Building a New Perspective on Unethical Workplace Behavior: A Qualitative Examination of Former Employees' Recounted Experiences

Emily Burnett
Clemson University, easulli@g.clemson.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations

Recommended Citation
Burnett, Emily, "Building a New Perspective on Unethical Workplace Behavior: A Qualitative Examination of Former Employees' Recounted Experiences" (2019). All Dissertations. 2429.
https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations/2429

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.
BUILDING A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON UNETHICAL WORKPLACE BEHAVIOR:
A QUALITATIVE EXAMINATION OF FORMER EMPLOYEES’ RECOUNTED
EXPERIENCES

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Graduate School of
Clemson University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
Industrial Organizational Psychology

by
Emily Burnett
August 2019

Presented to:
Dr. Cynthia L. S. Pury, Committee Chair
Dr. Fred S. Switzer, III
Dr. Mary A. Taylor
Dr. Robin M. Kowalski
ABSTRACT

Unethical workplace behavior has long been a concern for organizations and a topic of interest for researchers. However, despite the vast body of research on the subject, there seems to be no definitive consensus concerning the breadth of the content domain within unethical workplace behavior, what (if any) meaningful dimensions exist within the construct, and which forms of unethical behavior are most prevalent in the workplace (Kaptein, 2008). This lack of construct clarity may in part be due to the fact that much of the research literature has focused on individual subsets of unethical workplace behavior, either studying a single type of unethical behavior, like employee theft (Greenberg, 2002), or examining a specific type of worker, like marketing professionals (Akaah & Lund, 1994). Certain methodological limitations have also contributed to the issue of construct ambiguity, such as the use of inappropriate student samples and an overreliance on restrictive quantitative measurement instruments (Treviño, Nieuwenboer, & Kish-Gephart, 2014). I seek to address the weaknesses in past research and strengthen the current understanding of unethical workplace behavior by studying the construct using methodological strategies that have historically been underrepresented. In this study, I take an exploratory approach and examine the issue of unethical workplace behavior through a qualitative lens by conducting a large-scale content analysis of first-hand reports of unethical workplace behavior using a diverse applied sample. The resulting typography divides unethical workplace behavior into three content categories: Type of Behavior, Type of Victim, and Type of Perpetrator. The Type of Behavior content category contains several new subcategories not included in past research, such as inadequate response to a reported workplace issue and ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity. By broadening the spectrum of the types of behaviors that encompass unethical workplace behavior, describing who is affected by it, and describing who is
engaging in it, the present study paints a more complete picture of unethical behavior in the workplace. Future research efforts should incorporate the present study’s findings into existing scales of unethical workplace behavior. Additionally, increased attention should be placed on inadequate response to a reported workplace issue and how to prevent it.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Unethical behavior in the workplace has long been a concern for organizations and a topic of interest for researchers. Unethical workplace behavior can damage organizations’ reputation and financial standing, victimize the organization’s own employees, and harm many other stakeholder groups including customers, clients, investors, and local communities (Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006). The organizational ethics research community has built a vast body of literature in an effort to combat this issue; through this process, researchers have identified numerous antecedents of unethical workplace behavior (Kish-Gephart, Harrison, & Treviño, 2010), developed various organizational ethics interventions (Kaptein, 2009; Stevens, 2008), and introduced many theoretical perspectives from which to understand unethical behavior in the workplace (Loe, Ferrell, & Mansfield, 2000).

Despite these advancements in our scientific understanding of unethical workplace behavior, there seems to be no definitive consensus within the literature concerning the appropriate terminology, definition, and dimensionality of unethical workplace behavior. Researchers have developed numerous overlapping constructs related to unethical workplace behavior, including counterproductive work behavior (CWB; Mangione & Quinn, 1975), workplace deviance (Hollinger & Clark, 1982), organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996), deviant workplace behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), fraud (Gerety & Lehn, 1997), workplace incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), unethical pro-organizational behavior (UPB; Umphress, Bingham, & Mitchell, 2010), and detrimental citizenship behavior (DCB; Pierce & Aguinis, 2013), to name a few. Each new construct comes with its own definition, designating its distinctiveness from previous constructs, and often is accompanied by new empirical scales,
theoretical models, and divergent lines of research. Researchers have also sought to define the internal structure of unethical workplace behavior by proposing various dimensions with which to subdivide the construct. Many have classified unethical workplace behavior based on the nature or substance of the behavior, creating separate categories for acts such as theft, sabotage, and withdrawal, but the content and total number of these categories have not been consistent across the literature (Marcus, Taylor, Hastings, Sturm, & Weigelt, 2016). Others have categorized unethical workplace behavior based on the victim or target, often dividing the construct between behavior directed toward the organization and behavior directed towards people (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Still other researchers have proposed subdividing unethical workplace behavior based on (1) the goal or benefactor of the behavior (e.g., pro-organizational, anti-organizational, or non-aligned; Yardi & Wiener, 1996), (2) the severity of the action (minor or serious; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), and (3) the type of norms violated by the behavior (organizational norms or societal norms; Warren, 2003). Each proposed dimension creates two or more subdimensions of unethical workplace behavior, complete with their own terms and definitions. While this research fervor is encouraging in that it signifies a high level of interest in organizational ethics, it has also led to a sprawling and disjointed body of research which has clouded the nomological network of unethical workplace behavior and led to uncertainly about the key defining features of the construct.

Interlinked with this issue of the ambiguous conceptual definition of unethical workplace behavior is a more practical concern: the research community also struggles to paint a coherent picture of what unethical workplace behavior looks like in practice. Depending on the section of research literature one references, one may draw very different conclusions regarding the overall prevalence of unethical workplace behavior within organizations, which specific forms of unethical behavior are most common in the workplace, and which forms are most problematic.
Disagreement on these most central of questions could be considered an existential threat to organizational ethics research as a whole: when there are doubts concerning academic researchers’ ability to accurately measure and characterize the unethical workplace behavior actually occurring within the business community, it becomes difficult to make the case for scientific research as a viable strategy for addressing the ethical conduct issues faced by today’s organizations.

There are many contributing factors that could explain the shortcomings present in the organizational ethics research literature. Firstly, unethical workplace behavior is an inherently challenging research topic due to the sensitivity of the subject matter. Organizations are often hesitant to allow outside researchers to measure and report on unethical workplace behavior, citing legal and reputational concerns (Randall & Gibson, 1990; Treviño, 1986). This limits researchers’ opportunities to study the topic in an applied setting. Employees may also be motivated to underreport unethical workplace behavior out of concerns for job security, which makes it difficult to gather accurate measurements. Furthermore, in an issue common to all academic research, organizational ethics scholars must constantly strive to provide unique contributions to the scientific literature in order to remain relevant. This has resulted in a proliferation of specialized terminology, proposed subdimensions, empirical scales, and siloed lines of research, all of which make it difficult to draw overall conclusions about the global construct of unethical workplace behavior.

Finally, organizational ethics research is heavily reliant on restrictive quantitative survey methods (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Lehnert, Park, & Singh, 2015; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Most past studies have measured unethical workplace behavior using one of the many preexisting inventories available in the literature. These inventories list a set of items, with each item describing a specific example of unethical workplace behavior, and prompt participants to
rate each item on some numerical scale (Treviño, Nieuwenboer, & Kish-Gephart, 2014). While these inventories make it easy to quickly gather quantitative measurements on unethical workplace behavior, they also limit the resulting measurements by capturing only the types of unethical workplace behavior that fit the descriptions provided in the survey items. If an inventory does not cover all possible types of unethical workplace behavior, or if the inventory contains items that are irrelevant to a particular sample, this may cause researchers to miss potentially important types of unethical workplace behavior and artificially lower the mean levels of unethical workplace behavior found in that sample. Furthermore, the methods commonly used to develop inventories for measuring unethical workplace behavior can make the instruments vulnerable to bias. Most unethical workplace behavior inventories were developed by reviewing the research literature and by consulting with a small number of subject matter experts such as upper-level managers, HR professionals, business ethics lawyers, or academic experts (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Kaptein, 2008; Spector et al., 2006); input is generally not requested from lower-level workers, front-line managers, or customers. The sources consulted while developing an inventory will naturally bias that inventory towards emphasizing the types of unethical behavior most salient to those sources, while potentially missing the types of unethical behavior most salient to other stakeholders. The heavy reliance on these inventories will inevitably result in some domain restriction in the measurement of unethical workplace behavior and could potentially bias the conclusions made by the research community.

This study addresses some of the weaknesses in the existing research literature by conducting an exploratory examination of real-world instances of unethical workplace behavior, using an archival dataset obtained through a partnership with a workforce analytics consulting firm. This extraordinary dataset includes nearly fifteen-hundred narrative descriptions of unethical workplace behavior witnessed by former employees, transcribed word-for-word from
employee exit interviews. The sample includes former employees from over one hundred and thirty organizations, representing a vast assortment of work roles and a diverse array of industries. Access to such a large applied dataset with this richness of information is a rarity in the context of unethical workplace behavior research. This is therefore a unique opportunity to strengthen the areas of research that have historically been the weakest by taking an exploratory approach and examining the issue of unethical workplace behavior through a qualitative lens. By conducting a large-scale content analysis of first-hand reports of unethical workplace behavior using a diverse applied sample, my study seeks to illustrate a realistic view of the business ethics landscape from a front-line worker perspective seldom represented in academic research. Finally, by comparing my findings to that of past research, my study fills gaps in the literature by identifying underreported dimensions, categories, or specific examples of unethical workplace behavior with which to anchor future research efforts.

I will first clarify the theoretical concept of unethical workplace behavior by comparing the many overlapping constructs studied in the literature and exploring the numerous proposed dimensions used to categorize unethical workplace behavior. I will then review and critique the methodology of past research, focusing on participant sample choice and methods used to measure unethical workplace behavior. I will also summarize the past research findings on the prevalence of various forms of unethical behavior in the workplace, reflecting on the methodological constraints that may have biased these findings. Finally, I will introduce my study as a strategy to address the weaknesses that exist in the current research literature.

**Unethical workplace behavior and related constructs**

The issue of destructive or objectionable workplace behavior has been studied for decades under many different names. Early works researched individual problematic employee behaviors, such as bribery (James, 1962), employee theft (Merriam, 1977), and absenteeism...
(Muchinsky, 1977). In time, researchers began to consider the idea of grouping all ‘bad’ workplace behavior together as an inclusive construct, and many developed terms and frameworks to study the general phenomenon. Initial advancements include the creation of a scale to measure the overall rate of observed unethical behavior at work (Newstrom & Ruch, 1975), the proposal of a person-situation interactional model to predict unethical workplace behavior (Treviño, 1986), and the development of the terms “Property Deviance” and “Production Deviance,” which represented an early effort to identify major subdimensions within the overall construct of bad workplace behavior (Hollinger & Clark, 1983). Despite the substantial contributions of these pioneering publications, most were incomplete in some way. The majority of these initial works did not provide comprehensive construct definitions to establish the meaning of the terms that they used (Newstrom & Ruch, 1975; Treviño, 1986). Furthermore, many early conceptualizations for an all-inclusive ‘bad workplace behavior’ construct left out behaviors that arguably should have been included, which later researchers were quick to point out (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

In the decades since these formative works were published, the literature base has grown enormously. Building upon past contributions, the research community has developed several well-established constructs for the systematic study of bad workplace behavior; this includes the construct of unethical workplace behavior. In the following section, I will explore the theoretical definition of unethical workplace behavior, review its identifying features, and examine the structure of the construct based on previously proposed subdimensions. I will then introduce several related constructs that are also commonly studied in the business ethics literature, emphasizing the similarities and differences between the interrelated constructs.
Unethical workplace behavior

Unethical workplace behavior, in essence, refers to any behavior that occurs in the workplace that can be considered unethical. While this term has been used within the scientific business literature for decades, the construct of unethical workplace behavior remains difficult to define (Beauchamp & Bowie 1979; Newstrom & Ruch, 1975). Theoretical definitions for ethical and unethical behavior originate in philosophy, where ethics is defined as an “inquiry into the nature and grounds of morality where the term morality is taken to mean judgments, standards, and rules of conduct” (Taylor, 1975, p. 1). Thus, the field of ethics addresses the question of how to judge and label human behavior in terms of its rightness or wrongness. Lewis (1985) similarly defined business ethics, based on a synthesis of thirty-eight published definitions, as the “rules, standards, codes, or principles which provide guidelines for morally right behavior and truthfulness in specific [business-relevant] situations” (p. 381). These guidelines for ethical behavior in the workplace include formal standards for conduct established by the rule of law, but also encompass the implicit or informal moral norms established by the prevailing social order within society (Jones, 1991; Lewis, 1985).

Unethical workplace behavior can therefore be characterized as behavior occurring in the workplace that violates the laws, principles, shared norms, or standards for moral conduct that are largely agreed-upon within a society (Donaldson & Dunfee, 1994). This is consistent with the definitions for unethical workplace behavior seen throughout the literature, including “behavior that is contrary to accepted moral norms in society” (Treviño et al., 2014, p. 636), “behavior which is morally unacceptable to the larger community” (Kaptein, 2008, p. 980), and “behavior [that] violates hypernorms, or globally held standards of ethical behavior judged in terms of justice, law, or widely held social norms” (Umphress & Bingham, 2011, p. 622). While this construct definition leaves much open to interpretation (depending on the society in which the
organization operates and one’s perceptions of the prevailing societal moral norms), it also allows
the term to be relevant and salient when applied to any number of organizational contexts. To
lessness potential ambiguity, within the scope of this proposal, I will limit my focus to unethical
workplace behavior as judged from the prospective of current Western (and particularly
American) society.

Even after establishing that unethical workplace behavior is behavior that violates the
moral norms of society, this still only provides a vague picture of the construct of unethical
workplace behavior. To develop a more comprehensive understanding of the construct, scholars
have sought to specify the situational characteristics in which workplace behavior becomes
morally-significant, thereby clarifying the domain of unethical workplace behavior. Many
researchers have turned to stakeholder theory to identify the societal ethical principles that are
specifically relevant in an organizational context (Freeman, 1984; Jones & Wicks, 1999; Kaptein,
2008). Stakeholder theory defines the ethical responsibilities of organizations and their employees
based on the many formal and informal relationships formed between a given organization and its
stakeholders. A stakeholder is any entity whose welfare may be affected (intentionally or not) by
the actions of the organization, or whose actions may affect the welfare of the organization; this
includes employees, customers, other organizations, investors, and even local communities and
the surrounding ecological environment. Business ethicists argue that these interdependent
relationships between an organization and its stakeholders form implicit contracts which morally
oblige the organization to avoid harming the legitimate interests of its stakeholders, and vice
versa (Donaldson & Dunfee, 1999). Workplace behavior therefore takes on an ethical component
when it has the potential to impact the welfare of the organization or its stakeholders: in these
situations, actions that harm the organization or stakeholders would be be considered unethical,
whereas actions that preserve or benefit the welfare of the organization and all stakeholders would be considered ethical.

The conclusions drawn from stakeholder theory align well with the broader concept of the ‘moral issue,’ which is used in the business ethics literature to define ethically-relevant situations in which one’s actions have moral implications (Jones, 1991). Researchers define a ‘moral issue’ as a situation in which an individual’s actions has the potential to harm or help others, and the individual has the volition to choose how to respond (Jones, 1991; Velasquez & Rostankowki, 1985). This corresponds with the view in stakeholder theory that one’s behavior takes on ethical significance when it has the potential to affect the well-being of others. On a related note, although the actor’s intentions are often taken into account when judging the ethicality of an action, most conceptualizations of unethical workplace behavior do not require that the actor knowingly intends to cause any harm (Kaptein, 2008; Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008; Treviño et al., 2014). Ethical decision making theorists explain that one can be unintentionally unethical simply by lacking ‘moral awareness,’ or being oblivious to the ethical implications of the situation (Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008). Similarly, within the field of philosophy, several ethics theories hold that the ethicality of an action should be judged based on the consequences of the action, irrespective of the intentions behind the action; other theories argue that some behaviors are inherently unethical, regardless of any intended or unintended consequences (Velasquez, 2005).

Synthesizing the prevailing themes and commonly proposed features found throughout the literature, I define unethical workplace behavior as actions taken in the workplace that have the potential to harm the organization or any of its stakeholders, and in doing so violate the laws, principles, shared norms, or standards for moral conduct held by society.


Typography of unethical workplace behavior

Although many researchers have studied various aspects of unethical workplace behavior, there have been relatively few systematic and comprehensive attempts to define the dimensionality and subcategories within unethical workplace behavior. Early works either maintained a unidimensional view of the construct (Newstrom & Ruch, 1975; Treviño, 1986) or studied a single specific type of behavior, such as sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985). Cherrington and Cherrington (1992) made a noteworthy contribution by classifying types of moral issues based on the general nature or content of the behavior, identifying the twelve subtypes of (1) Stealing, (2) Lying, (3) Fraud and deceit, (4) Bribes, payoffs, and kickbacks, (5) Hiding information, (6) Cheating, (7) Personal decadence, (8) Interpersonal abuse, (9) Organizational abuse, (10) Rule violations, (11) Accessory to unethical acts, and (12) Ethical dilemmas. They proposed that these twelve subtypes of moral issues were common to all workplace environments. However, this typology was created unsystematically and was based solely on the authors’ informal observations and experiences while presenting at ethics seminars throughout their careers (Cherrington & Cherrington, 1992). Taking a more scientific approach, Akaah and Lund (1994) developed subcategories for unethical workplace behavior by performing a factor analysis on Newstrom and Ruch’s (1975) unethical workplace behavior scale. The resulting typology also distinguished types of unethical workplace behavior based on the general nature or content of the behavior, identifying the six subtypes of (1) Deception, (2) Falsification, (3) Personal use of company products, (4) Passing blame, (5) Padding expenses, and (6) Bribery. Despite the improved methodological rigor of Akaah and Lund’s (1994) study, their approach also had limitations. The seventeen-item scale these researchers used to measure unethical workplace behavior indicates that their typology was based on (at most) seventeen examples of unethical workplace behavior. Furthermore, this study only surveyed marketing professionals, which leads
to questions of the external validity of the resulting typography. Another similar typology was developed specifically for categorizing unethical behavior committed within public institutions; due to the focus on a single specialized population, this typology is also subject to the same concerns regarding external validity (Lasthuzen, Huberts, & Heres, 2011).

Other researchers have divided unethical workplace behavior based on the type of human right or the form of justice that was violated (i.e., right to dignity, right to privacy, right to property, right to autonomy, right to safety, distributive justice, and procedural justice); this work focused solely on the unethical actions of supervisors (Ünal, Warren, & Chen, 2012). Still others have introduced the dimension of intended benefactor as a way to classify unethical workplace behavior, but only studied the single subtype of unethical pro-organizational behavior (i.e., unethical workplace behavior that is intended to benefit the organization; Umphress & Bingham, 2011). Finally, one typology for unethical workplace behavior uses stakeholder theory as an outline for how to subdivide types of unethical workplace behavior (Kaptein, 2008). The author categorized unethical behavior along the dimension of affected stakeholder group, creating five separate subdimensions for unethical workplace behavior: behaviors that harm (1) financiers, (2) customers, (3) employees, (4) suppliers, and (5) society. This study also conducted exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to help develop and validate the typology, using data from several large and diverse samples. Kaptein’s (2008) typology is arguably the most comprehensive to date, as it seeks to include all potential types of unethical workplace behavior, regardless of worker type or industry.

**Workplace deviance and counterproductive work behavior**

Workplace deviance, which is often used interchangeably with the terms counterproductive work behavior and employee deviance, is another widely-used construct which overlaps substantially with unethical workplace behavior. Robinson and Bennett (1995, p. 556)
defined workplace deviance as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both.” Consistent with unethical workplace behavior, the definition for workplace deviance includes the elements of violation of group norms and the threat of harm. However, workplace deviance is differentiated from unethical workplace behavior due to the referent group and victim specified in the definition, as well as the element of volition. Workplace deviance is limited to behaviors that violate the norms within the organization, whereas unethical workplace behavior is judged based on violations of broader societal norms. This means that behaviors that violate organization norms but not societal norms (e.g., violations of a company’s attendance policy) could be considered workplace deviance but would not be considered unethical workplace behavior. Likewise, a behavior may qualify as unethical workplace behavior but not be considered workplace deviance if the behavior breaks societal ethical standards but is considered acceptable within a particular organization (e.g., overly aggressive sales tactics). Furthermore, to be considered workplace deviance, a behavior must victimize the organization or organizational members. This narrows the construct domain compared to unethical workplace behavior, which recognizes all organizational stakeholders as potential victims. Thus, workplace behavior that only harms outside stakeholders (such as customers or the environment) would not be considered workplace deviance, but would be considered unethical workplace behavior. Finally, only voluntary behaviors qualify as workplace deviance, whereas volition is not explicitly required for a workplace behavior to be considered unethical.

