

**Comparative Study**

## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

Thapar, Rohini.<sup>1</sup>, Brar, Sherry<sup>2\*</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

Counterproductive workplace behaviour amid employees is a global issue faced by majority of organizations. It is the type of behaviour that is intentional and violates organizational norms and behaviour such as decreased productivity, job dissatisfaction, high turnover, rumour-mongering- all of which effects work performance and precipitates financial loss to the organization. To neutralize the harmful effects of counterproductivity and its propensity to morally disengage and to neutralize the effect of unethical behaviour at workplace, it is essential to observe and monitor it closely. The objective of this paper is to assess and report counterproductive dispositions and moral disengagement between two different organizations, namely police personnel and industrial employees. To screen counterproductivity 32-items counterproductive work behaviour –Checklist by Spector and Fox et al., (2006) and propensity to morally disengage by Celia Moore et al., (2012) has been utilized. CWB is a multidimensional objective self-report 5-point Likert tool that measures dimensions such as abuse, production deviance sabotage, theft and withdrawal and propensity for Moral Disengagement is an objective 16-item multidimensional 7-point Likert tool. For research purpose, the sample has been divided into two groups, namely policemen in officer rank (N=200) and industrial employees at managerial level (N=50) and for analysis descriptive statistics and unequal independent t-ratio has been applied to study the differences in counterproductivity level and PMD at different dimensions. The results suggest that although, both groups scored low on all counterproductive dimensions yet except for sabotage significant differences were found in all other dimensions, including overall score of CWB. Consequently, the results suggest that police personnel were more likely to indulge in counterproductive work behaviour in the terms of abuse, production deviance, employee theft, withdrawal and overall scores for CWB as compared to industrial managers. Also, the results regarding PMD imply that police personnel have higher tendency to morally disengage in terms of diffusion of responsibility, attribution of blame and moral justification than industrial managers.

<sup>1</sup>Asst Prof., Dept of Psychology, D.A.V. College, Chandigarh, India

<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, Dept of Psychology, D.A.V. College, Chandigarh, India

\*Corresponding Author

**Received: March 29, 2022; Revision Received: June 26, 2022; Accepted: June 30, 2022**

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

**Keywords:** CWB=Counterproductive work behaviour, abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft and withdrawal, moral disengagement, PMD=propensity to morally disengage, moral justification, euphemistic labelling, advantageous comparison, displacement of responsibility diffusion of responsibility, distortion of consequences, dehumanization and attribution of blame.

An organization is a place where people, with the divergent credentials and varied interests, are convened together on a shared platform, working on the way to predefined goals and objectives. Occasionally professionals in the organizations and industries revel in unethical behaviour or actions as exhibited by Satyam Computer Service scandal (2009), Coal allocation scam (2012), Indian Saradha group financial scandal (2013). Aforementioned cases of deceitful and corrupt behaviour in organizations and industries have extracted a substantial harm on innocent people. Hence, with surge in the dishonourable corporate debacles overtime society has solicited from professional bodies to investigate the perpetrators and provocateur of such behaviour. As a result, the methodical study of behavioural ethics in organizations began to take shape in late 1980's. Contrarily, unethical behaviours at workplace are opposite to the set code of conduct established by an organization. Such behaviour can contaminate organizations, for instance -whether it is a shared relationship between employees, the employee customer dealings, through avoidance or delaying of work purposefully, turnover etc. Thereby, decreasing the efficiency of organization. *Such deviance in behaviour jeopardises the organizational functioning as it hinders its progress towards achievement of goals and well-being of the employees working for it, delays procedures.*

Sackett and DeVore (2001) defined CWB as intentional behaviour on the part of an organizational member that is opposing to the interests of the organization and endangers the well-being of the organizational members and organization itself (Robinson and Bennet,1995). Similarly, Vardi and Wiener, 1996; O'Leary-Kelley et.al, 1996; Vardi and Weitz 2003, documented Cwb as premeditated and defined CWB as an intentional action by the employees that abuses the fundamental organizational or societal norms. Managing such counter normative behaviour has been challenging and a source of concern to the organization. Therefore, *recently considerable attention has been paid CWB, as the manifestation of such behaviour has important repercussions on the organization itself as well as on the economical, sociological and psychological well-being of the employees (Aubé, Rousseau et al., 2009). For instance, being rude or using abusive language to the customers or co-workers, damaging organizational property, taking departmental stationery without prior approval etc. (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997). Such counterproductive behaviour affects the performance of the organization and are termed as counterproductive work behaviour (Fox et.al, 1999) or workplace deviant behaviour (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Irrespective of the conceptual differences among the various constructs of negative behaviour these are more or less interchangeable constructs since they share common framework such as: a) all behaviour is intentional, (b) infringing on organizational norms, (c) aiming to hurt organization or co-workers or both.* Additionally, Einarsen et al. (1999) documented that workplace bullying (i.e., comprising of aggressive verbal and non-verbal acts such as harassing, antisocial behaviour), withholding important information, sabotage, intimidating co-workers has also adverse effect on the organization as a whole.

## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

### ***The Nature of Counterproductive Work Behaviour***

As CWB is an intentional behaviour that intends to harm both the organization or co-workers working in the organization. Behaviour that encompasses acts that are hostile, involve damaging organizational property or passive acts such as deliberately working slowly or withholding of essential information. As CWB is generic term covering wide range of behaviour from offensive interpersonal behaviour (like being rude to co-workers or customers) to behaviour directed towards inert objects (such as theft or sabotage), to knowingly doing work inaccurately or withdrawing from work in the terms of absent or coming late for work (Rotundo et al., 2002). All such acts compromise the functioning and efficiency of the organization. The range of counterproductive behaviour can vary in severity from insignificant infractions such as stealing a pen to serious felonies such as embezzling funds from the organization. Robinson and Bennet (1995) classified counterproductive work behaviour in workplace in the following dimensions: Productive Deviance (e.g. delay, unpunctuality), Property Deviance (e.g. damaging or destroying of property), Political Deviance (e.g. Spreading rumours or favouritism) and Personal aggression (e.g. workplace bullying & sexual harassment).

Limited meta-analytic studies have been undertaken to measure the relationship between counterproductive work behaviour and its antecedents (such as personality, values and beliefs, cognitive moral development; job injustice as well as contextual factors such as work etiquettes, ethical climate or culture) as descriptive factors in individual wrong doings (O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Researchers (Robinson and Bennet, 1995; Fox and Spector, 1999) have consolidated the theory of CWB and its underlying causes. According to Martinko, Gundlach and Douglas, (2002) CWB is aimed at harming organization which included social and situational factors and behaviour, targeting specific individuals in the organization that included individual factors, such as personal dispositions. Lau, Au and Ho, (2003) further expanded social and situational factors into three determinants and categorised them as under:

- A) Personal or Individual factors:** These are collective qualities (such as demographic profile, personality dispositions and abilities, attitudes and beliefs of an individual to perceived stress and coping strategies) among employees exhibiting counterproductive behaviour.
- B) Situational or social factors:** Every organization affects employees in one way or another. Thus, the reactions that are formed by such effects are circumscribed in situational or social factors which are further classified into three parts:
  - i) *Organizational factors:* Factors that include pay incentives, work performance and appraisal, difficult work experience such as harsh supervision, role conflict and ambiguity (Chen and Spector, 1992; Spector and Fox, 2005; Bruk-Lee and Spector, 2006; Diefendorff and Mehta, 2007; Mitchell and Ambrose, 2007).
  - ii) *Work factors:* these are the causes related to the nature of job such as workplace victimization and workplace hostility (Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy and Alberts, 2007), personal and interpersonal conflict, along with job stress (Vasse and Colleagues 1998).
  - iii) *Environmental factors:* factors such as sound (Melamed, Fried and Froom, 2001), too much or too less light (Gifford 1996), crowded work space (Brill et al., 2001), culture and climate (Schneider et al.,2011).

Since CWB are voluntary acts and do not include unintentional or deliberate acts. The motive behind such behaviour ranges from perception of organizational injustice, job insecurity or interpersonal conflict etc. As CWB is damaging to the organization, therefore, it is imperative

## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

to contemplate on counterproductive behaviours when hiring employees and when executing human resource functions (like performance appraisal), evaluating personality style that suits the job requirements and recruiting employees who can handle the pressures entailing the job. Once the stress of the job goes beyond an employee's endurance, thereafter their work attitude and behaviour starts to deteriorate (Erera-Weatherley, 1996). Research studies by Sacket and DeVore (2002) and Martinko, Gundlack and Douglas (2002) stated that counterproductive work behaviour characterizes negative employee reactions that encroach upon the legitimate interests of the organization (e.g., organizational misconduct or misbehaviour).

Likewise, an investigation by Robinson and Bennet (1995) suggested that work place deviance is the intentional behaviour of organizational members that contravenes significant organizational rules, and in doing so, endangers the wellbeing of the organizational members and the organization itself. Employees exhibiting CWB are very likely to experience stress related problems and have higher turnover rates (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin and Glew, 1996) also, they are more likely to have lower self-esteem with low self-confidence, manifested frequently in focus of physical and psychological pain (Griffin, O'Leary and Collins 1998). Therefore, to study the intentional behaviour underlying causes behind the CWB, it is important to identify personal, psychological and job role stressors that motivates such behaviour.

Nevertheless, indulging in the acts of counterproductivity does not transpire on its own and in isolation rather these acts can circulate within the framework of complicated social settings infused with social norms, shared values and behaviour patterns attained during socialization (Schein, 1999). Therefore, to understand the underlying cause behind counterproductive work behaviour, it is important to understand the role of socio-cognitive processes such as moral disengagement. Moral disengagement is a socio-cognitive defense mechanism that deactivate moral self-regulations, thereby resulting in corrupt or dishonest behaviour (Bandura, 1986).

Bandura (1999) conceptualized the concept of moral disengagement as a result of social and psychological manoeuvring through which self-censorship is extricated from ruthless misbehaviour, so as to suppress self-regulatory mechanism during the process of moral reasoning. As moral disengagement is a multidimensional construct, Bandura (1990) suggested eight manifestations of moral disengagement namely: *moral justification, euphemistic labelling, advantageous comparison, displacement of responsibility, diffusion of responsibility, distortion of consequences, dehumanization and attribution of blame.*

The unethical behaviour is aided by employing cognitive defense mechanism via deactivating the cognitive link between self-regulation and transgressive behaviour that was supposed to have been restrained and prohibited in the first place. Therefore, these eight categories of moral disengagement form a consistent group of cognitive defense mechanism that an individual engages while taking ethical decision making.

