-flowing, in that participants will be welcome to lead the conversation.

Participants will be told that the researcher would like to talk about what their coworkers do outside of work. The following areas may be probed:

- How much do you know about what your coworkers do outside of work?
- Are there any behaviours that your coworkers engage in that you find questionable? Please do not name the coworker you are thinking of, but just tell me the behaviours.
- How does knowing about those behaviours affect the way you think about your coworker?
- Think of a coworker you trust. Do not name him or her. Imagine if you found out he or she did something reprehensible outside of work. How might this affect your relations with this coworker?
- Would it make a difference depending on how much you liked or disliked the coworker? How?
- Would it make a difference how competent the coworker is? How?
Title of research project:
*Interactions of Personal and Professional Lives in the Workplace*

Investigators:
This research is being conducted by Kate Rowbotham, a PhD student at the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto under the supervision of Dr. Hugh Gunz. If you have any questions or problems associated with this research you may contact Kate Rowbotham at (613) 389-9957 or rowbotham@rotman.utoronto.ca or Dr. Gunz at (905) 828-5461 or hugh.gunz@utoronto.ca

Background & Purpose of Research:
This research is part of my PhD thesis at the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto. This study will contribute to the growing body of knowledge about how personal and professional lives interact in the workplace. The total number of participants is unknown. The primary research interest is Canadian participants but all are encouraged to participate. You will be able to indicate your country of residence within the survey.

Invitation to participate:
You are being invited to participate in this research to share your experiences in the workplace. To participate in this study you must have at least three years of full-time work experience (or the equivalent).

Voluntary Participation & Early Withdrawal:
Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time with no adverse consequences. This study involves the completion of a variety of questions about you, your workplace and your coworkers.

The study is estimated to take about 20 – 30 minutes of your time in two different surveys. The two surveys will be separated by approximately one week. Participating in this study is completely voluntary and you may stop at any time or decide not to answer questions that feel uncomfortable.

Risks/Benefits:
The anticipated risks are minimal. There are no direct benefits to participants other than the opportunity to contribute to knowledge of about the intersection of personal and professional lives in the workplace. There is no compensation for participation in this study.
Privacy & Confidentiality:
All of the data collected will remain completely anonymous. Only people associated with the study will see the responses. All data will be kept on a secure computer and access to the computer will be secured by use of specific passwords known only to the research team. No information will be released or printed that would disclose any personal identity.

Because there are two questionnaires associated with this study, you will be asked for your birth date and mother’s maiden name as a means of matching your two questionnaires. This information will be deleted once the two questionnaires have been matched. At the end of the first questionnaire, you will be asked for your email address so the second questionnaire can be sent to you. Your email address will be stored in a separate file from your responses, so will not be connected to them in any way.

There will be no way in which your responses can be traced back to a particular computer or individual. The survey does not require the participants to accept “cookies” (small text files placed on the user’s computer) or send identifying information from the participant’s computer.

Dissemination of findings:
You can request a summary of the study findings by e-mailing the primary researcher at rowbotham@rotman.utoronto.ca and requesting that a summary be sent to you once the study has been completed.

Your consent is implied by your completion of the attached survey. Thanks, once again, for your time and cooperation in assisting me with this study. If you have any questions, now or later, you may contact me at the telephone number or e-mail address listed above. You may print a copy of this consent form for your records before you proceed to the survey.

Please pass this link on to others may be interested in participating anonymously.

Clicking on the button below will begin the survey. Continuing on to answer the study questions indicates that you have read and understood the content of this Consent Form and that you consent to participate in this project. Thank you.
Appendix D: Questionnaire – Study 2

Questionnaire – Time 1 and Time 2

[The same questionnaire will be used at Time 1 and Time 2. The vignettes that will be added at Time 2 are in a separate appendix.]

Note: The “X” seen throughout this questionnaire will be filled in with the name of the coworker in question.

In the first section, you are asked to consider the competence of your co-worker X. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X is very capable of performing his/her job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X is known to be successful at the things he/she tries to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X has much knowledge about the word that needs to be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very confident about X’s skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X has specialized capabilities that can increase the organization’s performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X is well qualified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often concerned about whether X can handle the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X seems to do an efficient job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section asks for your perceptions of your co-worker’s helpfulness towards you. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X is very concerned about my welfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My needs and desires are very important to X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X really looks out for what is important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X will go out of his/her way to help me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident that X will always try to treat me fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are now asked to consider the integrity of your co-worker. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X has a strong sense of justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never have to wonder if X will stick to his/her word.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X tries hard to be fair in dealings with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X’s actions and behaviours are not very consistent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like X’s values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sound principles seem to guide X's behaviour.