**Typography of workplace deviance**

Early works on workplace deviance identified two subtypes, distinguishing property deviance (involving theft or damage of company property) from production deviance (involving substandard performance of one’s job duties; Hollinger and Clark, 1983). These researchers used
both the terms workplace deviance and counterproductive work behavior to refer to the construct, and most works since have followed this convention. Other researchers built on this original model for workplace deviance, noting that these two subtypes leave out many potential acts of workplace deviance, such as sexual harassment and workplace violence (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). This led to a new typology of workplace deviance which included a ‘target’ dimension (organizational versus interpersonal) and a ‘severity’ dimension (minor versus serious). The new two-by-two taxonomy placed production deviance in the minor-organizational deviance quadrant and property deviance in the serious-organizational deviance quadrant, and allowed for the introduction of two new subtypes: political deviance (minor-interpersonal deviance such as gossiping and favoritism) and personal aggression (serious-interpersonal deviance such as sexual harassment, verbal abuse, and physical threats).

Warren (2003) created yet another typology for workplace deviance; this model positioned the construct within the broader context of societal norms and also emphasized the potential for constructive deviance. Workplace behaviors were subdivided based on two dimensions: ‘reference group norms’ (conforming to versus violating organizational norms) and ‘hypernorms’ (conforming to versus violating societal norms). This created another two-by-two taxonomy with four categories: (1) constructive-conformity (conforms to both organization and societal moral norms), (2) constructive-deviance (violates organization norms, but conforms to societal norms), (3) destructive-conformity (conforms to organization norms but violates societal norms) and (4) destructive-deviance (violates both organization and societal norms). Warren (2003) reasoned that some deviance is positive, such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB is discretionary extra-role behavior employees perform on their own volition to help support their coworkers or their company (Bornman, 2004). OCB falls under the constructive-conformity category, and was argued to be deviant in the sense that OCBs are beyond the normal
in-role expectations of the employee (Warren, 2003). The constructive-deviance category is also considered positive, as this category represents actions that oppose any norms or expectations of the organization that would violate societal ethical norms. Whistle blowing behaviors fall under the constructive-deviance category.

Warren’s (2003) typology represents a more inclusive conception of workplace deviance in that it includes behaviors that conform to organizational norms and behaviors that pose no threat to the organization or its members. Following the prevailing definition of workplace deviance, only the constructive-deviance and destructive-deviance categories would fall within the construct, as these categories represent behaviors that violate organizational norms and could harm the organization or its members. For comparison, the destructive-conformity and the destructive-deviance categories would fall under the definition of unethical workplace behavior, as these categories represent behaviors that violate societal ethical norms and could harm the organization, its members, or other outside stakeholders.

Other researchers have subdivided counterproductive work behavior based on the nature or content of the action. Gruys and Sackett (2003) created a typology with eleven categories: (1) Theft and Related Behavior, (2) Destruction of Property, (3) Misuse of Information, (4) Misuse of Time and Resources, (5) Unsafe Behavior, (6) Poor Attendance, (7) Poor Quality Work, (8) Alcohol Use, (9) Drug Use, (10) Inappropriate Verbal Actions, and (11) Inappropriate Physical Actions. These researchers used a multidimensional scaling analysis to examine the likelihood of co-occurrence of the different categories. They interpreted the results of this analysis to show that the eleven categories varied along two dimensions: a Target dimension (Interpersonal/Organizational) and a Task Relevance dimension (Task Relevant/Non Task Relevant). Another study proposed a simpler typology with only five content categories: (1)
Abuse towards Others, (2) Production Deviance, (3) Sabotage, (4) Theft, and (5) Withdrawal (Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, & Kessler, 2006).

Later researchers (Marcus et al., 2016) used structural equation modeling to determine the most appropriate internal structure of counterproductive work behavior, comparing the model fit of several prominent models, as well as various combinations of these models. Tested models include Spector et al.’s (2006) model of five content categories, Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) model of eleven content categories, and Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) two-category target dimension. Marcus et al. (2016) found that the best fitting model allowed the counterproductive work behavior items to load simultaneously on one of eleven ‘content’ factors from Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) model and one of three ‘target’ factors representing an expanded version of Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) target dimension. See Figure 1. These researchers concluded that individual counterproductive work behaviors vary independently in terms of their content and in terms of their target, such that the counterproductive work behaviors organized within a single content category will still have meaningful differences in terms of the targeted victim of the behavior (e.g., stealing from the company versus stealing from coworkers; Marcus et al., 2016).

Organizational misbehavior

Vardi and Wiener (1996) introduced an additional related construct called organizational misbehavior (OMB), which they defined as “any intentional action by members of organizations that defies and violates (1) shared organizational norms and expectations, and/or (2) core societal values, mores and standards of proper conduct” (p. 153). Organizational misbehavior includes actions that violate either organizational norms or societal norms, and therefore overlaps substantially with both unethical workplace behavior and workplace deviance. Organizational misbehavior and workplace deviance also share the element of conscious intention, which is not included in the definition of unethical workplace behavior. Finally, unlike the other two
Figure 1: Measurement Model for Counterproductive Work Behavior (Marcus et al., 2016)

*Note: This is a simplified representation of the best-fitting measurement model from Marcus et al. (2016). The top ovals represent the eleven 'content' factors, middle squares represent the survey items (simplified from 66 to 17 for visual clarity), and the bottom ovals represent the three 'target' factors. The eleven 'content' factors are allowed to intercorrelate with each other, and the three 'target' factors are intercorrelated with each other.*
constructs, organizational misbehavior does not include the element of threat of harm within its definition.

*Typography of organizational misbehavior*

Vardi and Wiener (1996) proposed that organizational misbehavior could be classified based on the dimension of underlying intentions behind the behavior, and identified the three subtypes as Type D (intentions to inflict damage), Type S (intentions to benefit the self), and Type O (intentions to benefit the organization). In this way, unethical pro-organizational behavior is similar to organizational misbehavior Type O in that both types of behavior are defined by the underlying intention to benefit the organization. However, organizational misbehavior Type O includes both actions that violation organizational norms and actions that violate societal norms, whereas unethical pro-organizational behavior is limited to actions that violate societal norms. In describing the three types of organizational misbehavior, the authors elaborated that Type S misbehaviors typically victimize the organization or its members, Type O misbehaviors typically victimize external entities such as customers or social institutions, and Type D misbehaviors can victimize either internal or external entities (Vardi & Wiener, 1996). Thus, although the threat of harm is not explicitly part of the definition of organizational misbehavior, it is implied based on the descriptions of the three categories that exist within the construct.

**Unethical workplace behavior and related constructs: Conclusions**

Although there are multiple terms used to describe and study harmful workplace behavior, and there are notable contrasts between the construct definitions of these terms, there seems to be more similarities between the constructs than there are differences. At their core, unethical workplace behavior, workplace deviance, and organizational misbehavior all reference workplace behavior that goes against the shared norms or expectations of the group. Workplace deviance uses the organization as the referent group, unethical workplace behavior uses society as
the referent group, and organizational misbehavior uses both the organization and society as referent groups. All three constructs are also strongly associated with the threat of harm to others, although workplace deviance only includes the organization and its members as potential victims, while unethical workplace behavior and organizational misbehavior include all entities as potential victims.

There are also many similarities in the proposed structure of the three constructs. Unethical workplace behavior and organizational misbehavior have both been classified based on the intended outcome or goal of the behavior. Likewise, both unethical workplace behavior and workplace deviance have been classified based on the targeted victim of the behavior as well as the general nature or content of the behavior. Finally, the fact that certain behaviors such as theft, harassment, fraud, and deception have been named as examples of all three constructs demonstrates their substantial overlap in content domain (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Treviño et al., 2014; Vardi & Weiner, 1996).

**Methodology of unethical workplace behavior research**

The construct of unethical workplace behavior is an integral part of the overarching field of Business Ethics. Researchers have employed a plethora of methodologies to study the causes and consequences of ethical and unethical workplace behavior, understand the process of employees’ ethical decision making, and build countless theoretical models, all with the ultimate goal of reducing unethical workplace behavior and increasing ethical outcomes in business settings. Over the decades, hundreds of empirical studies on workplace ethics have been published across a variety of journals; along the way, various features of this body of work have been summarized by an abundance of literature reviews. In this section, I will examine the methodological trends of past empirical research on ethical (and unethical) behavior at work, focusing on research design and participant sample.
Research design

Survey designs

The overwhelming majority of the empirical studies related to unethical workplace behavior have used a survey-based research design. An early literature review of business ethics research found that 81% of the 94 studies published between 1972 and 1989 used a survey-based design to study the ethical beliefs and behavior of organizational members (Randall & Gibson, 1990). Ford and Richardson (1994) reviewed empirical research published through 1993 that studied employee ethical decision making. Ethical decision making theory studies the four steps that determine whether an individual will behave ethically or unethically in a given situation: awareness (noticing the ethical significance of a situation), judgment (determining the ethically correct action), intention (deciding whether or not to choose the ethically correct option), and behavior (following through with ethical or unethical behavior; Rest, 1986). Of the journal articles included in Ford & Richardson’s (1994) review that were not already covered in the previous review, twenty-eight out of thirty used a survey design. Later reviews had similar conclusions, with one finding that 96 percent of the 174 studies published between 1996 and 2003 measured employees’ ethical decision making using a survey-based design (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). A review of organizational-level ethics research published between 1980 and 2012 had a more optimistic conclusion, finding that only 65% of the included 184 articles used a survey design (McLeod, Payne, & Evert, 2016). Finally, the most recent review of the empirical ethical decision making literature covering 2004 through 2014 similarly found that 65% of the included 141 studies used a survey design, and that 28 of those studies used a combination of survey and experimental designs (Lehnert, Park, & Singh, 2015).

Survey-based research designs pertaining to unethical workplace behavior use questionnaires to measure their target constructs; these questionnaires typically follow either a
direct question format or a scenario-based format (Craft, 2013; Ford & Richardson, 1994; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Randall & Gibson, 1990). Direct question surveys generally measure unethical workplace behavior using a set of items that describe various unethical workplace behaviors, and prompt participants to rate some aspect of the behaviors on a Likert scale. Response scales can be adapted to measure different metrics, such as the frequency that the participant engages in the behaviors, the frequency that the participant observes the behaviors in the workplace, the participant’s willingness to engage in the behaviors, or the participant’s judgements of the acceptability of the behaviors. Popular questionnaires include Newstrom and Ruch’s (1975) ethics scale, Reidenbach and Robin’s (1990) Multidimensional Ethics Scale, and Kaptein’s (2008) scale for unethical workplace behavior. Randall & Gibson (1990) found that direct question measures included an average of nineteen questions, with each question being approximately one sentence in length. These estimates of scale length continue to be generalizable for much of the research literature, as more recent reviews (Craft, 2013) have noted that the theories and instruments developed between 1980 and 1990 continue to be widely used in newer publications.

Direct-question survey measures have been used to draw conclusions on the overall prevalence or participation rate of unethical workplace behavior and its various subtypes (Kaptein, 2010; Kaptein, Huberts, Avelino, & Lasthuizen, 2005). More frequently, however, studies include these measures to test theoretical models of various direct, mediating, and moderating effects on employees’ ethical decision making and behavior, examining various predictors such as gender (Ameen, Guffey, & McMillan, 1996), gender moderated by religiosity (Kidwell, Stevens, & Bethke, 1987), cognitive moral development mediated by moral evaluation (Shapeero, Chye Koh, & Killough, 2003), peer influence mediated by perceived opportunity to
behave unethically (Zey-Ferrell & Ferrell, 1982), and affective commitment moderated by moral identity (Matherne & Litchfield, 2012).

Surveys following a scenario-based format present the participant with one or more scenarios in the form of vignettes, and ask the participant to picture themselves in each scenario. Typically the vignettes either describe a hypothetical workplace ethical dilemma in which there is an opportunity to behave unethically, or describe a fictitious unethical incident in the workplace that the participant is to imagine that they witnessed. (Weber, 1992). For vignettes featuring an ethical dilemma, participants are generally asked to report what they would do in the given situation, or their likelihood of behaving unethically. When the vignette describes an unethical incident, participants are typically asked to rate the unethical incident in some way, such as how acceptable or unacceptable the incident was, the likelihood that the incident would occur in their workplace, the likelihood that they would behave in the same way, or the likelihood that they would report such an incident. Both types of vignettes generally use a Likert scale or another close-ended response style, such as a multiple-choice or a dichotomous response option. These responses are then used to infer information, either about the factors that influence employees’ ethical decision making, or employees’ propensity to engage in various acts of unethical workplace behavior. Many studies reuse scenarios developed in previous research: popular scenario-based questionnaires include Clark’s (1966) Business Ethic Scale, Dubinsky and Ingram’s (1984) marketing dilemmas questionnaire, Rest’s (1986) Defining Issues Test, and Weber’s (1990) business dilemmas scale. On average twelve scenarios are included, each about five sentences in length (Randall & Gibson, 1990), although some studies have used as few as a single scenario (Grant & Broom, 1988; Stead, Worrrell, Spalding, & Stead, 1987; Weber & Green, 1991).
One of the main ways that scenario-based surveys of unethical workplace behavior differ from direct-question surveys is that scenario surveys include contextual details surrounding the described unethical behavior or dilemma, rather than simply listing the behavior in isolation. This makes scenario-based surveys well-suited to study the effect of various situational variables on employees’ ethical decision making, such as the severity of potential consequences (Davis, Johnson, & Ohmer, 1998; Fritzche & Becker, 1983), organizational pressure (Lacziak & Inderrieden, 1987), social consensus (Davis et al., 1998), top management’s involvement (Akaah & Riordan, 1989), and proximity to the victim (Davis et al., 1998). Some scenario-based research studies even include multiple variations of the same vignette, while manipulating key situational elements (Fritzche & Becker, 1983; Lacziak & Inderrieden, 1987; McNichols & Zimmer, 1985); although this design may limit the overall diversity of ethical scenarios included in the survey, it also allows for a more controlled assessment of how environmental factors affect employees’ unethical workplace behavior. Finally, although situational predictors feature prominently in scenario-based survey research, many of these studies also examine the influence of various individual factors on employees’ ethical decision making, such as gender and religiosity (McNichols & Zimmerer, 1985), nationality (White & Rhodeback, 1992), and job position (Dubinsky and Gwin, 1981).

The inclusion of situational details in scenario-based surveys also presents limitations. If the contextual factors described in the scenario are not relevant to the work experiences of the participant, they may be unaware of how they would respond in that given situation. Furthermore, incorporating situational factors into the descriptions of unethical workplace behaviors limits the generalizability of the measure. These items no longer measure the participants’ judgements of the particular unethical workplace behavior; instead, they measure the participants’ judgements of the particular unethical workplace behavior, within that particular situational context. If the
context added to a described unethical workplace behavior is unrealistic or unfamiliar to some participants, the resulting measurements could lead to erroneous conclusions about the unethical workplace behavior. Finally, the addition of contextual details tends to make scenario-based items much longer than direct-question items (5 sentences each versus 1 sentence each; Randall & Gibson, 1990). Lengthier items increases the possibility of participant fatigue and information overload; as a consequence, scenario-based surveys tend to have fewer items than direct-question surveys (12 items versus 19 items; Randall & Gibson, 1990). This limits the diversity of unethical workplace behaviors included in scenario-based surveys compared to direct-question format, and increases the likelihood that relevant forms of unethical workplace behavior will be omitted from the survey.

Whether using a direct question or scenario format, survey-based research designs typically measure unethical workplace behavior using a pre-determined set of unethical behaviors or situations included in the survey instrument. Consequently, a common complaint concerning these survey-based research designs is the lack of open-ended items or response options for participants (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Lehnert et al., 2015; Randall & Gibson, 1990). Only two of the survey-based workplace ethics studies included in the most recent review contained open-ended items (Lehnert et al., 2015); earlier reviews only observed one (Ford & Richardson, 1994) and five (Randall & Gibson, 1990) surveys with open-ended items. While following a strictly quantitative methodology makes research more convenient by eliminating the need for content analysis and making the analysis process much quicker, it also limits the measurement of unethical workplace behavior to the researchers’ pre-conceived notions of the construct. There is always the risk that the set of scenarios or list of specific behaviors included in a survey will not cover all forms of unethical workplace behavior that are most relevant to the specific participants or organization involved in the study. This is especially the case for scenario-based designs,
which tend to include fewer items. Furthermore, simply adding an open-ended item for participants to supply additional examples of unethical workplace behavior may be insufficient to address this issue in scenario-based designs; the contextual details included in scenario items limit the generalizability to the unethical workplace behaviors described in them, leaving far too much space within the construct domain to be addressed by a simple open-ended item.

For studies seeking to measure the overall prevalence of unethical workplace behavior and its various subtypes, the omission of relevant behaviors may lead to underreporting of specific forms of unethical workplace behavior, and an underestimation of overall unethical workplace behavior. Also, because different forms of unethical workplace behavior are likely to have different relationships with antecedents, the omission of relevant unethical workplace behaviors may lead studies to make inaccurate conclusions regarding the overall effect of individual or situational variables on unethical workplace behavior. For close-ended survey-based studies, there may be no indication of whether a scale truly captures all forms of unethical workplace behavior that are applicable to the target population without including an open-ended “other” item for participants. Ultimately, when using close-ended quantitative instruments to measure unethical workplace behavior, researchers’ findings will be confined by their a priori assumptions.

**Controlled lab and field designs**

Research designs that control and manipulate the study environment, either from a lab or field setting, appears to be a growing trend in workplace ethics research. These studies can take many forms, such as lab simulations, in-basket exercises, and various experimental or quasi-experimental designs set in the lab or field (McLeod et al., 2016; Randall & Gibson, 1990; Treviño, 1992). Relatively few business ethics researchers used these methodologies prior to the twenty-first century: multiple reviews of the ethical decision making literature spanning 1972
through 2003 found that lab- or field-based experimental and quasi-experimental designs were only used in about 4 to 5 percent of the published studies (Ford & Richardson, 1994; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Randall & Gibson, 1990). However, the most recent review of empirical research on workplace ethical decision making found that 29 of the 141 articles published between 2004 and 2014 used pure experimental designs, while another 15 conducted lab simulation studies; thus, 31 percent of the included articles had research designs that controlled and/or manipulated study environment (Lehnert et al., 2015).

Because research designs set in a controlled lab or field setting allow investigators to observe and collect data on actual behavior, they overcome many of the criticisms of survey designs, such as the practice in scenario-based studies of using imagined reactions to hypothetical situations as a proxy for behavior. Lab-based designs in particular have the advantage of increased control over the study environment, allowing researchers to remove confounding variables and draw conclusions on causality. Despite these advantages, some critics question the generalizability and external validity of lab studies (Locke, 1986). The manufactured environments used in lab experiments and simulations allow for increased control, but these studies lack the realism of research conducted in a genuine organizational setting (Treviño, 1992). Because of this artificial environment, lab experiments and simulations are particularly ill-equipped to draw conclusions concerning the nature of unethical workplace behavior occurring within real-world organizational environments. While field experiments offer greater realism, this methodology can be undesirable for researchers seeking a true experimental design: field experiments are often unable to control for confounding variables or use true random assignment due to the practical business needs of the organization (Treviño, 1992). Furthermore, acquiring an organizational partner willing to provide researchers with the access necessary to conduct a field experiment can be difficult, particularly for research on sensitive topics like unethical workplace
behavior. Despite the challenges associated with experimental designs, there are frequent calls within the workplace ethics literature for continued use of this methodology, particularly for theory-based hypotheses testing and for drawing true causal inferences (Ford & Richardson, 1994; McLeod et al., 2016; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Randall & Gibson, 1990; Treviño, 1992).