According to Detert, Trevino and Sweitzer (2008) moral disengagement has been described as a process of deactivating moral self-regulation that liberates an individual from self-incrimination. Thus, enabling an individual to isolate themselves from the dilemma of self-censure so as to cope with the resulting guilt.

## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

Several studies have affirmed the role of moral disengagement while explaining counterproductive work behavior that violates norms of the organization. Behavior such as organizational corruption and corporate misconduct (Bandura et al., 2000; Barsky, Islam, Zyphur and Johnson, 2006; Moore, 2008; Barsky, 2011), transgressing moral and legal codes of conduct and participating in unethical behavior (Brief, Buttram and Dukerich, 2014), and breaching security policies (Barbaranelli and Perna, 2004)

Farnese, Tramontano, Fida and Paciello (2011) reported that it is important to observe the context in which the gross misconduct is frequently embodied through moral cognitive distortions. Since the misbehaviour is contingent upon the context which generated such misbehaviour therefore, it is important to identify the circumstances which without ascertaining, may in turn, generate a collective “Moral Disengagement Culture” or “Organizational moral disengagement” in which these unfair cognitive mechanisms could be learnt, associated, activated and consorted, thereby legitimizing counterproductive work-behavior.

However, Moore (2008) posited that PMD operates as a mediator between individual and context, and as it can be learnt the mechanism of moral disengagement are termed as “malleable”. This implies that, overtime individuals use such cognitive restructuring, which becomes crystallized over a period of time from repetitive utilization while dealing with job stressors, in so doing justifying their aggressive reactions and flouting organizational norms (Paciello, Fida, Tramontano, Lupinetti and Caprara, 2008).

Henceforth, the present study is an attempt to study such tendencies to morally disengage and indulge in CWB in a profession like police, which unfortunately may have developed such an image amongst the common mind. But alongside, an attempt is also made to assess similar tendencies amongst a comparison group of industrial managers to ascertain if such tendencies are universal to work settings or are typically associated with certain professions.

The research hypotheses are as follows:

H<sub>1</sub>: There will be significant differences between police personnel and industrial managers on counterproductive work behaviour.

H<sub>2</sub>: There will be significant differences between police personnel and industrial managers on propensity to morally disengage.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Sample and Procedure:** This research investigation is an attempt to assess the level of counterproductive tendencies between police personnel and managers. For this purpose, a sample group of 200 police personnel (belonging to the rank of Inspectors, sub-inspector, and assistant sub-inspector), within the age range of 30 to 45 years were compared with a group of 50 industrial middle level managers (foremen, supervisors and floor managers). Both groups were matched in terms of age, gender, marital status and work experience. The main aim was to investigate the inclination to indulge in CWB and morally disengage in different environment. The following tools were administered to them in individual settings. The following tools were administered to them in individual settings.

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

### **Tools:**

- 1) Socio-demographic profile sheet: A socio-demographic profile sheet was designed and administered to seek information regarding samples' year of experience, age, marital status etc.
- 2) Counterproductive Work Behaviour Checklist-32 (CWB-C) items (by Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh and Kessler, 2006): To screen counterproductivity in an organisation, CWB-C consisting of 32 items (by Spector & Fox et al, 2006) was used. The CWB-C is an objective self-report multi-dimensional construct consisting of 32 items. It is in condensed form consisting of five sub-scales. The five sub-scales include the following dimensions: Abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft and withdraw.  
**Abuse:** This dimension comprises of nasty and harmful behaviour that affects other employees in the organisation.  
**Production Deviances:** This dimension comprises of purposefully or deliberately doing a job incorrectly or full of errors.  
**Sabotage:** This dimension consists of investigative behaviour that is involved in damaging organizational property.  
**Theft:** This dimension comprises of behaviour such as keeping the information to oneself or taking office supplies home without permission.  
**Withdraw:** This dimension comprises of behaviour such as being late or absent from work.

The CWB-C (Spector and Fox et al., 2006) is a 32 item multi-dimension checklist measuring counterproductivity on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (i) never to (v) every day. Total aggregate scores of all subscales combined represent the overall scores of counterproductive work behaviour. High scores indicate the presence of increased inclination towards counterproductive work behaviour. Spector and Fox et al (2006) reported the overall reliability of 0.84 representing high internal consistency.

- 3) Propensity to Morally Disengage Scale (Moore, Detert, Klebe Treviño, Baker and Mayer, 2012): To screen moral disengagement propensity to morally disengage scale by Celia Moore et al., (2012) was used. The PMD is an objective self-report multi-dimensional construct consisting of 16 items. It is in compressed form consisting of eight sub-scales.

The scale includes the following eight dimensions:

**Moral justification:** the process of rationalization for unethical behaviour is done so that the mistreatment is made socially and personally more acceptable. Also, convincing oneself as working towards worthy cause on noble grounds.

**Euphemistic labelling:** the process of reasoning and making reprehensible behaviour acceptable by reconstructing linguistic translation of immoral conduct. In so doing the effects of the misdemeanour are reduced.

**Advantageous comparison:** the process of substantiation and feeling at ease while participating in transgression by comparing and contrasting it with more hostile misconduct thereby reducing the effects of transgressive acts.