In this next section, you are asked to consider how trusting you are of your co-worker. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I had my way, I wouldn't let X have any influence over issues that are important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to let X have complete control over my future in this company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be comfortable giving X a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor their actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I got into difficulties at work I know X would try and help me out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can trust X to lend me a hand if I need it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X can be relied upon to do as he/she says he/she will do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X would get on with his/her work even if supervisors were not around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can rely on X not to make my job more difficult by careless work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now you are asked to consider how you interact with your co-worker. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with X is a pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my co-worker X very much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get along well with my co-worker X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help X out if he/she falls behind in his/her work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I willingly share my expertise with X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to act like a peacemaker when X has disagreements with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take steps to prevent problems with X.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I willingly give of my time to help X when he/she has work-related problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I touch base with X before initiating actions that might affect him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage X when he/she is down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now you are asked to consider how you interact with your co-worker. Indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I really throw myself into my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I am so into my job that I lose track of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is all consuming: I am totally into it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mind often wanders, and I think of other things when doing my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am highly engaged in this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job allows me opportunities for personal growth and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like being a member of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this next section, you are asked to consider how often you engage in the following behaviours at work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Twice a month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>2 or 3 times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking of being absent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatting with other coworkers about non-work topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending work time on personal matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting less effort into the job than you should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking of leaving the current job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting others do your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading rumours or gossip about coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively planning to leave the current job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, you are asked to provide some information about yourself. [This section will only appear in the first questionnaire.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>[ ] Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>[ ] 21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 46-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 51-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 56-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Over 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>[ ] 0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 6-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Time with Current Organization**

- [ ] 11-15
- [ ] 16-20
- [ ] 21-25
- [ ] 26-30
- [ ] Over 30

**Industry** Dropdown Menu

**Country** Dropdown Menu

**Province/State** Dropdown Menu

**Ethnic Heritage**

- [ ] White
- [ ] Chinese
- [ ] South Asian (e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
- [ ] Black
- [ ] Filipino
- [ ] Latin American
- [ ] Southeast Asian (e.g. Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, Laotian, etc.)
- [ ] Arab
- [ ] West Asian (e.g. Iranian, Afghan, etc.)
- [ ] Korean
- [ ] Japanese
- [ ] Other (please specify)

---

**[The following section will appear only in the second questionnaire.]**

Do you have any stories to share about blending personal and professional lives in your workplace? Perhaps a coworker has engaged in questionable behaviours outside of work. Or, maybe a coworker has done something really admirable outside of work. Please feel free to share your stories in the space below, but remember to not use real names.

Can I contact you about your story? If so, please note the best ways and times to contact you. This information will be kept separately from the rest of your responses and will not be able to be linked in any way.

---

**[End of Questionnaire]**
Appendix E: Vignettes – Study 2

Vignettes

[Note that the name and gender of the colleague will be filled in with the name provided by the participant.]

Vignette 1
Reading the newspaper yesterday, you have just found out that your colleague, _____________, was recently honoured by the Lifesaving Society by receiving their “Rescue Award of Merit”. The citation is given to people who recognize an emergency, and willing to intervene and show good judgment. Your colleague was recognized for rescuing a child who had fallen through the ice on a pond by using clothing as a rope and crawling out onto the ice to pull the child to safety. Your colleague hadn’t even told people at work about the rescue. The newspaper report stated that your colleague was more pleased about the opportunity to save the child rather than receiving accolades.

Vignette 2
Reading the newspaper yesterday, you have just found out that your colleague, _____________, recently ranked in the top 10 finishers at a national triathlon competition, and won his/her age category. The triathlon combines a 1.5 kilometre swim, a 40 kilometre bicycle ride and a 10 kilometre run. The article stated that the main prerequisites are stamina, drive and mental toughness. You knew that your colleague was training, but you had no idea about the level of competition.

Vignette 3
Your colleague, _____________, yesterday confided in you that he/she recently had a one-night stand with an old flame he/she ran into at a social event. Your colleague seemed to show no remorse. You know that your colleague is in a committed, long-term relationship with his/her partner.