**Qualitative designs**

Qualitative research designs have been notably underrepresented in literature reviews of empirical research on workplace ethics. The reviews covering research prior to 1994 only included nine interview studies and six survey-based studies with a qualitative element (i.e., open-ended items; Randall & Gibson, 1990; Ford & Richardson, 1994). A view covering 1996 to 2003 included no qualitative studies (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005), while the most recent review covering 2004 to 2014 only included two studies that collected qualitative survey data (Lehnert et al., 2015). However, a literature review which summarized organization-level research on a wider variety of business ethics topics (e.g., corporate social responsibility, whistle blowing, organizational ethical values) contained 52 (28%) qualitative or mixed methods studies, including 38 interviews and 14 direct observation studies. Indeed, another recent review of the workplace ethics literature focused solely on qualitative research; this review found over 100 qualitative or mixed method studies conducted just between 2004 and 2014 (Lehnert, Craft, Singh, & Park, 2016). Although both quantitative and qualitative research can be empirical in nature (i.e., both methods allow for the systematic observation, measurement, and reporting of the phenomenon in question), most articles reviewing “empirical” research on employees’ ethical decision making focus only on quantitative studies. It seems that, at least on the topic of employees’ ethical decision making, scholars prefer to silo quantitative research findings separately from qualitative research findings. Lehnert et al. (2016, p. 498) lamented the fact that “qualitative studies have
traditionally been viewed as rather anemic in their impact, influence, and publication”; the number of articles reviewing quantitative versus qualitative research on employees’ ethical decision making seems to confirm this viewpoint.

The review of qualitative research on employees’ ethical decision making found interviews to be the most common qualitative research approach (52 out of 121 studies), followed by case studies (27), document content analysis (26) focus groups (9), observations (7), narrative approaches (7) and open-ended surveys (6), with many studies using a combination of multiple methods (Lehnert et al., 2016). These qualitative research approaches can generally be grouped into three broad methods of data collection: (1) collecting responses directly from participants, (2) direct observation of a situation or phenomenon, or (3) gathering information from archival written documents. Different qualitative methods have unique advantages and challenges, especially related to these different methods of data collection.

Interviews, focus groups, narrative studies, and open-ended surveys all elicit information directly from participants, either in-person, online, on paper, over the phone, or through other means of communication. For research into unethical workplace behavior, this data collection method is advantageous in that it not only allows researchers to gather information on the types of unethical behaviors witnessed and committed by participants, but this method can also capture unobservable information about these incidents, such as the thought process leading up to the action, motives, backstory, and the psychological antecedents and consequences of unethical workplace behavior. Interviews and focus groups that allow real-time interaction between the researcher and participants also have some advantages over open-ended surveys, as they allow the researcher to prompt participants for more information and ask follow-up questions as necessary. On the other hand, open-ended surveys can offer a greater sense of anonymity to participants; this can be helpful in encouraging honest responding, particularly when dealing with the sensitive
topic of workplace ethics (Randal & Gibson, 1990; Weaver, 1992). Indeed, it would be particularly difficult for employees to respond honestly to questions about unethical behavior when in a focus group setting, as participants may fear the judgement of the other members of the focus group (Cowton & Downs, 2015).

Observational studies involve collecting data through systematically recording observations of the events and activities occurring within a given setting. This approach is often used in conjunction with other techniques, such as interviews or focus groups (Cowton & Downs, 2015; Lehnert et al., 2016). For researchers studying workplace ethics, direct observation studies can provide an opportunity to witness actual instances of unethical workplace behavior, and gather information about the incidents in real-time. This approach has some advantages over the interview or focus group method, as interviewees may be unable to recall (or misremember) specific details of an unethical workplace behavior incident after the fact. Also, there is always the risk of dishonesty in self-report and other-report information about unethical workplace behavior (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012; Crane, 1999; Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruursema, 2007). However, observational studies of unethical workplace behavior are difficult for other reasons: because it is a low base rate phenomenon, and typically conducted surreptitiously, it may be very difficult collect observational data on unethical workplace behavior in a genuine organizational setting. Observations of manufactured ethical dilemmas, on the other hand, may not accurately represent how such a situation would transpire in a real-life workplace setting.

Finally, document content analysis collects data from various archival documents, such as official organizational communications and records, news media, and legal documents; researchers then use content analysis to synthesize data on the phenomenon of interest. This approach is common in case studies, often in combination with interviews, focus groups, or observation (Lehnert et al., 2016). Document content analysis can also be very useful in studying
various organizational ethics structures, such as ethical codes of conduct, formalized internal reporting policies, and corporate social responsibility pledges. Furthermore, many of the archival texts used in document content analysis are publically available online from company, news, or government websites. However, studying the true nature and prevalence of unethical workplace behavior using official organizational documents may be difficult: these documents are often curated with the purpose of creating an ethical image for the organization, but in practice these statements may not be enforced within the organization (Cady, Wheeler, DeWolf, & Brodke, 2011). Thus, these documents may provide a prescriptive rather than descriptive view of workplace ethics. News articles and legal documents from various corporate scandals may provide a more complete view of unethical behavior within organizations, but these too can often be slanted towards a particular viewpoint or agenda. Still, these documents offer a unique high-level perspective to study the historical, cultural, or organizational context of any given workplace ethics issue.

While each form of qualitative research may have distinct benefits and drawbacks, all qualitative research has an advantage over quantitative designs in developing an understanding of the nuanced contextual and social factors involved in explaining human judgements and behavior (Lehnert et al., 2016). This makes qualitative research especially vital when studying broad spectrum, multifaceted, and highly adaptable social phenomena like unethical workplace behavior. The process of ethical decision making (and the resulting ethical or unethical behavior) is thought to be both uniquely individual as well as situational, while at the same time embedded within an intricate societal context, making it difficult to capture the complexities of the phenomenon using restrictive quantitative methods (Lehnert et al., 2016). Furthermore, changes in technology and the nature of work continually create opportunities for new forms of unethical workplace behavior; rigid quantitative instruments may be ill-suited to measure such a rapidly
evolving construct. Qualitative methodologies seek to flexibly collect data that matches the complexity of the human experience; this makes it possible for qualitative designs to discover dimensions, subtypes, and predictors of unethical workplace behavior that might have been missed in quantitative designs, simply because the researchers did not know to measure it. For this reason, qualitative research is especially helpful for theory building, identifying fruitful new research avenues or research questions, and guiding the development of research instruments, all of which improves the quality of subsequent quantitative research (Cowton & Downs, 2015; Lehnert et al., 2016). Using qualitative data as a supplement to quantitative research is also an effective means of triangulation, which verifies and validates the findings from both sources.

For all of these reasons, it is especially concerning that scholarly reviews of workplace ethics research generally choose to silo quantitative research findings separately from qualitative research. This makes it much more difficult to compare the findings of the two approaches, or to allow new quantitative research to benefit from the insights provided by past qualitative investigations. Although many popular quantitative instruments for the study of employees’ ethical and unethical behavior were originally developed using input from qualitative data, in some cases this data was only collected from a single industry (Newstrom & Ruch, 1975) or only from executives and managers (Weber, 1990); in other cases, the qualitative input came primarily or exclusively from archival document analysis rather than feedback from actual employees, such as Reidenbach and Robin’s (1990) use of moral philosophy texts, and Kaptein’s (2008) use of organizational codes of ethics. Furthermore, many of the scales still used today are now decades old (Newstrom & Ruch, 1975; Reidenbach & Robin, 1990; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Weber, 1990). These quantitative instruments developed in the twentieth century may not be adapted to accurately measure unethical workplace behavior as it exists in the information age. Issues such as technology, globalization, and the evolving relationship between employee and organization
have drastically changed the business landscape in recent years, and the pace of change continues to accelerate. This highlights the continued need for qualitative research on unethical workplace behavior, and the need to triangulate these findings against quantitative research on the subject.

**Participant sample**

In addition to the diversity of research designs, the methodology of empirical research related to unethical workplace behavior also varies in terms of participant sampling features. Within the business ethics literature, the choice of population group and sample size are frequently discussed as two of the most important elements of the participant sample (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Randall & Gibson, 1990). A study’s population group affects the conclusions that can be drawn from the research, and the generalizability of those conclusions. On the other hand, sample size affects a study’s ability to detect the true effect of their study variables, and also influences the study’s ability to accurately estimate the characteristics of the target population based on measurements taken from the sample.

**Population**

Although the populations sampled within business ethics research can vary along a number of factors, the largest distinction is made between applied samples and student samples. Reviews of the workplace ethics literature find that the use of student samples is on the rise. Approximately one third of the studies published prior to the mid-1990s used student samples to research employees’ ethical judgements and behavior (Randall & Gibson, 1990; Ford & Richardson, 1994), while 40 percent of the studies published between 1996 and 2004 used student samples (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). In contrast, more than half of the workplace ethics research published after 2004 have used student samples (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015). This shows an increased trend towards student samples, despite frequent protest by business ethics
scholars, and repeated calls for the use of more appropriate and representative applied samples (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015; O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Weber, 1992). Although the use of student samples is less prevalent in qualitative research on unethical workplace behavior, a recent review still found that twelve percent of qualitative studies used student samples, and another two percent used a mixture of students and non-students in their sample (Lehnert et al., 2016).

Applied samples in business ethics research generally consist of employees, although the employee group can vary in terms of their industry, job class, and nationality. Many studies choose to survey employees from one or more company within a particular industry; commonly studied industries include marketing (e.g., Fraedrich & Ferrell, 1992), sales (e.g., Valentine & Bateman, 2011), and accounting (e.g., Shafer & Simmons, 2011). Applied samples also frequently target a specific job class of employees, most often management (Randall & Gibson, 1990). The literature reviews that distinguished participant samples based on job class found that the majority of applied samples used in workplace ethics research include only management employees (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Randall & Gibson, 1990). In fact, 27 percent of the studies published prior to 1990 exclusively surveyed marketing managers (Randall & Gibson, 1990). Employees’ ethical judgements and behavior have also been studied using samples from a variety of countries, predominately within North America, Europe, and Asia (McLeod et al., 2016; Lehnert et al., 2016). Although most studies pulled participants from within a single country, there is a growing trend towards sampling participants from multiple countries to test for cross-cultural differences (Lehnert et al., 2015).

Although the choice of study population is always considered an important element of research methodology, this may be particularly true for workplace ethics research. Naturally, an employees’ specific job responsibilities and their physical and social workplace environment will
likely have an impact on that employee’s motivation and opportunity to engage in different forms of unethical workplace behavior. By extension, the forms and prevalence of unethical workplace behavior is likely to vary heavily depending on the business function of the organization involved, and the job position and authority level of the employee(s) involved. Sampling employees from within a particular industry, job position, or employee rank will allow for a more detailed examination of the characteristics and predictors of unethical workplace behavior within that specific population. On the other hand, this targeted sampling approach makes it more difficult to compare findings between studies, consolidate past research, and build an overall understanding of unethical workplace behavior. Additionally, when some populations are overrepresented in the research literature (such as management employees and the marketing industry), this may lead to biased conclusions about the global construct of unethical workplace behavior.

Most troubling is the increased use of student samples in business ethics research. Although some have argued that student samples can occasionally be suitable for workplace ethics research (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Randall & Gibson, 1990), the majority of scholars agree that the use of student samples is inappropriate for studying issues related to employees’ ethical judgements and behavior (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Weber, 1992). Student samples may be appealing due to their availability, but their general lack of work experience severely limits students’ familiarity with and relevant knowledge of unethical workplace behavior. Even for students with work experience, the heavy predominance of part-time, low-level, temporary employment among students restricts the generalizability of study findings when using student samples.
Sample size

Sample size has also varied widely across past research related to employees’ ethical judgements and behavior. Although literature reviews covering research published through the year 2000 have found a mean sample size of over 400 participants, these estimates were skewed by a small number of studies with very large sample sizes (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Randall & Gibson, 1990). The sample size of the studies included in these reviews ranged from 4 participants to 4044 participants, with a median of approximately 200 participants. A more recent review found that 15 percent of workplace ethics research published between 2004 and 2014 had a sample size of less than 100 participants, adding that this was an inappropriately small sample size for the research designs used in some of these studies (Lehnert et al., 2015); this criticism was in line with the conclusions of earlier reviews (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005).

The sample sizes used in qualitative business ethics research have generally been much smaller than that of the quantitative research (Lehnert et al., 2016; Lock & Seele, 2015). A brief inspection of the articles included in the Lehnert et al. (2016) review of qualitative workplace ethics research revealed that, of the studies that collected data directly from participants, very few studies had sample sizes larger 100. In fact, most of these qualitative studies had fewer than 50 participants, with some collecting data from only one participant (e.g., Ferrell & Ferrell, 2011). The minimally appropriate sample size for qualitative research is typically smaller than that of quantitative research, due to the decreased reliance on statistical significance testing and the increased depth of the data collected from each participant (Lock & Seele, 2015). Still, even in qualitative research, the use of a small sample size can restrict the diversity of personal experiences and perspectives represented within the participant sample. Therefore, relatively large sample sizes may be required for qualitative studies seeking to comprehensively cover the broad scope and varied typology of unethical workplace behavior.
Methodology of unethical workplace behavior research: Conclusions

Across nearly five decades of past research, scholars have employed many different methodologies to study various aspects of employees’ ethical and unethical judgements and behavior. Naturally, researchers’ choices regarding study design and participant sample have been influenced by their specific research questions: survey designs have frequently been used to test theoretical models of various direct, mediating, and moderating effects, lab experiments have been used to build evidence of causal relationships, and qualitative designs have helped to provide greater contextual detail related to the experience and process of employees’ ethical decision making and behavior. Narrowly defined participant groups have allowed for detailed examinations into the ethical challenges within specific industries or work roles, while diverse participant samples allow research findings to be generalized across a variety of business settings. However, certain weaknesses also exist in past research, including an overreliance on surveys using only close-ended items, inappropriate use of student samples, and in some cases, inadequate sample sizes. Additionally, scholars have frequently criticized that the methodology of business ethics research has in part been shaped by practical considerations of time and cost, as well as constraints related to the sensitive nature of the topic of workplace ethics (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Weber, 1992). In the next section, I will review the challenges facing business ethics researchers, how these challenges have influenced the methodology of workplace ethics research, and how this in turn has contributed to certain weaknesses and gaps in the current body of research on unethical workplace behavior.

Challenges and limitations of unethical workplace behavior research

The sensitive nature of unethical workplace behavior makes it an inherently difficult topic to study. Researchers have frequently acknowledged that many organizations are reluctant to be the subject of ethics research, potentially due to concerns over reputation damage or liability
Likewise, employees are often hesitant to report honestly about their own or others’ unethical behavior (Berry et al., 2012; Crane, 1999; Fox et al., 2007). Scholars studying unethical workplace behavior face these unique challenges on top of the usual research difficulties of balancing the priority of methodological rigor along with the need for cost and time efficiency. As I will explain in this section, research obstacles related to biased responding and sample inaccessibility, along with various methodological compromises meant to address these obstacles, have all contributed to certain weaknesses in the research community’s ability to accurately measure the construct of unethical workplace behavior.

**Limitations due to potential dishonest responding**

The potential for dishonest or biased responding when measuring unethical workplace behavior is a common concern throughout the research literature (Crane, 1999; McLeod et al., 2016; Treviño, 1992). This issue stems partially from employees’ fears that admitting to unethical workplace behavior may lead to self-incrimination and punishment (Giacalone, Knouse, & Ashworth, 1991; Lee, 1993). Additionally, the negative connotation and cultural taboo surrounding ethical transgressions causes the measurement of unethical workplace behavior to be especially vulnerable to social desirability bias (Giacalone et al., 1991; Heneman, Heneman, & Judge, 1997; Paulhus, 1991; Randall & Fernandes, 1991). Individuals’ actions are often influenced by an innate social desire to present a favorable impression of oneself to others; this can lead research participants to skew their responses towards what they perceive to be the “correct” or socially acceptable option (Maccoby & Maccoby, 1954). This effect is especially prevalent when the research topic is socially contentious, such as unethical behavior. Therefore, even employees with no fear of self-incrimination or punishment are likely to be uncomfortable disclosing their own unethical behavior. This creates a challenge for researchers seeking to study unethical workplace behavior, especially considering that self-report instruments are the
predominant method for measuring this construct (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Berry et al., 2012; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001).

The combined effect of social desirability bias and fear of self-incrimination are likely to lead to underreporting of unethical workplace behavior when self-report methods are used, which is evidenced by the well-documented trend of individuals evaluating their own behavior as more ethical than that of others (Cole & Smith, 1996; Ford & Richardson, 1994; Izraeli, 1988; McDonald & Zepp, 1988; O’Clock & Okleshen, 1993; Rappaport & Himschoot, 1994; Schminke & Ambrose, 1997; Vitell & Festervand, 1987). However, other-report measures of unethical behavior may also be subject to underreporting. Social desirability bias can extend beyond personal impression management, leading individuals to also represent their in-group in an overly favorable light (Sherwood, 1981). Employees may worry that admitting knowledge of unethical practices within one’s organization will implicate oneself by association. Additionally, employees may fail to report coworkers’ unethical behavior in order to protect their peers from potential punishment, or because they fear retaliation from the guilty individuals (Fox et al., 2007; Treviño, 1992). For these reasons, both self-report and other-report measures of unethical workplace behavior may be subject to underreporting (Berry et al., 2012; Giacalone, Knouse, & Pollard, 1999; Lee, 1993; King & Hermodson, 2000; Randall & Fernandes, 1991).

Researchers have used many methods to address the concern of dishonest or biased responding to measures of unethical workplace behavior. Naturally, employees are especially hesitant to discuss unethical workplace behavior when they believe their responses may used against them by their organization (Giacalone et al., 1999; Lee, 1993). To alleviate these fears of retaliation and punishment, studies generally go to great lengths to assure confidentiality, and limit or eliminate the involvement of the organization in the data collection process (Crane, 1999; Cowton & Downs, 2015; Giacalone, Knouse, & Montaglioni, 1997; Hinrichs, 1975). To further
reduce fears of self-incrimination, and address concerns with social desirability bias, many studies use indirect measures unethical workplace behavior as proxies for actual unethical workplace behavior (McLeod et al., 2016; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Rather than directly asking participants to report on their own or others’ unethical workplace behavior, proxy measures ask indirect or hypothetical questions about unethical workplace behavior, such as asking participants to judge the acceptability or unacceptability of various forms of unethical workplace behavior (Akaah, 1996; Longenecker, McKinney, & Moore, 1988), having participants rate their hypothetical likelihood of engaging in various unethical workplace behaviors (Adams, Harris, & Carley, 1998; Posner & Schmidt, 1987), or asking participants to rate the likelihood that they would punish or report the perpetrator of a hypothetical ethical violation (Barnett, Cochran, & Taylor, 1993; Gibson & Frakes, 1997). By asking participants about their hypothetical opinions and intentions rather than their actual behavior or experiences, participants may perceive less personal risk in responding honestly to the proxy measures; therefore, the proxy measures are thought to reduce dishonest and biased responding (Fisher, 1993).

Indirect measures of unethical workplace behavior also serve other functions besides their application in reducing response bias. Because these proxy measures often tap into participants’ thoughts, judgements, and intentions regarding unethical workplace behavior, they are ideal for research into ethical decision making. Researchers studying the ethical decision making process seek to understand the cognitive steps performed by an individual that help to determine whether the individual will behave ethically or unethically (Rest, 1986). The four steps in the ethical decision making process are (1) awareness (noticing the ethical significance of a situation), (2) judgment (determining the ethically correct course of action), (3) intention (deciding whether to act ethically or unethically in the given situation), and behavior (actually
engaging in ethical or unethical behavior). Many indirect measures of unethical workplace behavior correspond directly to one of the earlier steps in the ethical decision making process preceding the behavior step, and therefore these measures are generally suitable for ethical decision making research (Adams et al., 1998; Akaah, 1996; Longenecker et al., 1988; Posner & Schmidt, 1987). However, scholars argue that these alternative measures should not be considered equivalent to unethical workplace behavior (Craft, 2013; McLeod et al., 2016; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005). Research has shown that the correlation between individuals’ intentions and their actual behavior is weak to moderate at best (Weber & Gillespie, 1998). For various reasons, one’s ethical beliefs and intentions do not always align with one’s actions. Although they may be less susceptible to response bias, proxy measures that assess employees’ awareness, judgements, or intentions regarding unethical workplace behavior are not truly valid for measuring the construct of unethical workplace behavior. It is therefore troubling that fewer than half of the business ethics studies included in the most recent empirical review (Lehnert et al., 2015) specifically measured behavior as opposed to ethical awareness, judgements, or intentions.