**Displacement of responsibility:** the process of justification when the executors of the wrongful behaviour attributes their actions as merely following dictates of higher authority or social pressure over which they had no control.

**Diffusion of responsibility:** this rationalization refers to the act of deactivating or minimizing self-censorship by ignoring the consequences of participating in harmful misdeeds or activities.

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

**Distortion of consequences:** the process of reasoning is completed by deactivating or minimizing self-censorship by overlooking the consequences of participating in offensive deeds or activities.

**Dehumanization:** the process of validation of wrongful behaviour by stripping victims of having feelings, desire and aspiration. Thus, by taking away humane qualities of the felon they are seen unworthy of moral regard and sympathy.

**Attribution of blame:** the process of rationalization when the perpetrator of wrongful acts shifts the blame of their wrongdoing onto the victim itself.

The scale PMD is a 16 item objective self-report scale measuring moral disengagement on 7 point Likert scale ranging from (i) = strongly disagree to (vii)= strongly agree. The total aggregate score of all combined sub-scales represents overall moral scores of propensity to morally disengage. High scores in respective dimensions represent higher amount of moral disengagement mechanism in a particular dimension. Moore (2012) reported the overall reliability of 0.88 demonstrating high consistency.

**Analysis:** Descriptive statistics and independent t-ratio on unequal sample were calculated to compare the difference between police personal (N=200) and industrial employees at managerial level (N=50) on CWB and moral disengagement.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Difference between police and managers on counterproductive work behaviour and its dimensions*

Descriptive statistics and t-test has been applied to study the significant differences between police personnel and industrial managers on counterproductive work behaviour and its dimensions (abuse, production deviance, theft, withdrawal and the total score of counterproductive work behaviour).

**Table 1.1: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on total score of CWB**

Overall score of CWB	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	61.11	53.76
SD	19.81	17.71
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	2.39*	

*Note: df=248; \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05; Ns=Not Significant*

**Overall counterproductive work behaviour:** As CWB is a common incidence in organizations and can have a massive negative impact on both – the organization as well as on the people working in them in terms of increased dissatisfaction (Keashly, Trott & MacLean, 1994) and experiencing heightened job stress level, loss of productivity, destruction of organizational property as a retaliation and increased turn over (Benminson, 1994; Baron & Neuman, 1996; Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002; Vigoda, 2002). The results (Table 1.1) of aggregate overall scores for CWB were compared amongst police personnel and industrial managers. The results indicate a rather low tendency of both groups to engage in CWB on the whole. Nonetheless, the results also show statistically significant difference in the mean aggregate scores for police ( $M=61.11$ ,  $SD= 19.81$ ) than managers ( $M=53.76$ ,  $SD= 17.71$ ) with a  $t = 2.39$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . Thus, our hypothesis is accepted as the results suggests that

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

police personnel have inbuilt predisposition to indulge more often in counterproductive acts in contrast with managers. The overall tendency for police men to engage in CWB could be because of role ambiguity, demanding profession, an increased work overload, as a consequence of which having to work overtime, do additional work from home and or multi-task, lack of internal career prospects and inappropriate job appraisal system (Shamsudin, Subramaniam & Ibrahim, 2011), such provocation of behaviour emerged to be more prevalent in police organization as compared to managers, as indicated in the present study.

**Table 1.1.2: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Abuse**

Abuse	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	32.78	28.7
SD	10.74	10.02
Interpretation	low	low
t	2.43*	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not\ Significant$

**Abuse:** Abuse at work entails misbehaviour and treating co-workers violently; it comprises of explicit and harmful behaviours of an employee towards fellow workers and organizational members (Izawa, Kodama & Noumra, 2006). Unpleasantness in behaviours at work, confrontational deeds or assertive conduct, spreading malicious gossip, teasing and embarrassing co-workers, unfair criticism or even physical assault are some other facets of abuse (Farrell, 1997; Sackett, 2002). A significant difference was observed in scores for police personnel in the terms of abuse ( $M= 32.78$ ,  $SD= 10.74$ ) than managers ( $M=28.7$ ,  $SD= 10.02$ ),  $t = 2.43$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . A comparison of the mean score evince that the propensity for engaging in abusive behaviour at workplace is also more frequent amongst police personnel as compared to the managers. Although, the result table no 1.1.2 exhibit that both groups (police personnel and managers, respectively) were low on abuse. As there is a significant difference between both groups exists as policemen engage in verbal abuse more often as compared to managers our  $H_1$  stands true. This could be attributed to work aggression, political pressure, role overload, inter-role balancing, negative public image as a predictor of rude misbehaviour and corruption, the nature of the job where dealing of antisocial elements are more common, in police organization as compared to industrial employees.

**Table 1.1.3: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Production deviance**

Production Deviance	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	6.71	5.46
SD	3.67	2.45
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	2.29*	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not\ Significant$

**Production deviance:** Production deviance is the inability to perform at job efficiently and effectively (Hollinger, 1986). This includes intentionally working slowly and inaccurately thus lowering work efficiency of the organization. The results of the study indicate that the average score was low for production deviance for both the groups. Nonetheless, the result exhibits a significant difference in the mean score for both the police ( $M= 6.71$ ,  $SD=3.67$ )



**A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

and managers ( $M= 5.46, SD= 2.45$ ),  $t = 2.29, p<0.05$ . This means that the inclination to revel in production deviance is much more common amongst police than among industrial managers. Such behaviour is more passive as compared to sabotage. Also it is less noticeable and difficult to prove. Together, work load, role conflict and ambiguity appear to cause job dissatisfaction thus lowering work productivity and that may become the grounds that fosters counterproductivity. More so, police job has an added benefit of being a more secure government job, where such lethargy in performance can be tolerated more as compared with managers working in private industrial units.