Vignette 4
Reading the newspaper yesterday, you have just found out that your colleague, _____________, is facing drug charges after police busted a marijuana grow operation at your colleague’s residence and seized 325 marijuana plants. The potential street value of the plants, according to police, is about $325,000. Police also seized equipment used to produce the marijuana, which they estimate to be worth $10,000. Your colleague is charged with producing a controlled substance, possession for the purpose of trafficking and possession of a controlled substance.
Appendix F: Information Letter – Study 3

Title of research project:
Interactions of Personal and Professional Lives in the Workplace

Investigators:
This research is being conducted by Kate Rowbotham, a PhD student at the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto under the supervision of Dr. Hugh Gunz. If you have any questions or problems associated with this research you may contact Kate Rowbotham at (613) 389-9957 or rowbotham@rotman.utoronto.ca or Dr. Gunz at (905) 828-5461 or hugh.gunz@utoronto.ca

Background & Purpose of Research:
This research is part of my PhD thesis at the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto. This study will contribute to the growing body of knowledge about how personal and professional lives interact in the workplace. The total number of participants is unknown.

Invitation to participate:
You are being invited to participate in this research because you indicated that you had a story to share about blending personal and professional lives in the workplace. To participate in this study you must have at least three years of full-time work experience (or the equivalent).

Voluntary Participation & Early Withdrawal:
Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time with no adverse consequences. This study involves the completion of a variety of questions about you, your workplace and your coworkers.

The study is estimated to take about 20 – 30 minutes. Participating in this study is completely voluntary and you may stop at any time or decide not to answer questions that feel uncomfortable. With your permission, I will tape our interview.

Risks/Benefits:
The anticipated risks are minimal. There are no direct benefits to participants other than the opportunity to contribute to knowledge of about the intersection of personal and professional lives in the workplace. There is no compensation for participation in this study.
**Privacy & Confidentiality:**
All of the data collected will be totally anonymous. You will be given an identifying number and your name will not be connected to the information collected in the interview in any way. The information collected will be used only for the purpose of this research. Confidentiality is totally assured. No individual data will be presented in my research report, and no one’s identity will be revealed. Only I will have access to the full interviews; they will be kept encrypted on a secure computer. If you agree to have your interview taped, the tapes will be destroyed once the information has been transcribed.

**Dissemination of findings:**
You can request a summary of the study findings by e-mailing the primary researcher at rowbotham@rotman.utoronto.ca and requesting that a summary be sent to you once the study has been completed.

If you are willing to take part in this study, please complete the attached consent form. If you have any questions about this study and your participation, please contact me at 613-389-9957 or at rowbotham@rotman.utoronto.ca. Professor Hugh Gunz, my supervisor, can be reached at 905-828-5461 or at hugh.gunz@utoronto.ca. Additionally, you can contact Dean Sharpe at the University of Toronto’s Research Ethics Board at 416-978-5855 with any questions. Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kate Rowbotham
**PhD Candidate**
**Rotman School of Management**
Appendix G: Consent Form – Study 3

Participant Name: ________________________________________________

I have read the letter of information; all questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that I will be participating in a study about the interplay of personal and professional life. I understand that my involvement will consist of answering questions in an interview.

I am aware that I can contact Kate Rowbotham, her supervisor, or Dean Sharpe at the Research Ethics Board with any questions, concerns, or complaints.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time.

I have been assured that my confidentiality will be maintained.

Name: __________________________________________________

Signature: ______________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________

Further, I agree to have my interview taped. I understand that the tapes will be destroyed once the information is transcribed and all information will be completely anonymous.

Name: __________________________________________________

Signature: ______________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________
Appendix H: Sample Interview Schedule – Study 3

Situation: I worked with a woman who was into Goth culture and she confided in me that she participated in alternative activities like S&M. She also practiced paganism. After knowing this information I interpreted her actions in a different, somewhat more negative/strange light.

[verbatim from response to Study Two]

Questions to start with:

Can you tell me more about the coworker in question? (Liking, competence, trust)?

Can you tell me more about how you found out about her activities outside of work?

How did you react when your coworker told you about her involvement in S&M and paganism? (changes in interactions, perceptions)

You indicated that you interpreted her actions differently after you found out? Can you expand on what you mean by this?

How did other members of your organization react to this coworker?