Another strategy some business ethics researchers have used to address the concern of dishonest responding is the triangulation of archival data as a means to check for bias. These studies gather information about unethical workplace behavior from organizational records, comparing audits of financial files or other organizational documents to employees’ ratings of unethical workplace behavior (Dooley & Lerner, 1994; Weber, Kurke, & Pentico, 2003). However, archival records are also unlikely to be an accurate measure of unethical workplace behavior. Organizational records will not include unethical workplace behaviors that went undiscovered or unreported. Also, some behaviors (such as gossiping or minor acts of bullying) could fall within the spectrum of unethical workplace behavior, and yet may not considered a
punishable offence by the organization; these unethical workplace behaviors would also be excluded from organizational records. Furthermore, even supposedly objective records of unethical workplace behavior (such as personnel disciplinary statements) may be incomplete or inaccurate. Although archival records may be effective for evaluating certain forms of unethical workplace behavior that can be assessed through financial records, such as accounting fraud (Summers & Sweeney, 1998) or employee theft (Weber et al., 2003), it is likely that organizational documents will capture a narrower range of unethical workplace behaviors than could be obtained from directly surveying employees.

**Limitations due to sample inaccessibility**

Another major obstacle for researchers seeking to measure unethical workplace behavior is simply obtaining an appropriate organizational sample. As stated previously, organizations are typically unwilling to be the subject of research into unethical workplace behavior due to concerns over reputation damage and liability (Randall & Gibson, 1990; Treviño, 1986; Treviño & Weaver, 2003). Although participating organizations typically remain unnamed in published research, there is always the risk that a breach of confidentiality will result in the organization’s identity becoming exposed. If serious ethical violations are discovered, researchers may even feel ethically obligated to report the organization in some way. Organizations may also be concerned that their employees will react negatively to the study. Employees may find it threatening or distressing to be questioned on such a sensitive topic, especially in association with their place of employment (Sieber, 2001). Employees may also be skeptical of the true purpose behind the study, or even interpret the study to be an indication of the presence of ethical issues within the organization. Organizations may also have other practical concerns as well, such as the potential for lost productivity due to the distraction and time commitment of study participation. The
collective effect of all of these considerations leads organizations to generally avoid participation in research on unethical workplace behavior.

Difficulties with sample accessibility are reflected in the sampling choices seen in published research. As described previously, more than half of the workplace ethics research published after 2004 have used student samples (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015); this is despite the overall consensus within the research community that student samples are generally inappropriate for organizational behavior research (Craft, 2013; Lehnert et al., 2015; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Weber, 1992). Students are unsuitable participants for research on unethical workplace behavior for several reasons. Because students as a population tend to be much younger and less ethnically diverse than the overall workforce, student samples are unrepresentative of the target population for workplace ethics research. However, the most notable weakness of student samples for business ethics research concerns work experience. Many students’ employment history is limited to part-time and seasonal employment, or even non-paid positions. These students may not have had enough time on the job to gain first-hand experience with unethical workplace behavior, and therefore will be unable to provide accurate information about the topic. Additionally, the types of unethical workplace behaviors that one encounters in the workplace are in part influenced by one’s employment sector and specific work role. The unskilled retail positions typically held by students only represent one small subset of the total workforce experience, and therefore the use of student samples is likely to restrict the variety of unethical workplace behaviors captured by a study.

Certain sampling limitations can also be seen among workplace ethics research using applied samples. Within business ethics research, most studies that are able to obtain an applied sample do so by recruiting employees independently from their organization. This creates a sample of employees that are distributed across many different organizations. These distributed
employee samples are obtained through various means, such as lists of University alumni (Effelsberg, Solga, & Gurt, 2014; Peterson, 2002), member lists from various professional associations (Becker & Fritzche, 1987; Wahn, 1993; Zey-Ferrell, Weaver, & Ferrell, 1979), enrollment lists from management training programs (Abbratt, Nel, & Higs, 1992), or simply by recruiting workers on their morning train commute (Bell & Hughes-Jones, 2008). Some business ethics researchers have used this sampling approach to gather a diverse sample of employees across a variety of industries (Kaptein, 2008; Moore, Detert, Treviño, Baker, & Mayer, 2012; Peterson, 2002); others have sampled from narrower worker populations, such as HR professionals (Wahn, 1993), salespeople (Dubinsky & Ingram, 1984), or industrial buyers (Browning & Zabriskie, 1983). Much of the applied research into workplace ethics uses distributed employee samples of just business managers (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl, & Baumhart, 2003; Forte, 2004; Ibrahim, Howard, & Angelialis, 2008) or only marketing managers (Abbratt et al., 1992; Becker & Fritzche, 1987; Zey-Ferrell et al., 1979).

The popularity of this distributed sampling approach for business ethics research is understandable, as it allows researchers to “circumvent the problem of companies’ reluctance to participate in research where unethical behavior is the object of research” (Kaptein, 2008, p. 986-987). This sampling approach also eliminates the organization’s involvement in the study and increases respondents’ sense of anonymity, thereby decreasing the risk of social desirability bias and dishonest responding (Fernandes & Randall, 1992). Additionally, sampling employees from a wide variety of industries and work roles will increase the diversity of the collective workplace experiences within the participant group; this will help to provide the study with a wide variety of perspectives on unethical workplace behavior. However, there are also disadvantages to the distributed employee sampling approach. Because participants are typically not required to disclose the identity of their employer, and because each participant may be from a different
organization, this method does not allow participants to be nested by organization. Nesting employees’ responses by their organization allows researchers to assess unethical workplace behavior at the organization-level, and allows researchers to better study the effects of various group-level phenomena, such as ethical climate, on unethical workplace behavior (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). Without nested data, researchers cannot accurately compare differences in unethical workplace behavior between organizations, or examine how the shared social norms and environment within an organization affect employees’ unethical workplace behavior. Many scholars have recognized the importance of studying workplace ethics from a group-level perspective, and have called for more organization-level research (Craft, 2013; McLeod et al., 2016; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Treviño et al., 2006). However, individual-level unethical workplace behavior research continues to predominate, perhaps due to the convenience and overall popularity of the distributed sampling approach.

Although there are some examples of business ethics researchers partnering with organizations to study groups of employees nested within organizations, most of these studies only included one or two organizations (Lasthuizen et al., 2011; Mattherne & Litchfield, 2012; Niven & Healy, 2016), or only included organizations from one industry (Arnold, Bernardi, Neidermeyer, & Schmee, 2007; Bobek, Hageman, & Radtke, 2010; Douglas, Davidson, & Schwartz, 2001; Suar & Khuntia, 2010). Studies that include only one or two organizations have an insufficient group-level sample size for studying organization-level effects (Maas & Hox, 2005). Also, samples of employees from a single organization (or even a single industry) will be somewhat homogeneous in terms of their workplace experiences; therefore, these studies may only be able to study certain subsets of unethical workplace behavior.
Challenges and limitations of unethical workplace behavior research: Conclusions

For researchers seeking to accurately measure and study the total construct of unethical workplace behavior in all its forms, it seems that there is a sizable gap between the ideal methodology and the most convenient methodology. As outlined in previous sections, participants should ideally be asked about actual instances of unethical workplace behavior rather than their hypothetical opinions, judgements, or intentions. Also, measures must include open-ended items for participants to describe forms of unethical workplace behavior that may not be covered by any given preformed measurement instrument. Participant samples should be large and include a diverse collection of employees (not students) from many industries, work roles, and employment levels. A variety of different organizations should be represented (ideally more than one organization per industry), with many employees sampled from within each organization. Although employees must be matched to their employer in order to create nested data, participants must not fear punishment from their organization, and all possible steps should be taken to reduce social desirability bias. Unfortunately, the ideal conditions for the measurement of unethical workplace behavior are very hard to achieve. Because of the sensitive topic, researchers frequently opt for proxy measures that use hypothetical scenarios and do not require participants to disclose information about real-life instances of unethical workplace behavior. Also, most researchers use restrictive close-ended measures with no open-ended items included. Finally, researchers often settle for either student samples or distributed employee samples (which are often restricted to a single industry or work role). The methodological limitations in typical unethical workplace behavior research is likely to result in flawed measurement of unethical workplace behavior, which in turn could invalidate any research conclusions derived from those measurements.
In this study, I seek to address the weaknesses in past research and strengthen the current understanding of unethical workplace behavior by studying the construct using methodological strategies that have historically been underrepresented. The study makes use of a preexisting dataset of employee exit interviews obtained through a partnership with a workforce analytics consulting firm; this dataset has many unique qualities that make it ideal for studying the construct of unethical workplace behavior. One distinguishing feature of the dataset is its participant sample, which is large, diverse, and nested by organization. The dataset includes the interview responses of over 28,000 former employees from approximately 130 organizations; the employees held a wide variety of work roles and employment levels, and the organizations represent a diverse assortment of industries. Additionally, several factors served to limit dishonest or biased responding within this dataset. Participants reported on their former organization, which would have limited participants’ concerns of punishment or retaliation by the organization. Also, the interviews were conducted by an outside party, and the participants’ identities were not connected to their responses; these factors would have helped to reduce social desirability bias.

Perhaps the most significant advantage of this study’s dataset is the way in which unethical workplace behavior was measured. First, participants were asked to report about actual instances of unethical workplace behavior rather than hypothetical scenarios; the resulting measurements are therefore more accurate representations the true construct of unethical workplace behavior. Furthermore, the interview format facilitated the collection of rich, qualitative data. All participants were asked whether they were aware of any ethical violations that took place during their employment with their former organization; those who responded affirmatively were then asked to provide a description of the incident(s). Thus, the dataset contains nearly 1,500 qualitative descriptions of unethical workplace behavior witnessed by
former employees, transcribed word-for-word from the interviews. Content analysis of this large collection of free-response accounts of unethical workplace behavior fills a valuable role as a means of triangulation with past quantitative research in the field.

In this study, I sought to strengthen the areas of research that have historically been the weakest. I took an exploratory approach and examined the issue of unethical workplace behavior through a qualitative lens, conducting a large-scale content analysis of first-hand reports of unethical workplace behavior using a diverse applied sample. Taking this approach, I constructed a characterization of unethical workplace behavior that was not limited by a priori assumptions or prefixed inventories, but was instead built directly from the real-world experiences of fifteen-hundred workers from across the present-day American workforce. By comparing my findings to that of past research, this study helps to fill gaps in the literature by identifying underreported dimensions, categories, or specific examples of unethical workplace behavior with which to anchor future research efforts.

Because the aim of this study is to provide a description of unethical workplace behavior that is independent from the conventional construct assumptions delineated by past research, I did not dictate the direction of my analyses with a priori hypotheses. Instead, the content within the employee narratives drove the course of my analyses through the process of inductive content analysis. The inductive content analysis approach, which will be described in full detail in the Method section, allowed the narrative data from the employee interviews to shape the development and refinement of content categories and subcategories with which to define the structure and nature of unethical workplace behavior. These content categories and subcategories were then used as a coding system to label and categorize the unethical workplace behaviors described within the employee narratives, which translated this qualitative information into quantitative data for further analysis. The coded data was then used to succinctly describe and
quantify the key features and trends in unethical workplace behavior found within the dataset, including ranking subcategories of unethical workplace behavior in terms of prevalence and establishing trends in co-occurrence between specific categories of unethical workplace behavior.

For this study, the initial step in the inductive content analysis process was to examine the full set of employee narratives for reoccurring themes and prominent characteristics that could potentially differentiate some instances of unethical workplace behavior from others. The insights gained from this exploration of the data were then used to generate potential content subcategories for use in coding the qualitative data. After reading all employee narratives, identifying potential content subcategories, and organizing the proposed subcategories into main content categories, I formed the following research questions. Research questions Q1 through Q4 were explored through the process of coding this study’s qualitative data using inductive content analysis. Questions Q5 through Q10 were used to guide the quantitative analysis of the coded data, which was conducted after the coding phase of the content analysis was complete.

Research questions

**Q1.** What subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code unethical workplace behavior into overall groupings or types of behavior?

**Q2.** Who or what are the victims of unethical workplace behavior? What subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code the victims?

**Q3.** Who are the perpetrators of unethical workplace behavior, and what subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code the perpetrators?

**Q4.** How will the content categories and subcategories of unethical workplace behavior produced by this study compare to the dimensions and categories reported in past research?
Q5. For each of the main content categories of unethical workplace behavior, which subcategories are most commonly observed in this dataset? How does this result compare to past research findings?

Q6. Do different types of unethical workplace behavior tend to involve different victims and perpetrators?

Q7. Did the rate of reported unethical workplace behavior vary by organization?

Q8. Did the rate of reported unethical workplace behavior vary by industry, and if so, which industries had the highest and lowest rates?

Q9. Did the types of reported unethical workplace behaviors vary by organization?

Q10. Did the types of reported unethical workplace behaviors vary by industry? If so, how?
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

This study used a preexisting dataset obtained through a partnership with a workforce analytics consulting firm, which I will refer to as “the consulting firm.” One stipulation of my use of this dataset was a non-disclosure agreement, which precludes the disclosure of any confidential or proprietary information related to the consulting firm or the dataset. Therefore, I will only discuss the participants, procedures, and measures to the extent that the non-disclosure agreement allows.

Participant sample

The participant sample consisted of former employees from organizations that held contracts with the consulting firm in 2016. These organizations paid the consulting firm to conduct exit interviews and provide consulting services related to employee retention. The questions included in the exit interviews conducted by the consulting firm varied by organizational client, and not all clients opted to include questions about unethical workplace behavior. This study’s dataset comprised data from 2016 interviews that included an open-ended question about unethical workplace behavior; thus, participants were limited to former employees from organizational clients that opted to include this question.

Procedures

All employees who terminated employment with one of the consulting firm’s organizational clients were contacted by the consulting firm and invited to participate in an exit interview. The consulting firm would explain that participation was voluntary and would assure the employee that their identity would not be connected to their responses. Trained interviewers from the consulting firm conducted the structured interviews, which were administered either
over the phone or online depending on the contract specified between the organizational client and the consulting firm. Questions included demographic items, Likert-scale items, and open-ended items. For open-ended items, the interviewer would transcribe the interviewee’s response word-for-word and would prompt the interviewee for more information as needed; this process will be described in greater detail in the Measures section. Participants’ names were not recorded with their responses; instead, each response was assigned a unique respondent ID.

After an interview was completed, the participant’s interview data would be added to the dataset of other previous exit interviews conducted for that organizational client. The consulting firm analyzes this raw data and provides the organizational client with a periodic summary report and recommendations for how to improve retention. To obtain data from the consulting firm, I submitted a research proposal requesting data for research on unethical workplace behavior. After the proposal was approved, the consulting firm provided raw data from all 2016 exit interviews that included an open-ended question about unethical workplace behavior.

**Participants**

In all, this study’s dataset included the exit interview responses from 28,175 former employees from a total of 131 different organizations. Sixteen industries were represented among the participating organizations; health care and social assistance had the most participating organizations (70), followed by finance and insurance (12), manufacturing (10), professional, scientific, and technical services (7), and wholesale trade (5). The number of participants per organization ranged from 1 to 1,680, with a mean of 215 and a median of 122 participants per organization. Thirty organizations had fewer than 50 participating employees, 23 organizations had between 50 and 100 participating employees, and 78 organizations had more than 100 participating employees. In all, 2,777 of the interviews were conducted online, while 25,398 were conducted over the phone. Approximately 56 percent of participants were female, 36 percent
were male, and 8 percent did not specify gender. Age of participants ranged from 14 to 90, with mean age of 41. Tenure of participants ranged from 0 days (i.e., the participant was hired but left before starting work) to 61 years, with mean tenure of 5.6 years and a median tenure of 2 years. Fewer than 4 percent of participants had under 1 month tenure while 82 percent of participants had at least 6 months tenure.

**Measures**

The demographic items included in the interviews varied by organizational client; this study’s dataset only included the variables that were common across many organizational clients. The exact phrasing of the interview questions also varied by organizational client. These interview scripts are proprietary and were not provided to me by the consulting firm. The measures will be described in as much detail as possible, as permitted by the non-disclosure agreement.

**Demographics**

The dataset included demographic variables for participants’ gender, age (in years), tenure (in days), interview format (phone or online), and organizational client (full company names were provided). Some organizational clients chose not to collect gender, age, and/or tenure information; in total, 8.6 percent of the interviews omitted at least one of these demographic items. All responses included data on the interview format and organizational client. After receiving the dataset from the consulting firm, I created a variable for industry by researching the organizational client company names and assigning each to an appropriate industry category, using O*Net’s list of industries as the industry categories.

**Unethical workplace behavior**

Unethical workplace behavior was measured with two items, although the exact wording of these items varied by organizational client. The interviewer would first ask the interviewee if
they were aware of any ethical violations or unethical incidents that happened during their employment at their former organization. This item was recorded with a dichotomous yes or no response option. Within this study’s dataset, a total of 1,445 participants (5.1%) responded “yes” to this item. For those participants who responded “yes”, the interviewer would follow up with an open-ended question asking the participant to describe the incident or incidents. The participant would be given time to recount the incident or incidents in full detail, and the interviewer would transcribe the participant’s entire response word-for-word. If certain details were not provided in the participant’s initial open-ended response, the interviewer would ask additional open-ended follow-up questions to ascertain when and where the issues occurred, whether the participant had previously reported the issues, and if so, to whom. The participant could decline to provide these further details if he or she did not feel comfortable to do so. Any responses to the follow-up questions were also transcribed word-for-word by the interviewer. Participants’ transcribed responses to the open-ended unethical workplace behavior item (including follow-up responses) ranged in length from 3 words to 1,388 words; mean response length was 110 words and median response length was 87 words. I will refer to these responses as the “employee narratives.” Although I received the raw, unaltered version of the employee narratives, I chose to increase participant confidentiality by redacting all identifiable information from the narratives (e.g., individuals’ names, company names, and location details) before the narratives were read by the undergraduate research assistants who were involved in this research study.

Data analysis

Content analysis: Overview

The bulk of the data analysis for this research project consisted of content analysis. Content analysis is a method for analyzing qualitative data in the form of written, verbal, or visual content (Cole, 1988). This research method allows researchers to describe and quantify
qualitative data in a valid, systematic, and replicable way. The process essentially involves distilling sets of qualitative statements or records into fewer content-focused categories; the underlying goal of this process is to provide a comprehensive description and classification of the phenomena described in the original statements (Krippendorff, 1980).

Content analysis can follow either an inductive or deductive approach depending on the specific phenomenon of interest in the research. Deductive content analysis is used in cases when there is a satisfactory level of consensus concerning the structure and theory behind the phenomenon of interest; this method allows researchers to use findings from past research to construct the categories to be used throughout the content analysis process (Elo & Kyngas, 2007). On the other hand, inductive content analysis is used when the past research on the phenomenon of interest is fragmented, or when the reported structure and theory behind the construct has been inconsistent. Inductive content analysis requires the researcher to use the data itself to develop the content categories and subcategories to be used throughout the content analysis process. As explained previously, my goal was to develop an independent characterization of unethical workplace behavior for triangulation against the fragmented construct knowledge that exists in the research literature; for this reason, I used inductive content analysis for the present study.

Although inductive content analysis is highly adaptable as a research methodology, the essential steps generally involve (1) determining the appropriate unit of analysis for studying the qualitative data, (2) reading through all responses to familiarize oneself with the data and identify potential subcategories for organizing the data, (3) developing a coding scheme by refining the proposed subcategories and organizing subcategories under main content categories, (4) using the coding scheme with trained coders to code the dataset, further refining the categories and subcategories as needed to achieve satisfactory interrater reliability, and (5) interpreting and reporting the results (Elo & Kyngas, 2007; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; White & Marsh, 2006).
Beyond these usual steps, I also conducted some additional quantitative analyses using the coded content category data and other variables from the dataset. I describe my analyses in the following sections, dividing the process into major phases called the (1) preparation phase, (2) coding phase, and the (3) quantitative analysis and reporting phase.