**Table 1.1.4: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Sabotage**

Sabotage	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	4.98	4.98
SD	2.36	2.47
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	0.01 <sup>ns</sup>	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not Significant$

**Sabotage:** the term sabotage refers to destruction of organizational property or assets of organizational assets. The results clearly show that both police personnel and industrial managers were low on their average scores. Moreover, t-test did not reach any statistically significant level for police ( $M= 4.98, SD= 2.47$ ) and managers ( $M= 4.98, SD= 2.47$ ),  $t = .01^{ns}$ . Thus, as mean for both groups were equally low implying that both groups showed low inclination to engage in sabotage, and caused not much damage to their respective organizational assets and property.

**Table 1.1.5: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Theft**

Theft	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	7.97	6.92
SD	3.27	2.74
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	2.09*	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*  $< 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not Significant$

**Theft:** By implicating oneself in theft, employees intend to intentionally harm the organizations for the gratification of their motives (Niehoff & Paul, 2000; Spector et al., 2006). Theft can take many forms such as of misleading records and deception (Gabbidon et al., 2006). The results clearly depict that inspite of the low mean scores for theft at workplace for both police personnel and industrial managers, a significant difference did emerge between police ( $M= 7.97, SD= 3.27$ ) and managers ( $M= 6.92, SD= 2.74$ ),  $t = 2.09, p<0.05$ . Accordingly, suggesting that the prevalence of theft as dimension of counterproductive work behaviour is more eminent in police as compared to managers. It seems that policemen engage more often in such form of behaviour as besides serving active duty there is a lot of paperwork involved which is burdensome and time-consuming adding to the existing workload, thereby causing job dissatisfaction and stress. As a result, mishandling or creating and passing incorrect information are the form of counterproductivity found higher in police as compared to industrial managers. More so, owing to the very nature of the job in police, there is more chance of stealing confiscated goods or indulging in other forms of corruption

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

like bribery. Also, its quite obviously observed that police shirk from lodging formal complaints, misrepresenting information because of vested interests and can even hide critical information. As far as, industrial managers are concerned, it's not only mere lack of intention for theft, but also lesser scope and motive for it may make the difference.

**Table 1.1.6: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Withdraw**

Withdraw	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	8.67	7.7
SD	2.78	2.42
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	2.26*	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not\ Significant$

**Withdrawal:** Withdrawal at workplace refers to set of negative behaviours that reduce the amount of working time than the obligatory time by the organization (Spector et al. 2006; Kulas et al., 2007). It consists of absenteeism, reporting late at work or leaving early from the workplace, and taking longer breaks than officially permitted. Additionally, the result shows that despite the low mean scores for withdrawal for both police personnel and industrial managers, the test result reveals a statistical significant difference in scores for police ( $M=8.67$ ,  $SD=2.78$ ) and managers ( $M=7.7$ ,  $SD=2.42$ ),  $t = 2.26$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . As the result indicate that the act of withdrawal at workplace is again more common in police as compared to managers. This could be because working in police organization is a high-pressure job with lot of power politics at play leading to job dissatisfaction and stress. Also, workplace injustice and discrimination leads to stressful job conditions (Fox et al., 2001) and counterproductive behaviour. Therefore, by withdrawing police personnel try to avoid state of affairs at work rather than harming the organization and its members. Also, employees who displayed counterproductive work behaviour are more likely to develop stress related problems and are likely to resign (O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996; Griffin et al., 1998) rather than risk organizational contempt (Muafi, 2011). Moreover, police department being a government bureaucratic structure can be inflicted with the typical red tapism and procedural dictates unlike the privately owned industrial units.

### **Summary of results for counterproductive work behaviour**

In summary, the results suggest that although both group score low on all dimensions namely abuse, production deviance, sabotage, withdraw and overall score of CWB, yet except for sabotage significant differences were found in all dimensions of CWB, with police personnel emerging to be significantly more prone to indulge in CWB and its various facets. *Therefore, CWB damages both the organization and its employees (Bennett and Robinson, 2003).*

### **Moral Disengagement**

In the present study an attempt was also made to assess the difference between police and managers on moral disengagement and its dimensions.

Moral disengagement is a process of cognitive restructuring of offensive behaviour by maintaining eight psychosocial mechanisms. Based on the concept of cognitive theories, moral disengagement has been defined as a result of social and psychological manoeuvres by which self-sanctions are disengaged from inhumane conduct, so that self-regulatory

**A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

mechanisms do not operate during the process of moral reasoning (Bandura,1999). The process of engaging and manoeuvring self- regulatory processes initiates moral disengagement resulting in the inception of amoral behaviour easier. Descriptive test and t-test was carried out for comparing the PMD, a cognitive correlate of CWB, on average scores between police and managers. The following results are disclosed.

**Table 1.2.1: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Moral disengagement**

Total md	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	54.58	49.2
SD	15.52	15.16
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	2.2	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \* =  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*  $< 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not\ Significant$

**Overall moral disengagement score:** Moral disengagement is referred to as the process of deactivation of moral self-regulation while opposing moral principle, which liberates an individual from adhering to moral code, lessens the accompanying guilt, that would ensue when behaviour violates their internal moral principles therefore, resulting in making an unethical decision easier on the conscience (Detert, Trevino & Sweitzer 2008). The overall scores for propensity to morally disengage were low for both policemen and industrial managers (Table 1.2.1). Regardless, there was a significant difference in the mean aggregate scores for police personnel ( $M= 54.58, SD= 15.52$ ) and industrial managers ( $M= 49.2, SD = 15.16$ ),  $t = 2.2, p<0.05$ . As indicated by the result the overall PMD was more common amongst police personnel as compared to industrial managers. This could be as police organization deals with law-offenders and criminals on daily basis and the interaction between them and pressure to deal with them efficiently and effectively often leads to rude and ruthless behaviour thereby raising cognitive defenses. This tendency of policemen to disengage from moral principles routinely helps them deal with ensuing guilt resulting from engaging often in offensive, ruthless behaviour and taking unethical decisions as supported in the study as perhaps one has to think and behave differently in order to handle or understand the antisocial elements.

**Table 1.2.2: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Diffusion of responsibility**

DFRmd	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	6.95	5.56
SD	2.58	2.76
Interpretation	Low	Low
t	3.53*	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not\ Significant$

**Diffusion of responsibility:** The mechanism of diffusion of responsibility allows individuals to electively enable and disable the morality principles at will. By doing so, an individual distance themselves from the cognitive dilemma in order to cope with guilt. Hence, the cognitive defense mechanism moral disengagement helps extricate individuals from their moral responsibilities i.e. while transgressing between moral self and an actual behaviour (Bazerman and Tenbrunsel, 2011). The aggregate score for police and managers were low.

**A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

Nonetheless, the test was statistically significant for diffusion of responsibility in police personnel ( $M= 6.95$ ,  $SD= 2.58$ ) and managers ( $M= 5.56$ ,  $SD= 2.76$ ),  $t = 3.53$ ,  $p<0 .01$ . Thus, the results indicate that police personnel have higher propensity towards allocating diffusion of responsibility than managers. This could be as police follow the command and abide by the orders given by the authority. Therefore, while complying with orders which may be unethical it is easier for them to diffuse the responsibility and lessen the guilt especially in lower line of authority like inspector and sub-inspectors.

**Table 1.2.3: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Attribution of blame**

ABmd	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	7.06	5.62
SD	2.84	2.94
Interpretation	Mod	Low
t	3.18***	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not Significant$

**Attribution of blame:** Similarly, in the mechanism of attribution of blame there is a re-interpretation of individual conduct by minimizing the effects caused by those actions by the perpetrator. Also, the victims themselves are held accountable for causing such ripostes (Bandura, 2002). The average scores on this dimension were moderate for police and low for managers. However, the t-test shows significant difference in the average scores for police ( $M= 7.06$ ,  $SD= 2.84$ ) and managers ( $M = 5.62$ ,  $SD= 2.94$ ),  $t = 3.18$ ,  $p<0.01$ . Therefore, the result suggests that police personnel have higher tendency for transferring attribution of blame on others as compared to managers. This could be rationalised with the reasoning that as policemen routinely deal harshly with delinquents on a daily basis, they build an apathetic attitude towards them. Also, as policemen abide by the command given by authority, consequently it becomes easier for them to vindicate themselves from callousness of their mistreatment of law offenders by blaming it on higher authority and the compelling circumstances instead of personal choice. Therefore, aside from attributing the blame onto the circumstances, authority or victim the perpetrator discharges all of the responsibility for their actions and somewhat feel morally superior.

**Table 1.2.4: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for Moral justification**

MJmd	Police personnel	Industrial managers
Mean	7.45	6.18
SD	2.67	2.28
Interpretation	Mod	Mod
t	3.09*	

Note:  $df=248$ ; \*\* $= p < 0.01$ ; \* $p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not Significant$

**Moral justification:** Likewise, the defense mechanism of moral justification deals with cognitive reconstruction of immoral and harsh conduct which is made socially and personally acceptable by rationalising it with worthy cause such as working for public welfare. Individuals then indulge in immoral acts by wreaking harm on others by way of representing themselves as righteous person, bringing justice to the community (Bandura, 2002) and serving noble purpose like reinstating proper balance of power or achieving higher academic

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

success (Annaloui,1995; Higbee and Thomas, 2012). The result shows that the aggregate score for moral justification were moderate for both police and managers. Nevertheless, there was a significant difference in the scores for police ( $M=7.45$ ,  $SD=2.67$ ) and managers ( $M=6.18$ ,  $SD=2.28$ ),  $t = 3.09$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . This implies moral justification is more common in police organization as it deals with bringing discipline and order in public dealings rather than industrial managers. Due to their routine interaction with law offenders the atrocities of police actions are easily camouflaged on the grounds of moral ideologies. Therefore, by re-enacting of moral principles, self-censorship is repressed successfully and engaging in violent and aggressive behaviour is rationalized as protecting humanity and serving for community welfare. Perhaps the difference in the nature of job of the two groups can explain the significant difference in scores