**Preparation phase**

Once the data has been collected, the initial preparatory steps in the inductive content analysis process involve (1) determining the appropriate unit of analysis for studying the data and (2) exploring the data by reading through all responses (Elo & Kyngas, 2007). The unit of analysis determines how the data will be organized and presented to coders during the coding phase of the content analysis process. The unit of analysis can be as narrow as a single word or as broad as entire documents containing thousands of words, or can even consist of lengthy recordings of audio and visual content (Cavanagh, 1997). Researchers caution that a very narrow unit of analysis (e.g., a single word or sentence) could result in fragmentation of the meaning extracted from the data during the content analysis process, while a very large unit of analysis (e.g., multi-page interview transcripts) can make the analysis challenging due to the complexity and variety of ideas that may exist within a single unit of analysis of that size (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). For this study, the individual employee narratives function as ideal units of analysis. The employee narratives were on average one paragraph (110 words) in length, and participants were given the opportunity to describe their experience in as great of detail as they desired. Also, when important details such as locations, timeframes, or potential witnesses were not initially provided by the participant, the interviewer would prompt the interviewee to provide these details. These narratives are a suitable length for a unit of analysis because they are as long as necessary for the participant to describe their experience with unethical workplace behavior in
detail, while short enough to allow coders to keep the entire context of the narrative in mind while coding the narrative (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004).

Once the unit of analysis is determined, the researcher must “become immersed in the data” in order to develop a sense of the prominent themes and distinguishing features of the content described in the qualitative data (Elo & Kyngas, 2007, p 109). To complete this step, I thoroughly read all 1445 narratives, and the committee chair read approximately half of the narratives. We then compared our notes and thoughts concerning the narratives, particularly focusing on potential subcategories with which to code the unethical workplace behavior described in the narratives.

**Coding phase**

The coding phase was started with the development of the initial coding scheme; this was followed by coder training and piloting the coding scheme. Next, all narratives were coded while frequently monitoring coder reliability and implementing additional coder training or further refinements to the coding scheme as necessary.

*Initial coding scheme development*

The initial coding system was developed from the insights gained while studying the data during the preparation phase. Potential subcategories of unethical workplace behavior that were identified in the preparation phase were grouped under higher-order headings; these higher-order headings become the main content categories. For instance, while reading the narratives, it was noted that many narratives described instances of unethical workplace behaviors that resulted in harm to employees; numerous narratives were also observed that described unethical workplace behaviors that negatively impacted customers, clients, outside organizations, or even the organization itself. When developing the coding system, these features were all grouped under the
heading of “Type of Victim”. Type of Victim thus became a content category, while all observed variations of victims were grouped as subcategories under the Type of Victim content category.

Next, subcategories that were highly similar or overlapping with other subcategories within the same content category were consolidated. Overlapping subcategories can make it difficult for coders to distinguish between subcategories while coding, which reduces coding reliability (Stemler, 2001). Two or more proposed subcategories were combined if it was determined that the fundamental meaning behind the subcategories were equivalent or highly related. For instance, of the proposed subcategories that were grouped under the “Type of Behavior” content category, the three subcategories of sexual harassment, unwanted or inappropriate sexual advances, and sexual assault were combined into a subcategory called sexual misconduct. Also within the Type of Behavior content category, the proposed subcategories of breach of confidentiality and violating others’ privacy were combined into a single privacy and confidentiality violations subcategory.

Once proposed subcategories were organized under content categories and overlapping subcategories were consolidated, the initial coding scheme contained three content categories: (1) Type of Behavior, (2) Type of Victim, and (3) Type of Perpetrator. See Appendix A for the initial coding scheme showing the content categories, subcategories, and descriptions for each subcategory.

**Training coders and piloting coding scheme**

Next, coders were introduced to the coding system and trained on how to code the narratives as systematically and objectively as possible. Coders consisted of undergraduate Psychology majors enrolled in an applied research course. To avoid overloading coders’ attentional capacities with excessively complex coding procedures, content categories were coded in segments. The Type of Behavior content category was coded first; this content category was
trained, piloted and coded during the spring 2018 semester. The Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator content categories were then coded during the fall 2018 semester.

Prior to starting coder training, all coders were required to sign a non-disclosure agreement with the consulting firm and to complete CITI training for research involving human participants. Next, in-person coder training started with an explanation of the purpose of the coding, a review of the content category to be coded, a detailed description of each of the subcategories, instructions for how to record coded data in Excel, and instructions of best practices for consistent and accurate coding. Instructions were also provided in writing for coders to review throughout the coding process. See Appendix B for the written instructions given to coders. Coder training also included coding demonstrations in which all coders followed along while I read a narrative and talked through my thought process while I coded the narrative. Next, coders participated in instructor-led group coding practice where all coders separately coded a single narrative and then all coders and I shared our coding decisions and how we reached those decisions.

Coder uncertainties or misunderstandings concerning coding procedures or subcategories were addressed through in-person training and by adding greater detail to the written instructions and written descriptions of the subcategories. Coder training also functioned as an opportunity to pilot and refine the initial coding scheme to improve its validity and replicability. The coding scheme was adjusted if a subcategory was determined to be too broad, vague, or narrow, if two or more subcategories frequently conflicted, or if some form of unethical workplace behavior that does not fit any of the available subcategories was repeatedly encountered in the narratives. Coding scheme refinement most frequently involved clarifying the definitions of the existing subcategories, but when necessary, subcategories were combined or new subcategories were added. The goal of coding refinement was to ensure that (1) the included subcategories
adequately covered the domain within each main content category and (2) each subcategory
description accurately defined the meaning of that subcategory; this helped to increase the
validity and replicability of the coding scheme.

Coding procedures

Once all coders were trained and very familiar with the proper coding procedures and the
coding scheme was refined as necessary, coders were assigned sets of narratives to code
separately outside of class. Each narrative was coded in both coding stages in order for each
narrative to be coded into all three content categories. Coders received weekly coding
assignments consisting of Excel spreadsheets with sets of employee narratives to code. Coders
conducted their coding independently, but each narrative was assigned to at least two coders
during each coding stage.

To code the Type of Behavior content category, coders were given coding assignment
sheets with columns for respondent ID, employee narrative, and each of the Type of Behavior
subcategories. The coding sheets did not include the full set of study variables so that coders
would not be influenced by other information about the participant (such as demographics) while
coding the narratives. Coders were also given a Word document with detailed descriptions of
each Type of Behavior subcategory for them to review as needed while they coded. To code a
narrative, the coder would carefully read the narrative and determine into which subcategory or
subcategories the narrative fit. The coder would then type a “1” in the correct cell or cells to
indicate into which subcategory or subcategories the narrative fit. The coder was required to
choose at least one subcategory of Type of Behavior for each narrative, but there was an other
(write-in) subcategory for narratives that did not fit any of the available subcategories. See
Appendix C for an example coding assignment sheet for coding the Type of Behavior content
category.
To code the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator content categories, coders were given coding assignment Excel sheets with columns for respondent ID, employee narrative, the Type of Behavior subcategory code(s) for that narrative, and columns for each of the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategories. To help distinguish between the separate victims and perpetrators involved in separate instances of unethical workplace behavior described within a single narrative, coders were able to record separate victim and perpetrator subcategories for each Type of Behavior subcategory coded to each narrative. See Appendix D for an example coding assignment for coding the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator content categories.

During both coding stages, completed coding assignments were compiled using the respondent IDs to match the coded data to the correct employee narratives. Coding results were reviewed weekly to check interrater reliability using Kappa and percent agreement, and coding disagreements were resolved with in-class discussion. Any time a coder was thought to have unusually high coding errors, that coder was retrained as needed; generally, this involved a reminder to (1) read the whole narrative carefully before coding, (2) only code based on information in the narrative and avoid coding based on assumptions, and (3) maintain proper attention while coding. In cases where a subcategory was identified to have low interrater reliability, that subcategory would be discussed amongst all the coders and myself to determine how to improve consistency in coding. After the initial piloting stage, the preferred strategy for improving interrater reliability was additional in-person training and additional clarifications to the subcategory definitions. For example, the range of severity for the bullying, abuse, & incivility subcategory was clarified by adding the following statement to the subcategory description: “On the extreme end is physical, verbal, psychological, or emotional abuse. On the mild end is acting meanly towards others or saying rude things to others.”
Subcategories that continued to return low interrater reliability after several weeks of in-person training and instruction were removed or combined with other overlapping subcategories to reduce ambiguity while coding. For example, the favoritism and conflicts of interest subcategories were combined into a favoritism or conflicts of interest category due to frequent confusion between the two subcategories. Additionally, the lying subcategory frequently returned low Kappa (less than .40 on most weekly coding assignments); this subcategory was determined to be overly broad and overlapping with several other subcategories such as falsifying documents and falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior. Thus, the lying subcategory was removed and narratives already coded under this subcategory were recoded under the other subcategory. As an example within the Type of Perpetrator category, the mid- and lower-level management employees subcategory was removed because the information provided in the narratives was often insufficient to accurately identify the exact management level of the perpetrator. Instead, the upper management employees subcategory was relabeled higher-level employees, which included all levels of management. See Appendix E for the final iteration of the coding instructions, with the subcategory labels and descriptions for all three of the main content categories.

Quantitative analysis and reporting phase

Once coding was complete, additional analyses using the quantitative coded variables were conducted to rank content subcategories in terms of prevalence and establish trends in co-occurrence between specific content subcategories.

The final iteration of the coding schemes for the three content categories, along with the interrater reliability statistics, will be presented in the Results section to address Q1 (What subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code unethical workplace behavior into overall groupings or types of behavior?), Q2 (Who or what are the victims of unethical workplace
behavior? What subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code the victims?), and Q3 (Who are the perpetrators of unethical workplace behavior, and what subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code the perpetrators?). Examples of narratives that fit each subcategory will be provided to further describe the meaning and range of content that defines each subcategory. I will also document any noteworthy insights I gained throughout the content analysis process to aid in the interpretation of the meaning and structure of each content category and subcategory.

To explore Q4 (How will the content categories and subcategories of unethical workplace behavior produced by this study compare to the dimensions and categories reported in past research?), the final coding scheme for each content category will be compared to the dimensions and subdimensions reported in past research (such as those described previously in the Unethical Workplace Behavior and Related Constructs section of this proposal).

Further quantitative analysis was required to address the remainder of the research questions. The data was structured in two ways for these analyses. Dataset 1 consisted of the original interview dataset with the coded content category variables added; respondent IDs were used to match the coded data to the correct participants. Because many narratives described multiple instances of different types unethical workplace behavior involving different victims and perpetrators, it was necessary to allow each narrative to be coded under multiple subcategories for each of the three content categories. For this reason, it was not possible to represent the content categories with individual categorical variables. Instead, each content category was represented with a series of dichotomous variables (one dichotomous variable per subcategory). For each subcategory variable, a “1” was recorded if that participant’s narrative was coded under that subcategory; otherwise, a “0” was recorded.
Dataset 2 only included respondent IDs, employee narratives, and the coded content category variables, and only included data from the 1,445 participants that provided an employee narrative. Rather than having one row of data per participant, Dataset 2 was structured to have a separate row of data for each Type of Behavior subcategory described in each narrative. Thus, if a participant’s narrative was coded into three Type of Behavior subcategories, that participant would be represented in three rows of data. The Type of Behavior content category was structured as a single categorical variable with a separate number value to represent each of the subcategories within the Type of Behavior content category. Because each overall type of unethical behavior described in the narratives often involved multiple victims and perpetrators, the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator content categories was structured as they are in Dataset 1 (separate dichotomous variables for each subcategory).

To address Q5 (For each of the main content categories of unethical workplace behavior, which subcategories were most commonly observed in this dataset? How does this result compare to past research findings?), the frequency of occurrence for each subcategory variable was examined using both datasets. The frequencies of the subcategory variables in Dataset 1 was used to indicate the percentage of individual participants that described unethical workplace behavior involving each subcategory. The subcategories for Type of Behavior were ranked from highest to lowest prevalence, as were the subcategories for Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator. Because Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator were coded multiple times per narrative (once for each Type of Behavior in the narrative), the frequencies for the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategories varied between in Dataset 2 compared to Dataset 1. The frequencies of the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategory variables in Dataset 2 were used to indicate the overall percentage of unethical workplace behaviors in the dataset that involved each Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategory. The subcategories for Type of Victim and
Type of Perpetrator were again ranked from highest to lowest prevalence, this time using Dataset 2. The subcategory frequency results from both Dataset 1 and Dataset 2 were then compared to past findings on the frequency of different types of unethical workplace behavior.

To explore Q6 (Do different types of unethical workplace behavior tend to involve different victims and perpetrators?), Dataset 2 was used. Chi-square tests were used to test the significance of the association between the Type of Behavior content category variable and each Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategory variable. Then, the Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategories with a significant association to the overall Type of Unethical Behavior category variable were cross tabulated against each individual Type of Behavior subcategory. Chi-square tests were used to determine the associations between individual Type of Behavior subcategories and individual Type of Victim or Type of Perpetrator subcategories.

The remainder of the analyses were conducted using Dataset 1. Research question Q7 (Did the rate of reported unethical workplace behavior vary by organization?) was addressed by nesting participants by organization and examining differences in the proportion of exiting employees that responded “Yes” to the dichotomous unethical workplace behavior item. The ICC1 was calculated to determine the degree to which employees’ likelihood of reporting an unethical workplace behavior varied by organization. To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only organizations with 50 or more participating employees were included for this analysis.

Research question Q8 (Did rate of reported unethical workplace behavior vary by industry, and if so, which industries had the highest and lowest rates?) was explored in several ways. First, the overall percentage of participants who reported an unethical workplace behavior was documented for each industry. To demonstrate the degree of variation in reporting rates within each industry, the organizations with the highest and lowest reporting percentages were
documented for each industry. Additionally, multilevel logistic regression was used to determine whether organizational industry had a statistically significant effect on the frequency to which exiting employees reported unethical workplace behavior. This served to indicate the effect of industry type on former employees’ likelihood of reporting unethical workplace behavior while accounting for the nested nature of the data. As with Research Question 7, to avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only organizations with 50 or more participating employees were included in these analyses. Furthermore, only industries with 10 or more participating organizations were used in these analyses.

Research question Q9 (Did the types of reported unethical workplace behaviors vary by organization?) was addressed by nesting participants by organization and examining differences in reporting rates for each of the subcategories of unethical workplace behavior. The range of organization-wide reporting rates was also documented for each subcategory. To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only organizations with 50 or more participating employees were included. For subcategories of unethical workplace behavior with a sufficient rate of occurrence\(^1\) to allow for multilevel logistic regression, the intraclass correlation coefficient was calculated to statistically test how the reporting rate of that subcategory of unethical workplace behavior varied by organization. In order for a subcategory of unethical workplace behavior to be tested using multilevel logistic regression, the prevalence rate must be high enough such that 50 or more organizations have an expected rate of occurrence of 2 or more (Moineddin, Matheson, & Glazier, 2007). This stipulation was to ensure valid estimates of within- and between-group variance.

Research question Q10 (Did the types of reported unethical workplace behaviors vary by industry? If so, how?) was explored in several ways. First, the overall reporting rate of each

\(^1\) This was calculating while including all 131 organizations.
subcategory of unethical workplace behavior was documented per industry. To avoid overgeneralizations using small samples, only industries with 10 or more participating organizations were included in this analysis. For each subcategory of unethical workplace behavior, industries were ranked from highest to lowest reporting rate. For each industry, the Type of Behavior, Type of Victim, and Type of Perpetrator subcategories were ranked from highest to lowest reporting rate. This served as an indication of the overall profiles of unethical workplace behavior reported within each industry. Differences between industries were noted in terms of the most commonly reported overall types, victims, and perpetrators of unethical workplace behavior per industry. For subcategories of unethical workplace behavior with a sufficient rate of occurrence, multilevel logistic regression was used to determine whether the organizations’ industry had a statistically significant effect on the reporting rates for specific subcategories of unethical workplace behavior. This serves to indicate the effect of industry type on the reporting rates for unethical workplace behavior while taking into account the nested nature of the data. For subcategories where the effect of industry was significant, the predicted probability of reporting that subcategory of unethical workplace behavior were reported for each industry.
CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

Q1. What subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code unethical workplace behavior into overall groupings or types of behavior?

See Table 1 for the final iteration of the Type of Behavior subcategory labels, descriptions, frequencies, and reliability statistics. Subcategories are reported in order of frequency of occurrence.

Inadequate response to reported workplace issue

The inadequate response to a reported workplace issue subcategory involves “ignoring reports of workplace issues, or not doing enough to address reports of workplace issues.” This was the most frequently reported subcategory of unethical behavior, likely due to the nature of the interview process. Often respondents would first recount a different subcategory of unethical behavior that they had experienced or witnessed and then go on to describe how they had reported the other violation to a supervisor or ethics hotline, only to be ignored or silenced. In other cases, there would be some response to the reported workplace issue, but the response would be insufficient to resolve the problem to the respondent’s satisfaction. Thus, inadequate response to a reported workplace issue was the most frequently reported unethical behavior, although this subcategory was almost always in conjunction with another subcategory of unethical behavior.

One respondent described their experience as follows, which illustrates inadequate response to a reported workplace issue as well as sexual misconduct subcategories:
I filed a sexual harassment charge against a coworker, [Person A], with [Person B] in HR and nothing came of it. In fact, they made me continue to work with him. [Person A] also said inappropriate things to me and would
Table 1: Type of Unethical Behavior subcategory labels, descriptions, frequencies, and Kappa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ethical Violation Subcategory</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Interviews</th>
<th>Percent of Violations</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>Ignoring reports of workplace issues, or not doing enough to address reports of workplace issues.</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>22.15%</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>Bullying, assault, mean behavior, or any behavior that creates a hostile work environment. On the extreme end is physical, verbal, psychological, or emotional abuse. On the mild end is acting meanly towards others or saying rude things to others.</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>19.72%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>Endangering others’ health or safety. Unnecessarily exposing others to health or safety risks.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>17.09%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Falsifying information on a company document, like invoices, billing statements, accounting information, HR documents, etc.</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>Denying fair pay or benefits to those who are owed them. Includes undercounting employees’ hours, employees working off the clock, &amp; employees not receiving overtime pay.</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>9.83%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>Showing favoritism to friends or family, accepting or giving bribes/kickbacks, or having conflicting business roles. Going against the interests of some innocent party in order to help yourself, or your friends or family.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Discrimination based on protected classes: race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, age, physical/mental disability, sexual orientation.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Violating others’ privacy. Sharing confidential information. HIPAA violations.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>7.54%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>Asking, forcing, or pressuring others to engage in illegal or unethical activities.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>Punishing or taking negative actions against someone, not because they broke any rules, but because they did something you didn’t like.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>Sexual harassment or sexual assault. Saying or doing sexual things that makes others feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>Firing someone for no justifiable reason, or firing someone under false pretenses.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Ethical Violation Subcategory</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent of Interviews</td>
<td>Percent of Violations</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>Stealing or intentional misappropriation of money, materials, products, or other valuable commodities.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>Working slowly, being off-task while on the clock, or neglecting work duties while on the clock.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>Individuals performing work that they are unqualified to perform because they do not have proper license, certification, training, etc.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>Making employees work in a way that is too fast-paced or overly strenuous. Forcing workers to delay or skip lunch; denying bathroom or rest breaks.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>Claiming more work hours than were worked, having someone else clock you in before you get to work, clocking in and leaving work, not being present at work while on the clock.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>Any false or unfair blaming/accusations related to unethical or bad behavior. Examples include (1) blaming one’s own misbehaviors/mistakes on others, (2) giving an employee an unfairly harsh performance review, (3) starting false rumors related to another’s bad behavior.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>Working while impaired or intoxicated. Being in possession of drugs or alcohol while on the job.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>Being unfair when assigning work hours, shifts, or duties to workers. Unfairly giving certain workers more or fewer hours than they want. Unfairly giving some workers all the bad shifts. Unfairly changing workers’ schedule. Making workers’ come in on their days off. NOTE: Must be seen as unfair from the perspective of the worker – does not count if the worker actually wants that schedule.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>Harming the natural environment or risking potential harm to the natural environment. Things like pollution, littering, and harming wildlife.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Does not fit into any other category – write in a description.</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>11.97%</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>Cannot tell what happened based on narrative; not enough information.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Values in the Percent of Violations column add to more than 100% because more than one type of unethical behavior could be coded per narrative.
touch me inappropriately. This happened in the food service department at the workplace in [date].