**Table 1.2.5: t-ratio of the scores of Police personnel and industrial managers group on for average scores of moral disengagement**

MD	DCmd		ELmd		Dmd		DRmd		ACmd	
	Police	Managers	Police	Managers	Police	Managers	Police	Managers	Police	Managers
Mean	6.68	5.78	7.4	6.52	5.9	5.6	6.84	6.64	6.39	7.3
SD	2.97	2.87	2.89	3.03	2.77	2.98	2.75	3.66	3.41	3.42
Interpretation	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
t	1.92 <sup>ns</sup>		1.9 <sup>ns</sup>		0.66 <sup>ns</sup>		0.43 <sup>ns</sup>		1.7 <sup>ns</sup>	

Note:  $df=248$ ;  $**p < 0.01$ ;  $*p < 0.05$ ;  $Ns=Not Significant$

Results in Table no. 1.2.5 further revealed that no significant difference emerged between police personnel and industrial managers in terms of either dimension of moral disengagement i.e., distortion of consequences, euphemistic labelling, dehumanization, displacement of responsibility and advantageous comparison.

### CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Therefore, the results portrayed a relatively more dismissal picture of police personnel who could more conveniently disengage morally and indulge in cognitive defense mechanism like diffusion of responsibility, attribution of blame onto others or situations and still morally justify their wrongful actions as compared to their counterparts working in industrial units.

More so, the results from the previous section also puts forth more counterproductive tendencies of these police personnel, who significantly had more chance of becoming abusive, making deliberate thefts and deviated towards objectionable behaviour, and also at times indulged in shirking or withdraw from work. Therefore, the present results have eye opening implications for our country's police department as in both organizations, be it police or industrial units, there are humans working in different roles. So, there is a need to understand and restrain factors inducing counterproductive work behavioural tendencies which can prove detrimental to police as a department or organization. Since, there is a dearth of empirical work in Indian context. Moreover, research evidence does exist, explaining various antecedents of counterproductive work behaviour, but it is far from substantial and is quite scattered. There is a pertinent need to study counterproductive work behaviour and the factors that cause counterproductivity in a more comprehensive way, while looking into its correlates from a wider perspective and in more different work settings.

## A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers

### REFERENCES

- Ambrose, M. L., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2008). Individual moral development and ethical climate: The influence of person–organization fit on job attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(3), 323-333.
- Analoui, F. (1995). Workplace sabotage: Its styles, motives and management. *Journal of Management Development*, 14(7), 48-65.
- Anjum, M. A., & Parvez, A. (2013). Counterproductive behavior at work: A comparison of blue collar and white collar workers. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 7(3), 417-434.
- Aubé, C., Rousseau, V., Mama, C., & Morin, E. M. (2009). Counterproductive behaviours and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(3), 351-361.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), 101-119.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., & Zsolnai, L. (2000). Corporate transgressions through moral disengagement. *Journal of Human Values*, 6(1), 57-64.
- Barbaranelli, C., & Perna, A. (2004). Meccanismi di disimpegno morale nell'applicazione delle normative sulla sicurezza: contributo empirico. *Risorsa Uomo*, 10(4), 393-415.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 22(3), 161-173.
- Barsky, A. (2011). Investigating the effects of moral disengagement and participation on unethical work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104(1), 59-75.
- Bazerman, M. H., & Tenbrunsel, A. E. (2011). *Blind spots*. Princeton University Press.
- Benminson, H. F. (1994). Violence in the workplace. *Training and Development Journal*, January, 27-32.
- Benson, M. L. (1985). Denying the guilty mind: accounting for involvement in a white-collar crime. *Criminology*, 23(4), 583-607.
- Björkqvist, K. (2001). Social defeat as a stressor in humans. *Physiology & Behaviour*, 73(3), 435-442.
- Brief, A. P., Buttram, R. T., & Dukerich, J. M. (2014). Collective corruption in the corporate world: Toward a process model. In *Groups at Work* (pp. 485-514). Psychology Press.
- Brill, M., & Weidemann, S. (2001). Bosti Associates. *Disproving widespread myths about workplace design, Jasper, IN: Kimball International*.
- Brown, T. G. (2012). *Job stress and counterproductive work behaviors: Does moral identity matter?* Seattle Pacific University.
- Bruk-Lee, V., & Spector, P. E. (2006). The social stressors-counterproductive work behaviours link: are conflicts with supervisors and coworkers the same? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(2), 145.
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(3), 177-184.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 124.
- Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Sweitzer, V. L. (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: a study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 374.
- Diefendorff, J. M., & Mehta, K. (2007). The relations of motivational traits with workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 967.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 547.

## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

- Douglas, T. (2002). *Scapegoats: transferring blame*. Routledge.
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 16-27.
- Erera-Weatherley, P. I. (1996). Coping with stress: Public welfare supervisors doing their best. *Human Relations*, 49(2), 157-170.
- Farnese, M. L., Tramontano, C., Fida, R., & Paciello, M. (2011). Cheating behaviors in academic context: Does academic moral disengagement matter? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 356-365.
- Farrell, G. A. (1997). Aggression in clinical settings: Nurses' views. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(3), 501-508.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20(6), 915-931.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 59(3), 291-309.
- Gabbidon, S. L., Patrick, P. A., & Peterson, S. A. (2006). An empirical assessment of employee theft lawsuits involving allegations of employer misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(2), 175-183.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. E. (1997). *Antisocial Behaviour in Organizations*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Gifford, R. (2014). Environmental psychology matters. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 541-579.
- Griffin, R. W., O'Leary-Kelly, A. E., & Collins, J. M. (1998). *Dysfunctional Behaviour in Organizations: Violent and Deviant Behaviour*. Elsevier Science/ JAI Press.
- Gualandri, M. (2012). Counterproductive work behaviors and moral disengagement (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). *Spienza Universita De Roma, Rome, Italy*.
- Higbee, J. L., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*, 40(1), 39-52.
- Hollinger, R. C. (1986). Acts against the workplace: Social bonding and employee deviance. *Deviant Behaviour*, 7(1), 53-75.
- Izawa, S., Kodama, M., & Nomura, S. (2006). Dimensions of hostility in Japanese undergraduate students. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 13(2), 147-152.
- Kaukiainen, A., Salmivalli, C., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., Lahtinen, A., Kostamo, A., & Lagerspetz, K. (2001). Overt and covert aggression in work settings in relation to the subjective well-being of employees. *Aggressive Behaviour: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 27(5), 360-371.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behaviour in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9(4), 341-357.
- Kramer, M. S. (1987). *The moral logic of Hizballah* (No. 101). Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies, Shiloah Institute, Tel Aviv University.
- Kulas, J. T., McInnerney, J. E., DeMuth, R. F., & Jadwinski, V. (2007). Employee satisfaction and theft: Testing climate perceptions as a mediator. *The Journal of Psychology*, 141(4), 389-402.
- Lanyon, R. I., & Goodstein, L. D. (2004). Validity and reliability of a pre-employment screening test: the counterproductive behaviour index (CBI). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 533-553.
- Lau, V. C., Au, W. T., & Ho, J. M. (2003). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(1), 73-99.
- LeBlanc, M. M., & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 444.

## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S. J., & Alberts, J. K. (2007). Burned by bullying in the American workplace: Prevalence, perception, degree and impact. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6), 837-862.
- Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behaviour: A causal reasoning perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 36-50.
- Melamed, S., Fried, Y., & Froom, P. (2001). The interactive effect of chronic exposure to noise and job complexity on changes in blood pressure and job satisfaction: a longitudinal study of industrial employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(3), 182
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159.
- Mohd Shamsudin, F., Subramaniam, C., & Ibrahim, H. (2011). HR practices and deviant behavior at work: An exploratory study. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 16(2011), 13-17.
- Mohd Shamsudin, F., Subramaniam, C., & Ibrahim, H. (2011). Investigating the influence of human resource practices on deviant behaviour at work. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 2(6), 514-519.
- Moore, C. (2008). Moral disengagement in processes of organizational corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(1), 129-139.
- Moore, C., Detert, J. R., Klebe Treviño, L., Baker, V. L., & Mayer, D. M. (2012). Why employees do bad things: Moral disengagement and unethical organizational behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), 1-48.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Paul, R. J. (2000). Causes of employee theft and strategies that HR managers can use for prevention. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in Alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 39(1), 51-64.
- O'Fallon, M. J., & Butterfield, K. D. (2005). A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature: 1996–2003. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59(4), 375-413.
- O'Brien, K. E., & Vandello, J. (2005). Development and validation of the workplace hostile attribution bias scale. In *Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA*.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 225-253.
- Paciello, M., Fida, R., Tramontano, C., Lupinetti, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2008). Stability and change of moral disengagement and its impact on aggression and violence in late adolescence. *Child Development*, 79(5), 1288-1309.
- Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). Workplace incivility.
- Price, J. L. (1995). A role for demographic variables in the study of absenteeism and turnover. *International Journal of Career Management*.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Robinson, S. L., & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour (1986-1998)*, 1.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66.
- Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviours: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 5-11.



## **A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers**

- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviours at work: In Anderson, N., Ones, D.S., Sinangil, H.K., and Viswesvaran, C.(Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology, 1*. 145-164
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 361-388.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behaviour.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviours created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 68*(3), 446-460.
- Spratlen, L. P. (1995). Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace. *Violence and Victims, 10*(4), 285-297.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178-190.
- Tepper, P., Liu, X., Guo, C., Zhai, J., Liu, T., & Li, C. (2008). Depressive symptoms in Chinese children and adolescents: parent, teacher, and self-reports. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 111*(2-3), 291-298.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2003). Misbehavior in organizations: Theory. *Research and Management, Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.*
- Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehaviour in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Science, 7*(2), 151-165.
- Vasse, R. M., Nijhuis, F. J. N., & Kok, G. (1998). Associations between work stress, alcohol consumption and sickness absence. *Addiction, 93*(2), 231-241.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). Stress-related aftermaths to workplace politics: the relationships among politics, job distress, and aggressive behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 23*(5), 571-591.

### ***Acknowledgement***

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### ***Conflict of Interest***

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

***How to cite this article:*** Thapar, R. & Brar, S. (2022). A Comparative Study of Counterproductive Work Behaviour and Moral Disengagement amongst Police Personnel and Middle Level Industrial Managers. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 10*(2), 1007-1023. DIP:18.01.100.20221002, DOI:10.25215/1002.100