Bullying, abuse & incivility

The bullying, abuse and incivility subcategory was described in the coding instructions as “Bullying, assault, mean behavior, or any behavior that creates a hostile work environment. On the extreme end is physical, verbal, psychological, or emotional abuse. On the mild end is acting meanly towards others or saying rude things to others.” Most narratives that fell into this subcategory described instances of chronic verbal abuse and intimidation of a bullying nature. In fact, the words “bully,” “bullied,” or “bullying” were used in 67 of the narratives, or 24% of the total bullying, abuse & incivility subcategory. Many narratives from this subcategory described a single perpetrator from within the organization who would repeatedly abuse multiple victims within the organization. In many cases, the perpetrator would conduct the abuse in the presence of others, seemingly as a form of humiliation for the victim. Respondents’ also often described the hostile work environment caused by the abuse. One respondent described the following scenario:

[Person A] constantly created a hostile work environment for myself as well as other members of staff. [Person A] was the 10th person that I had ever reported to in 16 years, and this was the first time in my career that I had ever worked with someone who was as unprofessional as she was. She had absolutely no control over her personal life and would bring that into the workplace causing a lot of tension between her and I on a daily basis. She would talk down to me in front of other employees, she would talk about employees to other members of staff.
Safety violations

The safety violations subcategory is described as “endangering others’ health or safety. Unnecessarily exposing others to health or safety risks.” The safety violations came in many forms, including food safety issues, road safety issues, security issues (e.g., doors being left unlocked at night), sanitation issues, exposure to various hazardous substances, and many more specific safety issues. The various safety violations had many different underlying causes, such as malfunctioning machinery, insufficient personal protective equipment, a general lack of preventative safety protocols, and often inattentive, overworked, or underqualified workers. The narratives in this subcategory often described situations that could become dangerous, although no harm had yet been caused. In other cases, the narratives described safety violations that had already resulted in an injury or even death. In many cases, the respondent described a workplace or supervisor who prioritized profits and productivity over safety. One respondent described a road safety issue in the following narrative, which includes safety violations as well as ordering others to engage in unethical or illegal activity, unfair scheduling, and retaliation subcategories:

They are violating DOT laws. They constantly have employees exceed the amount of hours you can be out driving. In fact, I had an employee call me yesterday saying he exceeded his drive time and the company does not care. There are not enough employees and the company operates 24/7, so people are putting in 70-80 hours a week. It is up to the employees to push adhering to the DOT laws, but the company retaliates against people bringing up the issue. If an employee gets pulled over by DOT they will get fined and so will the company. This is an ongoing issue that I noticed happening in [State].
Falsifying documents

The falsifying documents subcategory is described as “falsifying information on a company document, like invoices, billing statements, accounting information, HR documents, etc.” This subcategory was broad in terms of the specific actions taken and the specific documents involved in the narratives that fell under this subcategory. Actions included knowingly putting false information on company documents, inappropriately altering company documents, intentionally leaving important information off documents, and forging signatures. Documents included employee timesheets, travel reimbursement forms, accounting reports, customer billing statements, patient records, patient intake paperwork, insurance filings, and vehicle travel logs. One respondent described the following issue involving insurance claims:

*I do not want to say where this was or who was doing this but they bill the insurance companies for more medication than what is prescribed for the patients and then they will use the medication that is left over for another patient.*

*The cost of this medication is about $500 per dose. This is something that is unethical because that is over billing the patients.*

Underpaying wages or benefits

The underpaying wages or benefits subcategory is described as “denying fair pay or benefits to those who are owed them. Includes under-counting employees’ hours, employees working off the clock, & employees not receiving overtime pay.” This subcategory often involved the respondent reporting that they were missing paychecks or that money was missing from their paychecks. Missing compensation included regular wages as well as overtime pay, commissions, bonuses, danger zone pay, travel mileage pay, performance pay, vacation pay, and others. Missing benefits included health insurance benefits, workers compensation, and FMLA benefits. In some cases, the issue arose from the employer promising a particular level of
compensation prior to employment, and then not following through with their promise after hiring
the employee. In other cases, the respondent felt they were unfairly denied some compensation or
benefit when it was requested, such as workers compensation or FMLA. This subcategory also
included many instances of employees who had not yet received their final paycheck. Finally,
many cases involved the manipulation of employee timesheets to unfairly reduce employees’
wages, such as recording lunch breaks that were not taken, or deleting hours from a timesheet that
would have resulted in overtime. In these cases, the narratives were coded as both underpaying
wages or benefits as well as falsifying documents. One respondent described such an experience
in the following narrative:

I was always told that as a manager you are not allowed to alter an employees
time card without approval of the employee. It was regular practice to add a
lunch in when employees did not take the lunch break. [Person A], the executive
director, and [Person B], the business office manager did this routinely. I noticed
this from [date] to [date]. This was in Sales and Marketing. This was in [City,
State].

Favoritism or conflicts of interest

The favoritism or conflicts of interest subcategory is described as “showing favoritism to
friends or family, accepting or giving bribes/kickbacks, or having conflicting business roles.
Going against the interests of some innocent party in order to help yourself, or your friends or
family.” Examples of conflicts of interest included accepting gifts from business clients, offering
bribes, an employee managing her own payroll, and employees awarding contracts to their own
private side-businesses. Favoritism was more common than conflict of interest situations; nearly
30% of narratives in this subcategory explicitly include the word “favoritism.” Instances of
favoritism generally involved a supervisor having a personal relationship with certain
subordinates and subsequently treating some subordinates differently than others, such as being more lenient with some subordinates. There were also many narratives that described supervisors hiring their own friends or family over more qualified candidates. One respondent described the following issue, which illustrates favoritism or conflicts of interest as well as wrongful termination subcategories:

[Person A], my supervisor, showed favoritism, and I feel treated me very wrongly. There were a couple of different employees who came in late every single day and he never reprimanded them, but then I called in three times over the course of three months for my children, or to go to a doctor’s appointment, and he fired me.

**Discrimination**

The discrimination subcategory includes “discrimination based on protected classes: race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, age, physical/mental disability, sexual orientation.” Narratives that fell under this category most often described discrimination based on race or nationality, but instances of discrimination based on gender, age, and disability were documented as well. Discrimination based on nationality or ethnicity was often prompted by the use of a language other than English in the workplace. Several narratives also described reverse discrimination, either against Caucasians or against males, although these narratives were less frequent than those describing discrimination against minorities and females. Although many respondents described the discrimination as emanating from a specific perpetrator, many other respondents described the entire workplace or organization as a discriminatory environment. One respondent described the following discrimination issue:

There are associates that work for the organization at [Facility A] that openly use the "N" word. They operate under the "good ole boy" mentality and if you
are not part of the system you are thwarted from opportunities. I was a
supervisor and I felt that because I was a minority I was paid less than I should
have been. I talked to a few people throughout the time I was there and there
were people with diplomas making a few thousand more per year than I was with
a Master's degree. This in itself I feel is cultural bias. This occurred at the
[redacted] Dairy in [City] from [date] through [date].

Privacy or confidentiality issues

The privacy or confidentiality issues subcategory is described as “violating others’
privacy. Sharing confidential information. HIPAA violations.” Most of the narratives that fell
under this subcategory focused on issues of data privacy or security, such as individuals’ financial
information being shared or accessed inappropriately, individuals sharing login and password
information, or patients’ medical records being insecure. Because the largest industry group
within the participant sample was healthcare, many of the narratives in this subcategory
referred to HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) violations, which is
legislation to protect data privacy for patients’ medical information. One respondent described the
following HIPAA violation:

There was a station set up in the emergency room where the computer screens
that we have in the triage department are set up in a way where patients can see
the information on the screens. I feel that this is a HIPAA violation. This is how
the Triage department is set up and I saw this problem in [date]. This was in the
[City, State] location.

Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity

The ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity subcategory is described as
“asking, forcing, or pressuring others to engage in illegal or unethical activities.”
subcategory, like the inadequate response to a reported workplace issue subcategory, often occurred in conjunction with another subcategory of unethical behavior. In most but not every narrative under this category, the respondent described a time when they personally were asked to engage in illegal or unethical activity. In most instances, the employee chose or was forced to comply with the order to engage in unethical activity, but in some cases the employee refused. One respondent from the health care and social assistance industry described the following issue which involved ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity as well as falsifying documents:

*There were multiple communities where people would move out and we would be told by my immediate supervisor, [Person A], and the Vice President of Operations, [Person B], to not move them out of the computer system so the occupancy numbers looked better. That was not ethical and I believe fraudulent. It was a soft compliance issue. It messed up billing and the residents would get frustrated. They would do this when it came to Medicaid residents and they would credit it back the next month. I first noticed this in [date] until I left in [date] over [State A and State B].*

**Retaliation**

The retaliation subcategory is described as “punishing or taking negative actions against someone, not because they broke any rules, but because they did something you didn’t like.” Narratives that included the retaliation subcategory often cooccurred with certain other subcategories of unethical behavior, particularly wrongful termination. In other cases, the retaliation was precipitated by the employee turning in their 2-week notice. One respondent described their experience as follows, which involved retaliation as well as wrongful termination and privacy or confidentiality issues:
I was terminated because I filed a HIPAA violation against my boss [Boss A] in [date] and she retaliated against me. I called the compliance line in [same date] and reported that she had been taking home medical records. I then had a meeting with [Person B] in HR around [later date] to discuss the issue. Nothing ever came of the meeting that I had and [Boss A] was never written up or fired for clearly violating HIPAA. After that meeting [Boss A] started to harass me and started putting me on a performance plans even though I had been a model employee. [Boss A] then claimed that I was not meeting the performance standards and did not complete the performance plan so she terminated me.

**Sexual misconduct**

The *sexual misconduct* subcategory is described as “sexual harassment or sexual assault. Saying or doing sexual things that makes others feel uncomfortable.” This subcategory covered verbal, physical, and online sexual misconduct. The sexual misconduct generally involved unwanted sexual advances towards the victim, although instances of consensual sexual relations were included as well if they were inappropriate for a workplace setting or if they were making others uncomfortable. Although some narratives describe a single incident of sexual misconduct, more often these narratives described an issue involving repeated sexual misconduct, generally coming from a specific perpetrator towards one or more victims. One respondent described the following scenario which involved *sexual misconduct* as well as *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* and retaliation:

*My supervisor, [Person A], waged a campaign of sexual harassment and intimidation for my entire tenure with this company. When I first arrived, he made sexual overtures towards me which I turned down. From then on he verbally abused me on a daily basis, calling me bitch and things of that nature.*
went to [Person B], the director of HR with this in hopes that this would change. Instead, it only became worse. Whenever he spoke to me he would stare at my breasts and assert his position over me. He also went around telling people in our department that he had sexual relations with me. This was absolutely not the case, but because of this my coworkers began to also insult me and alienate me in the workplace.

Wrongful termination

The wrongful termination subcategory is described as “firing someone for no justifiable reason, or firing someone under false pretenses.” In most cases, the victim of the wrongful termination is the respondent, although in other cases the respondent reports on another individual’s wrongful termination. This subcategory often cooccurred with certain other subcategories, such as retaliation, falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior, and discrimination. The following narrative describes wrongful termination as well as retaliation:

I believe that I was fired because I was one of the employees that was interviewed in the investigation of [Executive Director A]. She knew that a few of the nurses were brought in by HR to talk about her behavior and decisions as a person in power and since she knew that I was one of those people she got rid of me. I was never given any other reason for being terminated, so I believe wholeheartedly that I am correct in my assumption. I did report my concern to the Human Resources department and spoke with [Person B] and [Person C].

This happened in [City, State] in the office on [date].

Stealing

The stealing subcategory is described as “stealing or intentional misappropriation of money, materials, products, or other valuable commodities.” Stolen items varied widely,
including funds from various sources, truckloads of asphalt, B12 injections, food, scrap metal, narcotics, office supplies, software, and personal identity information. In some cases, this subcategory would cooccur with the falsifying documents category; these narratives generally described cases of money fraud. One respondent described the following incident involving the theft of company funds:

A train dispatcher I worked with called me and informed me my old superintendent had been fired from [the company] for fraudulently taking "Thanks Award" monies and other money he had access to as a superintendent. I always liked him and he was always fair with me but since he was fired, there must have been evidence.

Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties

The wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties subcategory is described as “working slowly, being off-task while on the clock, or neglecting work duties while on the clock.” The narratives generally describe cases of employees being physically present at work, but not completing the work that was expected of them. Although the victim was most commonly the organization itself (due to lost productivity), in certain more egregious cases, the victims included patients who would not receive their needed care due to the perpetrating employee(s) not completing their job duties. The following respondent described one such case, which illustrates wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties as well as safety issues, inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, and favoritism subcategories:

There is abuse by neglect. Occasionally an aid does not change a resident’s diaper because they are too lazy to do so. There was also one employee that did not feed a patient when the patient was supposed to eat. This happened frequently. I wrote the person up and there were times where my supervisor
would just throw out the write up, because she liked that particular employee.

This is at the facility located in [City, State].

Working unqualified

The working unqualified subcategory is described as “individuals performing work that they are unqualified to perform because they do not have proper license, certification, training, etc.” In some cases, an individual would be hired for a job position for which they were not qualified; in other cases, an employee would perform a task that the employee was not qualified to perform. Often, the employee would be asked by a superior to complete the task. Narratives in the working unqualified subcategory often had the implication of safety concerns, particularly within the healthcare and social assistance industry. In other cases, fairness concerns are mentioned rather than safety concerns (i.e., other more qualified workers should have been given the position). One respondent described the following scenario which fell under working unqualified as well as safety issues and ordering others to engage in unethical or illegal activity subcategories:

Employees who are not qualified to perform certain exams are routinely allowed to do so. By not qualified I mean the employee has a LIMITED LICENSE/CERTIFICATION or NO CERTIFICATION AT ALL. Also employees are required to check-in a patient although we do not have the capability to treat or diagnose their condition. This causes the patient to have to pay [the company] THEN be told they need to go to the ER after spending time and money going through the check-in process. This happened at the clinic on a routine basis.

Overwork or work break issues

The overwork or work break issues subcategory is described as “making employees work in a way that is too fast-paced or overly strenuous. Forcing workers to delay or skip lunch;
denying bathroom or rest breaks.” This subcategory includes situations where employees are asked to work too many hours in a day, week, month, or over long-term. Also included are situations where employees are not allowed breaks (e.g., rest, bathroom, or lunch breaks) or are pressured to skip breaks. Often the respondent would mention that the workplace was understaffed, which led to the overwork or work break issues. This subcategory often cooccurred with underpaying wages or benefits, such as in cases when workers would be forced to clock out for lunch but not be allowed to take a lunch break. This subcategory also frequently cooccurred with safety violations, due to the increased risk of mistake or injury when workers are fatigued. For example, the following narrative includes overwork or work break issues as well as safety violations, inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, and underpaying wages and benefits:

I still have not received my last check even though my last day of work was [date]. [Person A] is the location manager and she would have us working fourteen hour days. I was a shuttle driver, and pursuant to the DOT rules, we are not supposed to drive over 10 hours a day. I told her this and she did not care. She would also punch us out for a thirty minute lunch break even if we never took one.

Overcounting work hours

The overcounting work hours subcategory is described as “claiming more work hours than were worked, having someone else clock you in before you get to work, clocking in and leaving work, not being present at work while on the clock.” Although this subcategory has substantial overlap with the subcategories falsifying documents, stealing, and wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties, the frequency of its occurrence and accuracy with which coders could identify this subcategory warranted its continued inclusion in the type of unethical behavior content category. Employees would overcount work hours in many ways, including altering their
timesheet after the fact, having others clock them in before they arrive to work, not clocking out for lunch breaks, or leaving work without clocking out. One respondent described a wide-spread case of the overcounting work hours subcategory:

*People were stealing hundreds of hours in time by not coming in or leaving at the time they were supposed to be in. Everyone would cover for each other. No one would ever get caught because there were no managers at the [Organization] satellite ER that I was at. The managers would only come by for a few hours at a time. However, I know that [Person A] had come by a few times and witnessed this occur, but nothing was ever done about it. The worst offenders were [Persons B and C], though everyone in that office was doing it.*

**Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior**

This subcategory was not included in the original iteration of the Type of Unethical Behavior content category, but was added during the pilot phase after several coders identified this type of behavior within the “Other” category. This subcategory was subsequently created, with the description of “any false or unfair blaming/accusations related to unethical or bad behavior. Examples include (blaming one’s own misbehaviors/mistakes on others, (2) giving an employee an unfairly harsh performance review, (3) starting false rumors related to another’s bad behavior.” Although there were some instances of one worker blaming their own mistake on another worker in an attempt to avoid punishment, more often the respondent would describe the false accusations as being entirely fabricated. In many cases, the false accusations of unethical or bad behavior led to a negative employment action against the victim, such as a missed promotion opportunity, reduced compensation, or in some cases termination. In nearly every instance of this subcategory, the respondent alleges or implies that the perpetrator(s) knew the accusations to be false. One respondent described their experience as follows:
Throughout my tenure at the hospital including working for the Emergency Department, I have seen managers manipulate rules and policies to encompass someone for a violation that they did not commit. I have seen coworkers call other places of employment to try impersonate Human Resources Department personnel and try to terminate an old coworker because he or she didn't like them but I refused to report these issues out of fear of losing my position. This instances occur on a regular basis throughout the hospital.

Drugs, alcohol & intoxication

The drugs, alcohol & intoxication category is described as “working while impaired or intoxicated. Being in possession of drugs or alcohol while on the job.” This category included narratives that recounted workers’ drug or alcohol usage while on the job as well as instances of employees arriving to work already under the influence of drugs or alcohol. There were also several instances of workers abusing the company’s own pharmaceutical drugs; these occurred in a healthcare setting. Often times, the respondent mentioned safety implications related to the drug or alcohol use. One respondent described the following scenario, which included drugs, alcohol & intoxication as well as safety issues and inadequate response to a reported workplace issue subcategories:

We had a safety audit in August which we failed because all our quality control papers were thrown away by the warehouse manager when he was so called cleaning. There was an employee who drives a vehicle who was terminated right before I left for being drunk on the job so he was driving a company vehicle on the road endangering people. I know that there are several other employees that come to work either high or drunk and when I mentioned it to Human Resources they never followed through so I have no faith in them.
Unfair scheduling

The unfair scheduling subcategory is described as “being unfair when assigning work hours, shifts, or duties to workers. Unfairly giving certain workers more or fewer hours than they want. Unfairly giving some workers all the bad shifts. Unfairly changing workers’ schedule. Making workers’ come in on their days off. NOTE: Must be seen as unfair from the perspective of the worker – does not count if the worker actually wants that schedule.” This subcategory frequently cooccurred with favoritism, due to one or more employees receiving less favorable schedules compared to one or more other workers. Although this subcategory mostly consisted of workers being displeased with their assigned schedules, some narratives described (1) workers’ schedules being changed with little or no notice, (2) workers being promised one schedule but then given another, or (3) workers being denied reasonable requests for days off. One respondent described the following issues related to unfair scheduling:

I think it was unethical where a person was working part time and they wanted full time hours. The person was made to work 7 days a week to get full time hours. I do not remember the employees name. Another time an employee had to leave for something to do with their kids and they got a bad evaluation for it. They were then told that the job needs to be their main priority. I do not remember the name of the employee that this happened to. Both incidents happened sometime in [date] at the facility located in [City, State].

Harming the natural environment

The harming the natural environment subcategory is described as “harming the natural environment or risking potential harm to the natural environment. Things like pollution, littering, and harming wildlife.” Only six out of the 1,445 narratives were identified to include this subcategory, but because the topic was distinctive, and because the interrater reliability was
satisfactory, the subcategory was retained. Two of the narratives within this subcategory described drugs being improperly disposed of down the drain, two narratives describe fuel spills, and two narratives describe companies failing to recycle. One respondent described the following environmental concern which fell under harming the natural environment as well as inadequate response to a reported workplace issue:

The hospital is still wasting narcotics down the drain. With children, this can be a significant amount. This should not be going down the sink. I mentioned this to a number of people there, and the answer was always that this is how we do it. This is not legal or right. I talked to my preceptor and the educators and my supervisor, [Person A], about it. As a resident in [City, State], I would like to see this stopped as the narcotics could be going into our ground and water supplies. This is in [City State] in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. It happened the entire time that I was with the company.

Other

The other subcategory is described as “does not fit into any other category – write in a description.” Many different topics of unethical behavior fell under this subcategory, including (1) breaking a workplace policy, such as a tobacco policy, (2) cheating on a workplace contest, (3) deceiving an employee about future career opportunities, (4) discussing politics, (5) inconsistent enforcement of workplace policies, (6) not providing adequate training, (7) not supporting a needy employee, (8) providing a poor quality product, (9) refusing to provide services to a potential customer, and (10) unpaid and/or child labor. Although most narratives that fell under this subcategory described behaviors that were easily identified as unethical or illegal by myself and the coders, occasionally a respondent would describe a behavior that was not obviously unethical, such as discussing politics. Additionally, several narratives that were
originally coded under the lying subcategory were recoded under the other category after the lying subcategory was dissolved. The following narrative was originally coded as lying and wrongful termination, which was then recoded to other and wrongful termination:

*They are not ethical with their customers. They do not reinforce the right information to the workers to provide the customers. Customers could be having the wrong information and pretty much be "lied to." I was put on an improvement plan on [date] and it was basically a way for them to terminate me. There was no feedback. The manager expected you after 5 days of training to keep working with no type of support for the rest of the job. This happened the entire time at [City, State]. This happened the entire time at [City, State].*

**Not enough information**

The *not enough information* subcategory is described as “cannot tell what happened based on narrative; not enough information.” These narratives were generally very short and vague, with no definitive information about the type of unethical behavior involved. Narratives in this subcategory also sometimes contained acronyms or industry-specific language that coders were unable to interpret. Occasionally, narratives would describe two incidents, but only provide detailed information about one of the incidents; in these cases, the narrative would be coded under not enough information along with another subcategory or unethical behavior. The following narrative was coded under not enough information:

*Issues with management have been happening since [outside company A] bought out the company. [City, State]*

**Post hoc analyses**

Throughout the coding process, it was observed that three subcategories of Type of Behavior (*inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, ordering others to engage in...*)
illegal or unethical activity, and retaliation) seemed to function as “secondary” forms of unethical workplace behavior, in that they either generated or perpetuated other forms of unethical workplace behavior. To better understand this observation, additional analyses were conducted to examine the cooccurrence between these three subcategories of Type of Behavior and other subcategories of Type of Behavior.

Post hoc analysis using the Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square test revealed that several subcategories of unethical behavior had a significant positive association with the inadequate response to a reported workplace issue subcategory, including bullying, abuse, & incivility ($\chi^2(1) = 15.99, p < .001$), drugs and intoxication ($\chi^2(1) = 7.04, p = .008$), safety violations ($\chi^2(1) = 4.81, p = .028$), and sexual misconduct ($\chi^2(1) = 4.53, p < .033$). While 22.1% (320) of all narratives contained the subcategory inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, this subcategory was observed in 31.2% (89 out of 285) of the narratives containing bullying, abuse, & incivility, 41.7% (15 out of 36) of the narratives containing drugs and intoxication, 27.5% (68 out of 247) of the narratives containing safety violations, and 32.1% (26 out of 81) of the narratives containing sexual misconduct. There was also a significant negative association between inadequate response to a reported workplace issue and ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity ($\chi^2(1) = 5.77, p = .016$). While 22.1% (320) of all narratives contained the subcategory inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, this subcategory was only observed in 12.8% (12 out of 94) of the narratives containing ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity.

Post hoc analysis revealed that two subcategories of unethical behavior had a significant positive association with the ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity subcategory: falsifying documents ($\chi^2(1) = 43.94, p < .001$) and working unqualified ($\chi^2(1) = 4.85, p = .028$). While 6.5% (94) of all narratives contained the subcategory ordering others to engage
in illegal or unethical activity, this subcategory was observed in 19.4% (37 out of 191) of the narratives containing falsifying documents, and 14.8% (8 out of 54) of the narratives containing working unqualified.

Post hoc analysis using the Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square test revealed that two other subcategories of unethical behavior had a significant positive association with the retaliation subcategory: wrongful termination ($\chi^2(1) = 21.81, p < .001$) and sexual misconduct ($\chi^2(1) = 5.69, p = .017$). While 5.6% (81) of all narratives contained the subcategory retaliation, this subcategory was observed in 20.3% (16 out of 79) of the narratives containing wrongful termination and 12.3% (10 out of 81) of the narratives containing sexual misconduct.

Q2. Who or what are the victims of unethical workplace behavior? What subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code the victims?

See Table 2 for the final iteration of the Type of Victim subcategory labels, descriptions, frequencies, and reliability statistics. Subcategories are reported in order of frequency of occurrence.

Employee(s)

The employee(s) subcategory of Type of Victim is described as “one or more employees within the respondent’s company were the victims.” This was by far the most frequent subcategory of victim. In these narratives, the victims were generally referred to as employees, associates, co-workers, or by their specific name or job title. Often the respondent would describe an unethical behavior that had victimized the respondent personally, or that victimized the respondent as well as other employees. Although occasionally the respondent would specify the victim(s) job class as either higher-level management or lower-level hourly workers, more often the respondent would not specify the job level of the victimized employee(s); thus, all employee levels were coded under one subcategory for the Type of Victim content category. As this was the most
Table 2: Type of Victim subcategory labels, descriptions, frequencies, and Kappa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Victim Subcategory</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
<td>One or more employees within the respondent’s company were the victims.</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>66.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers/Patients</td>
<td>Customers or patients of the respondent’s company were the victims.</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Company</td>
<td>The company itself was the victim. For example, the ethical violation caused the company to lose money.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
<td>Other companies besides the respondent’s company were the victims. This can include contract companies, insurance companies, competitor companies, etc.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants/Potential</td>
<td>People who applied for a job opening at the company or people who were qualified for a job opening at the company were the victims. This can include current employees of the company who applied for or were qualified for a different job within the company.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community</td>
<td>The general community or environment around the respondent’s company were the victims. For example, the properties around the respondent’s company were harmed by the ethical violation.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>There is a clear victim, but it does not fit any of the above categories.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Based on the narrative, it is unclear who is the victim.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values in the Percent of Violations column add to more than 100% because more than one victim could be coded per ethical violation.
frequently occurring Type of Victim subcategory by far, the employee(s) victim subcategory cooccurred frequently with many of the Type of Ethical Violation subcategories, particularly Bullying, abuse & incivility, Discrimination, Retaliation, Underpaying wages or benefits, and Wrongful termination. The following narrative describes employee(s) victimized by sexual misconduct, retaliation, and privacy or confidentiality issues:

[Person A] would sleep with employees and then she would brag about it to other employees that worked in the department. If you did not sleep with her she would look for ways to discipline you for things that you had not done. [Person A] would tell employees your personal issues in order to see their reaction which is unprofessional for a supervisor to do. This occurred in the Orthopedic department located in [City, State] on the shift from [time]-[time] on a frequent basis.

Customers/Patients

The customers/patients subcategory of Type of Victim is described as “customers or patients of the respondent’s company were the victims.” In these narratives, the victims were referred to using terms such as customer, client, shopper, patron, and within the healthcare and social assistance industry, resident or patient. Animals were also occasionally named the victims, as the list of 131 participating companies included one veterinary practice. In some cases, the respondent would not specifically mention the type of victim, but the victim could be inferred based on the context of the narrative, such as in the following narrative. The following narrative contained two ethical violations that were coded into the customers/patients victim subcategory: working unqualified and falsifying documents. The falsifying documents ethical violation also coded into the other company(s) victim subcategory.
I was a speech therapist and I was being asked to do stage pressure ulcers, and asked to try to figure out the symptoms of congestive heart failure. These were not things that were in my scope of practice and not things that I should have had to do. I consider it a form of fraud that they had me doing this. I was also encouraged to change certain coding on procedures in order to get more money out of Medicare. Both issues happened in [City, State], in the speech therapy department from [date] to [date].

The Company

The company victim subcategory is described as “the company itself was the victim. For example, the ethical violation caused the company to lose money.” Most narratives involving this victim subcategory described direct financial harm to the company, which generally occurred through ethical violations in the stealing, overcounting work hours, or falsifying documents subcategories. Other types of harm were not directly financial, but harmed the effective functioning of the company in some way, such as wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties, working unqualified, or drugs, alcohol & intoxication subcategories. The following narrative describes several unethical behaviors that victimized the company, including wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties, drugs, alcohol & intoxication, and other (misuse of company property).

[Persons A and B] misuse of company computers by watching movies and youtube videos on their shift. [Person A] bringing alcohol onto the company property (which was recorded on the company security cameras). [Person A] using the shop bay to clean his personal vehicle.
Other company(s)

The other company(s) victim subcategory is described as “other companies besides the respondent’s company were the victims. This can include contract companies, insurance companies, competitor companies, etc.” The harm to other companies was almost always of a financial nature, whether due to funds inappropriately taken from the other company, or the other company suffering the loss of potential funds. This subcategory of victim most often cooccurred with the falsifying documents subcategory of unethical behavior, although in some instances this subcategory also cooccurred with favoritism or conflicts of interest and ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity. Due to the predominance of healthcare and social assistance companies in this dataset, many narratives within the other companies victim subcategory described instances of insurance fraud. The following narrative describes such a case in which falsifying documents and inadequate response to a reported workplace issue harmed both other companies and customer/patients:

Independent residents that were completely independent and unaware of the services they were being charged for came to me about it. Medicare was being billed for home health that was not being conducted according to the patients. I told [Person A], my executive director, and [Person B], a nurse manager, and they brushed it off several times and said they would take care of it. This happened from [date] until now. This was in [City, State] in Sales and Marketing.

Applicants/Potential Employee(s)

The applicants/potential employee(s) subcategory of victim is described as “people who applied for a job opening at the company or people who were qualified for a job opening at the company were the victims. This can include current employees of the company who applied for
or were qualified for a different job within the company.” This subcategory of victim was not included in the first iteration of the Type of Victim content category, but was created during pilot coding to encompass the typical victims observed in the many narratives involving unethical behavior that occurred during the recruiting and hiring process. The most common subcategories of unethical behavior affecting this group of victim were discrimination and favoritism or conflicts of interest. The following narrative describes an incident victimizing applicants/potential employees involving discrimination:

I felt that there was a lot of racism. A misconduct to ethics. I was at a [Food and Beverage Company] event for a social mixer. During the event I heard two Asian Doctors saying that they were only interested in White and Asian graduate students only. They stated that other races are too lazy to get the job done. The main research building at the [City, State] facility. This was in [date].

The Community

The community victim subcategory is described as “the general community or environment around the respondent’s company were the victims. For example, the properties around the respondent’s company were harmed by the ethical violation.” The harm caused to the community was typically exposure to some safety or pollutant hazard, but also occasionally entailed the potential for shared financial harm, such as when an organization violates tax law. The types of unethical behavior that cooccurred with this victim subcategory included harming the natural environment, safety issues, and falsifying documents. The following narrative describes an incident victimizing the community involving an act of falsifying documents. The narrative also includes inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, which was also coded as victimizing the community, due to the nature of the reported workplace issue.
The last day of the fiscal year, I was doing a Medi-Cal report and I noticed that certain dates were being written off for charity / tax purposes while they were not even being billed, which is fraudulent. The person who wrote every single charge that was fraudulent was [Person A]. I did email my supervisor [Person B] about what I saw and she ignored it. The department was Patient Financial Services at [City]. This was before the fiscal year ended. I want to say that this was around [date].

Other

The other victim subcategory is described as “there is a clear victim, but it does not fit any of the above categories. This subcategory was only used nine times. The victims that fell under this subcategory included contract workers, volunteer (non-paid) workers, and laboratory animals. The following narrative briefly describes an issue that affected contract workers (who were coded under the other victim subcategory) that involved wrongful termination:

Firing contract workers cause they don't like them.

Unknown

The unknown victim subcategory is described as “based on the narrative, it is unclear who is the victim.” This subcategory was often used for vague or extremely short narratives that did not provide enough information to determine who was victimized by the ethical violation. In other cases, the type of ethical violation itself was unclear, and therefore it was difficult to determine who might have been harmed. The following narrative involves an unknown type of victim and an instance of inadequate response to a reported workplace issue:

I feel the company could have acted faster on a legal issue they had. It was brought to management years ago, but they dilly dallied around and did not get anything done once the issue was brought to them. I would give more information
to our legal staff, but I will not give more information here. This happened back in [date]. I was in the field sales department on [team name].

Q3. Who are the perpetrators of unethical workplace behavior, and what subcategories can be used to describe and reliably code the perpetrators?

See Table 3 for the final iteration of the Type of Perpetrator subcategory labels, descriptions, frequencies, and reliability statistics. Subcategories are reported in order of frequency of occurrence.

**Higher-level employee(s)**

The *higher-level employee(s)* perpetrator subcategory is described as “one or more higher-level employees from the respondent’s company perpetrated the ethical violation. “Higher-level” means these employees are management, or are in highly skilled and specialized job positions. HINT: The employee should be considered high-level if they are in charge of things like hiring, firing, setting salaries, setting schedules, or disciplining other employees.” This subcategory is the combination of two subcategories from the initial coding scheme called *upper management employees* and *mid- and lower-level management employees*; these two subcategories were combined to address coders’ difficulties in reliably determining the exact management level of the perpetrators within the narratives. This difficulty was mostly due to the varying levels of detail provided by narratives, as well as the differing terminology used to describe management positions in different companies. As this was the most frequently occurring perpetrator subcategory, this coding cooccurred frequently with many Type of Unethical Behavior and Type of Victim subcategories. Below is a narrative that demonstrates the combination of the most common subcategories from each content category: *higher-level employee(s) victimizing employee(s) with inadequate response to a reported workplace issue.*

There were 186 such narratives that included all three of these subcategories, which represents
Table 3: Type of Perpetrator subcategory labels, descriptions, frequencies, and Kappa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Perpetrator Subcategory</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Interviews</th>
<th>Percent of Violations</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level Employee(s)</td>
<td>One or more higher-level employees from the respondent’s company perpetrated the ethical violation. “Higher-level” means these employees are management, or are in highly skilled and specialized job positions. HINT: The employee should be considered high-level if they are in charge of things like hiring, firing, setting salaries, setting schedules, or disciplining other employees.</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>61.45%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Company (Policy, Culture, etc)</td>
<td>Use this category when the blame doesn’t fall to specific employees, but a company policy, company culture, or workplace environment is at fault for the ethical violation.</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>25.26%</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-level Employee(s)</td>
<td>One or more low-level employees from the respondent’s company perpetrated the ethical violation. “Low-level” means these employees are generally lower-skilled and do not have authority over other employees.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee(s) of unknown level</td>
<td>One or more employees are to blame, but it is not clear whether the perpetrator(s) are low-level or high-level. Specific employees may be named as perpetrators in the narrative, or the narrative may imply that one or more employees were the perpetrators.</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>17.37%</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The perpetrator does not fit any of the above categories (write-in).</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values in the Percent of Violations column add to more than 100% because more than one perpetrator could be coded per ethical violation.
nearly 13% of all narratives. The below narrative also includes an instance of lower-level employee(s) victimizing employee(s) with bullying, abuse or incivility.

I left because of unaddressed workplace harassment. My coworkers were bullying me. I suffered verbal abuse. They were very unprofessional in front of patients. [Person A], a therapist, was one of them. I had taken it to my rehab director, [Person B] who did not address it properly. I went to Human Resources about 4 times about it. I tried to get a meeting with [Person C], the head of human resources. I left emails and messages but no one responded. I experienced this from [date] to [date]. This is in [City, State]. This was in the Rehab department.

The company (policy, culture, etc.)

The company perpetrator subcategory is described as “the blame doesn’t fall to specific employees, but a company policy, company culture, or workplace environment is at fault for the ethical violation.” This subcategory was not part of the initial iteration of the Type of Perpetrator coding scheme, but was added when it was observed that many respondents would not place blame on any individual employee or employees for the unethical behavior they described, despite the fact that the unethical behavior was being committed by employees within the organization. Occasionally the respondent would specifically blame a workplace policy or the company culture for the unethical behavior, but more often the respondent would simply note that the unethical behavior in question was pervasive within the organization, was not discouraged or punished within the organization, or was considered ‘normal’ within the organization. Although the coding scheme did not include a distinct code for self-incrimination, anecdotally, I noticed that narratives involving the company as the Type of Perpetrator were the only narratives in
which the respondent would often admit to being involved in the unethical behavior
themselves. The following narrative describes incidents where the company harmed
customers/patients through of safety violations and privacy or confidentiality issues.

HIPAA violations were happening a lot. We were asking patients personal
medical questions around other employees and patients due to not having enough
beds and having all of the patients in chairs in the hallway. You are not allowed
to do that kind of stuff based on the HIPAA rules, but we did that all the time.
Two patients had a heart attack while being in the waiting room due to not
having enough beds for the patients in the ER. I had a kid that needed to be
compressed and due to the cuts in our supplies I had to run all the way over to
the geriatric ER department to get the equipment that I needed to help save the
kid. Clearly they are putting the health of the patients at risk. All of these issues
happened in [City, State] in the Pediatric ER and I noticed this from [date] to
[date].

Lower-level employee(s)

The lower-level employee(s) subcategory of perpetrator is described as “One or more
low-level employees from the respondent’s company perpetrated the ethical violation. ‘Low-
level’ means these employees are generally lower-skilled and do not have authority over other
employees.” The perpetrators in this subcategory were generally referred to as employees, staff,
workers, co-workers, or by their specific job title. Certain job titles such as nurse2 or physician’s
assistant were coded as lower-level employee(s) despite being skilled positions due to being
relatively low-skilled and low authority within their working environment. The lower-level

---

2 Certain nursing positions, such as charge nurse or nurse practitioner, were coded as higher-level employees.
employees(s) perpetrator subcategory frequently cooccurred with many Type of Unethical Behavior subcategories, including bullying, abuse, and incivility, falsifying documents, safety violations, wasting time of the clock, and working unqualified. The following narrative describes an incident lower-level employee(s) victimizing customers/patients through safety violations.

There were a few instances where patients were given more medication than the doctor had ordered because the nurse felt it was not enough. I know this has happened at least twice from what I have seen. This happened in [date], during the night shift in the ER department.

**Employee(s) of unknown level**

The employee(s) of unknown level subcategory is described as “one or more employees are to blame, but it is not clear whether the perpetrator(s) are low-level or high-level. Specific employees may be named as perpetrators in the narrative, or the narrative may imply that one or more employees were the perpetrators.” As the description states, this subcategory was used when the perpetrators were clearly employed by the respondent’s company, but not enough information was given to determine the perpetrator(s)’ job level. Respondents would occasionally refer to the perpetrator by name without giving the perpetrator’s job title; other respondents would to blame the unethical behavior on a vague group of employees, such as people within my department.” The following narrative illustrates an employee of unknown level perpetratin bullying, abuse & incivility that victimized the respondent (an employee).

[Person A] was telling me, in front of other people, to quit. [Person A] was bullying me and harassing me. I thought he was joking but he was serious.

**Other**

The other perpetrator subcategory is described as “The perpetrator does not fit any of the above categories (write-in).” Although it was uncommon, occasionally a respondent would
describe an incident of unethical behavior that was not perpetrated by an employee of the respondent’s company or the company itself. The perpetrators that fell under the *other* subcategory include company affiliates, contractors, suppliers, family members of employees, former employees, employees from outside organizations, outside organizations, customers, patients, family members of patients, and unknown perpetrators. The following narrative illustrates unethical behavior perpetrated by customers, which falls into the *other* perpetrator category. Specifically, this narrative includes incidents of *safety violations* and *bullying, abuse & incivility*, both perpetrated by customers (*other*) and both victimizing *employee(s)*. The narrative also includes a case of *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue*, perpetrated by *higher-level employee(s)* and victimizing *employee(s)*.

*There is a problem with the level of mental and sometimes physical abuse from customers in table games with my wife and myself. I was cursed at a lot and taken advantage of a lot in an emotional capacity and so was my wife. My wife was a dealer in table games and a gentleman told her that he was going to wait for her after work, follow her and poison her. I brought the situation to Security to have the gentlemen removed and escorted, but they shrugged their shoulders. She brought it to her supervisors and it was brushed off as well.*

**Q4. How will the content categories and subcategories of unethical workplace behavior produced by this study compare to the dimensions and categories reported in past research?**

See Table 4 for a summary of the similarities in Type of Behavior subcategories between past studies and the present study. Although no past typography of unethical workplace behavior is a perfect match for the content categories and subcategories created in this study, there are many similarities between this study’s typography and those of certain past studies. Of the past
studies that included an overall Type of Behavior content category in their typography of unethical workplace behavior (Akaah & Lund, 1994; Cherrington & Cherrington, 1992; Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Spector et al., 2006), no past study included as many subcategories as the current study’s 21 subcategories. All four of the comparable designs from past studies included a subdimension equivalent to stealing, and three of the four past designs included a subdimension similar or equivalent to bullying, abuse, & incivility. Some subdimensions from past designs were narrower than those of the current study; for instance, in Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) design, separate subcategories were included for (1) alcohol use and (2) drug use, while the current study included both in a single subcategory of drugs, alcohol and intoxication. Other subcategories were much broader than those of the current study, such as the interpersonal abuse subcategory from Cherrington and Cherrington’s (1992) design. Many subcategories of unethical behavior from the present study fall under this ‘interpersonal abuse’ subcategory, including bullying, abuse, & incivility, sexual misconduct, and discrimination.

The present study included many more subcategories for unethical behavior compared to past studies, and my design contains several subdimensions of unethical behavior not included on any past typography, such as unfair scheduling, ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity, and inadequate response to a reported workplace issue. Notably, most of the subcategories of Type of Behavior that were captured in my typography and not on past typographies were types of behavior that primarily harm employees, rather than behaviors that harm the company itself or other victims.

Although Kaptein’s (2008) design did not subdivide unethical workplace behavior by type of behavior, the individual items included in his scale address most of the subcategories of type of behavior included in my present design. See Table 5 for a review of the items on

---

3 This excludes the present study’s other and not enough information subcategories.
Table 4: Similarities in Type of Behavior subcategories between past studies and the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cherrington &amp; Cherrington, 1992</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Moral Issues at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Stealing</td>
<td>Taking things that do not belong to you</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lying</td>
<td>Saying things that you know are not true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fraud and deceit</td>
<td>Creating false impressions; Pretending to be someone else; Not correcting others’ misconceptions</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bribes, payoffs, and kickbacks</td>
<td>Conflict of interest and influence buying</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hiding information</td>
<td>Hiding versus divulging information</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cheating</td>
<td>Unfair advantage (Using insider information, granting privileges to friends or family, abusing ones position)</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Personal decadence</td>
<td>Low personal standards (slow/sloppy work, extravagant account spending, losing ones temper)</td>
<td>Wasting time on the clock/neglecting duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Interpersonal abuse</td>
<td>Physical violence, sexual harassment, racism, sexism</td>
<td>Bullying, abuse and incivility; sexual misconduct; Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Organizational abuse</td>
<td>Inequity in compensation, excessive transfers or time pressures, terminating people through no fault of their own</td>
<td>Underpaying wages/benefits; Overwork &amp; workbreak issues; Wrongful termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rule violations</td>
<td>Disobeying laws, social conventions, organizational rules, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Accessory to unethical acts</td>
<td>Seeing something unethical and not reporting it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ethical dilemmas</td>
<td>Choosing between two equally desirable or undesirable options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akaah &amp; Lund, 1994</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Unethical Workplace Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Deception</td>
<td>Divulging confidential information; Not reporting others’ violations</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Falsification</td>
<td>Falsifying time/quality/quantity reports</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Personal use of company products</td>
<td>Pilfering company supplies or doing personal business on company time</td>
<td>Stealing; Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Passing blame</td>
<td>Concealing one’s errors; passing blame to an innocent co-worker</td>
<td>Falsly accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Padding expenses</td>
<td>Padding an expense account</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bribery</td>
<td>Giving or accepting gifts/favors for preferential treatment</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CWB</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Theft and related behavior</td>
<td>Taking company or employee(s) property; misuse of expense account</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Destruction of property</td>
<td>Deface, damage, or destroy property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Misuse of information</td>
<td>Destroy or falsify company records; Disclose confidential information; Provide false information</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues; Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Misuse of time and resources</td>
<td>Conduct personal business on company time; Getting paid more hours than worked</td>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties; Overcounting work hours; Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Unsafe behavior</td>
<td>Endanger yourself or others by not following safety procedures</td>
<td>Safety violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Poor attendance</td>
<td>Be absent from work with no legitimate excuse; Intentionally come to work late; Miss work without calling in</td>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Poor quality work</td>
<td>Intentionally do work badly, incorrectly, or slowly</td>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Alcohol use</td>
<td>Consume alcohol at work or before work</td>
<td>Drugs and intoxication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Drug use</td>
<td>Use drugs at work or before work</td>
<td>Drugs and intoxication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Inappropriate verbal actions</td>
<td>Verbally abuse or argue with others; use sexually explicit language</td>
<td>Bullying, abuse and incivility; sexual misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Inappropriate physical actions</td>
<td>Physically attack others; Make unwanted sexual advances</td>
<td>Bullying, abuse and incivility; sexual misconduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gruys & Sackett, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CWB</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Abuse towards others</td>
<td>Harmful behaviors directed towards others that harm either physically or psychologically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Production deviance</td>
<td>Purposful failure to perform job tasks effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Sabotage</td>
<td>Defacing or destroying physical property belonging to the employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Theft</td>
<td>Theft of company property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Withdrawal</td>
<td>Absence, arriving late or leaving early, and taking longer breaks than authorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, & Kessler, 2006
Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Unethical Workplace Behavior</th>
<th>The Present Study</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from past studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcategories</td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>Ignoring reports of workplace issues, or not doing enough to address reports of workplace issues.</td>
<td>Interpersonal abuse&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Inappropriate verbal actions&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Inappropriate physical actions&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Abuse towards others&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>Bullying, assault, mean behavior, or any behavior that creates a hostile work environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Safety violations</td>
<td>Endangering others’ health or safety. Unnecessarily exposing others to health or safety risks.</td>
<td>Unsafe behavior&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Falsifying information on a company document.</td>
<td>Fraud and deceit&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Hiding information&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Falsification&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;; Misuse of information&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>Denying fair pay or benefits to those who are owed them.</td>
<td>Organizational abuse&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>Showing favoritism to friends or family, accepting or giving bribes/kickbacks, or having conflicting business roles. Going against the interests of some innocent party in order to help yourself, or your friends or family.</td>
<td>Bribes, payoffs, and kickbacks&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Cheating&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Bribery&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Discrimination</td>
<td>Discrimination based on protected classes.</td>
<td>Interpersonal abuse&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Violating others’ privacy. Sharing confidential information.</td>
<td>Deception&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;; Misuse of information&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>Asking, forcing, or pressuring others to engage in illegal or unethical activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Retaliation</td>
<td>Punishing or taking negative actions against someone, not because they broke any rules, but because they did something you didn’t like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Subcategory from Cherrington & Cherrington, 1992  
<sup>2</sup> Subcategory from Akaah & Lund, 1994  
<sup>3</sup> Subcategory from Gruys & Sackett, 2003  
<sup>4</sup> Subcategory from Spector et al., 2006
Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Present Study</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from past studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Unethical Workplace Behavior</td>
<td>Subcategories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual harassment or sexual assault. Saying or doing sexual things that makes others feel uncomfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal abuse&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Inappropriate verbal actions&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Inappropriate physical actions&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firing someone for no justifiable reason, or firing someone under false pretenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational abuse&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stealing or intentional misappropriation of money, materials, products, or other valuable commodities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stealing&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Personal use of company products&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;; Padding expenses&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;; Theft and related behavior&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Theft&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working slowly, being off-task while on the clock, or neglecting work duties while on the clock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal decadence&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Personal use of company products&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;; Misuse of time and resources&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Poor quality work&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Production deviance&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals performing work that they are unqualified to perform because they do not have proper license, certification, training, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making employees work in a way that is too fast-paced or overly strenuous. Forcing workers to delay or skip lunch; denying bathroom or rest breaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational abuse&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claiming more work hours than were worked, having someone else clock you in before you get to work, clocking in and leaving work, not being present at work while on the clock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misuse of time and resources&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Poor attendance&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Withdrawal&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any false or unfair blaming/accusations related to unethical or bad behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passing blame&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working while impaired or intoxicated. Being in possession of drugs or alcohol while on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal decadence&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Alcohol use&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;; Drug use&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Subcategory from Cherrington & Cherrington, 1992
<sup>2</sup> Subcategory from Akaah & Lund, 1994
<sup>3</sup> Subcategory from Gruys & Sackett, 2003
<sup>4</sup> Subcategory from Spector et al., 2006
Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Present Study</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from past studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Unethical Workplace Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Descriptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>Being unfair when assigning work hours, shifts, or duties to workers. Unfairly giving certain workers more or fewer hours than they want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>Harming the natural environment or risking potential harm to the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Subcategory from Cherrington & Cherrington, 1992
2 Subcategory from Akaah & Lund, 1994
3 Subcategory from Gruys & Sackett, 2003
4 Subcategory from Spector et al., 2006
Kaptein’s (2008) scale of unethical workplace behavior. Because Kaptein’s (2008) scale is subdivided by victim and not type of behavior, the scale includes items that overlap on type of behavior but are differentiated by type of victim, such as (1) Breaching customer or consumer privacy and (2) Breaching employee privacy. However, because most items specify a type of victim (e.g., “Discriminating against employees”), but the scale does not include items to cover all combinations of type of behavior with each type of victim, this scale may not capture instances of unethical behavior targeting an atypical victim, such as discrimination against customers. Notably, Kaptein’s (2008) scale for unethical workplace behavior did not include any items equivalent to the present study’s bullying, abuse & incivility subcategory.

The subcategories of unethical behavior included in past designs that did not have an equivalent subcategory in the present study were (1) lying, (2) rule violations, (3) accessory to unethical acts, (4) ethical dilemmas, (5) destruction of property, and (6) sabotage. ‘Ethical dilemmas’ from Cherrington and Cherrington’s (1992) study was described as an ethical uncertainty rather than an ethical violation, and therefore was not included in the present study. Although instances of lying, rule violations, and individuals being accessories to unethical acts were all observed in the present study’s dataset, these three types of unethical behavior overlapped extensively with many other subcategories of unethical behavior, making it difficult to code them as separate subcategories. Lying was originally included as a subcategory in the present study, but was later removed due to challenges with low interrater reliability. There were very few instances of destruction of property observed in the present study’s dataset, and no instances of intentional destruction of property or sabotage observed; therefore, these subcategories were not included in the present study.

See Table 6 for a summary of the similarities in type of victim subcategories between past studies and the present study. Of the past studies that included a dimension for type of victim
Table 5: Items included in Kaptein’s (2008) scale of unethical workplace behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaptein, 2008 Unethical Workplace Behavior Items</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study Type of Behavior</th>
<th>Type of Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breaching computer, network, or database controls</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching customer or consumer privacy</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching employee privacy</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminating against employees</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business with disreputable suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business with third parties that may be involved in money laundering or are prohibited under international trade restrictions and embargos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in (sexual) harassment or creating a hostile work environment</td>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in activities that pose a conflict of interest</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in anticompetitive practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in false or deceptive sales and marketing practices</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into customer contract relationships without proper terms, conditions or approvals</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into supplier contracts that lack proper terms, conditions or approvals</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing the public to safety risk</td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
<td>The community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricating or manipulation of product quality or safety test results</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying or manipulating financial reporting information</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Customers/patients, The community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying time and expense reports</td>
<td>Falsifying documents, Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improperly gathering competitors' confidential information</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making false or misleading claims to the public or media</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>The community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making improper political or financial contributions to domestic or foreign officials</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandling confidential or proprietary information</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying suppliers without accurate invoices or records</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inappropriate information to analysts and investors</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaptein, 2008 Unethical Workplace Behavior Items</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing regulators with false or misleading information</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing or misappropriating assets</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting false or misleading invoices to customers</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading securities based on inside information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating contract or payment terms with suppliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating contract terms with customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating document retention rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating employee wage, overtime, or benefits rules</td>
<td>Underpaying wages/benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating environmental standards or regulations</td>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating international labor or human rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating or circumventing supplier selection rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating the intellectual property rights or confidential information of suppliers</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating workplace health and safety rules or principles</td>
<td>Safety Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting, mismanaging, or abusing organizational resources</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Similarities in type of victim subcategories between past studies and the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders Affected by Unethical Workplace Behavior</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Financiers</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Customers</td>
<td>Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Employees</td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Suppliers</td>
<td>Other companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Society</td>
<td>The community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets of Workplace Deviance</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Organizational</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interpersonal</td>
<td>Employee(s); Customers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets of Workplace Deviance</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Organizational</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interpersonal</td>
<td>Employee(s); Customers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets of Workplace Deviance</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Organizational</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interpersonal</td>
<td>Employee(s); Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Self-directed</td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims of Unethical Workplace Behavior</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from past studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcategories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Customers</td>
<td>Customers&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Interpersonal&lt;sup&gt;2,3,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Employee(s)</td>
<td>Employees&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Interpersonal&lt;sup&gt;2,3,4&lt;/sup&gt;; Self-directed&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Company</td>
<td>Financiers&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;; Organizational&lt;sup&gt;2,3,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outside Company(s)</td>
<td>Suppliers&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The Community</td>
<td>Society&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Subcategory from Kaptein, 2008
<sup>2</sup> Subcategory from Robinson & Bennett, 1995
<sup>3</sup> Subcategory from Gruys & Sackett, 2003
<sup>4</sup> Subcategory from Marcus et al., 2016
Kaptein’s (2008) design was most similar to that of the present study. Kaptein (2008) included five subcategories for type of victim (which he called stakeholder groups) as compared to the two or three subcategories of victim in other past studies. The five victim subcategories in Kaptein’s (2008) study are comparable to the five included in the present study: Kaptein included subcategories for (1) financiers, (2) customers, (3) employees, (4) suppliers, and (5) society, which are equivalent to the present study’s five subcategories of (1) the company, (2) customers, (3) employees, (4) other companies, and (5) the community. Other past studies (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Marcus et al., 2016; Robinson & Bennett, 1995) all subdivided victim types into (1) organizational and (2) interpersonal victims; the ‘organizational’ subcategory aligns with the present study’s the company subcategory, while the ‘interpersonal’ subcategory covers the present study’s subcategories of employees and customers.

Finally, none of the past designs included a dimension for Type of Perpetrator, so no comparisons could be made for this content category.

Q5. For each of the main content categories of unethical workplace behavior, which subcategories are most commonly observed in this dataset? How does this result compare to past research findings?

See Table 7 for the frequency rates of each type of unethical behavior subcategory from the present study, and see Table 8 and Table 9 for comparison data from past studies. Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue was the most commonly reported unethical workplace behavior in the present study; however, no past studies included a comparable subcategory. In both Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) study and Kaptein’s (2010) study, wasting or misuse of organizational time and resources were the top reported type of unethical workplace behavior; in comparison, all of the related subcategories from the present study (i.e., Wasting time on the
Table 7: Frequency rates for each type of unethical behavior subcategory from the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ethical Violation Subcategory</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Interviews</th>
<th>Percent of Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>22.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>19.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>17.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>9.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>7.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>11.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Likelihood of occurrence for each type of counterproductive workplace behavior from Gruys & Sackett, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Behavior Subcategory</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of Time and Resources</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties; Overcounting work hours; Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Attendance</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Behavior</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Verbal Actions</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility; Sexual misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft &amp; Related Behavior</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of Information</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Privacy &amp; confidentiality issues; Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Quality Work</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Drugs and intoxication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of Property</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Physical Actions</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility; Sexual misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Drugs and intoxication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Scale is measured from 1 (No Matter What the Circumstances, I would not engage in the behavior) to 7 (In a wide variety of circumstances, I would engage in the behavior).*
Table 9: Frequency rates of unethical workplace behavior from Kaptein, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unethical Workplace Behavior Item</th>
<th>Kaptein, 2010 %</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wasting, mismanaging, or abusing organizational resources</td>
<td>45.68%</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminating against employees</td>
<td>39.23%</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating workplace health and safety rules or principles</td>
<td>34.74%</td>
<td>Safety Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in (sexual) harassment or creating a hostile work environment</td>
<td>30.92%</td>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching employee privacy</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating employee wage, overtime, or benefits rules</td>
<td>27.65%</td>
<td>Underpaying wages/benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandling confidential or proprietary information</td>
<td>22.93%</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in activities that pose a conflict of interest</td>
<td>21.89%</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying time and expense reports</td>
<td>21.18%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents, Overcounting work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating document retention rules</td>
<td>20.73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in false or deceptive sales and marketing practices</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching computer, network, or database controls</td>
<td>19.26%</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing or misappropriating assets</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating environmental standards or regulations</td>
<td>18.11%</td>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into customer contract relationships without proper terms, conditions or approvals</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching customer or consumer privacy</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating contract terms with customers</td>
<td>14.97%</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting inappropriate gifts, favors, entertainment, or kickbacks from suppliers</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making false or misleading claims to the public or media</td>
<td>14.61%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricating or manipulation of product quality or safety test results</td>
<td>13.77%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing the public to safety risk</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improperly gathering competitors' confidential information</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community

Other company(s)
Table 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unethical Workplace Behavior Item</th>
<th>Kaptein, 2010 %</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study Type of Behavior</th>
<th>Type of Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violating or circumventing supplier selection rules</td>
<td>12.74%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying or manipulating financial reporting information</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Customers/patients, The community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in anticompetitive practices</td>
<td>11.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into supplier contracts that lack proper terms, conditions or approvals</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business with disreputable suppliers</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing regulators with false or misleading information</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>The community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting false or misleading invoices to customers</td>
<td>10.09%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating contract or payment terms with suppliers</td>
<td>9.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inappropriate information to analysts and investors</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating the intellectual property rights or confidential information of suppliers</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying suppliers without accurate invoices or records</td>
<td>7.83%</td>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading securities based on inside information</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violating international labor or human rights</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making improper political or financial contributions to domestic or foreign officials</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business with third parties that may be involved in money laundering or are prohibited under international trade restrictions and embargos</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values represent percent of participants who observed the specified unethical behavior within the last 12 months.
clock or neglecting duties, Overcounting work hours, and Stealing) were in the bottom half in terms of reported frequency. Both the present study and Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) study found bullying and related actions to be among the top reported unethical workplace behaviors; in contrast, Kaptein’s (2010) study did not include any items related to bullying or (non-sexual) verbal abuse, and therefore did not capture this type of unethical behavior within his taxonomy. The present study is in agreement with past studies (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Kaptein, 2010) in that all three found safety issues to be the third most commonly reported type of unethical workplace behavior. Both the present study and Gruys and Sackett (2003) included subcategories for drug and/or alcohol use, and both studies found these subcategories to be among the least reported types of unethical workplace behavior. Finally, the present study found falsifying documents to be among the most commonly reported workplace ethical violations; likewise, Kaptein’s (2010) study included many items related to falsifying documents, which together account for a large portion of the reported ethical violations within his study.

See Table 10 for frequency rates of each type of victim subcategory from the present study, and see Table 11 for comparison data from past research. The rank order of frequencies for the victim subcategories are nearly identical between the present study and Kaptein’s (2008) study. Both found employees to be the most common victim. The second and third most common victims were reversed between the present study and Kaptein’s (2008) study: the present study found customers to be the second most frequent victim, followed by the company, while Kaptein (2008) found the company to be the second most frequent victim, followed by customers. Other companies were the fourth most common victim in both studies, and the community was the least commonly reported victim in both studies⁴.

---

⁴ This excludes the other and not enough information subcategories from the present study.
Table 10: Frequency rates for each type of unethical behavior subcategory from the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Victim Subcategory</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Interviews</th>
<th>Percent of Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>66.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers/Patients</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Company</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other company(s)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants/Potential Employee(s)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Frequency rates for each type of victim subcategory from Kaptein, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Victim</th>
<th>Kaptein, 2008 %</th>
<th>Comparable subcategories from the present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Employee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financiers</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>The company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Customers/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Other companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>The community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values represent percent of participating employees who observed unethical behavior affecting this type of victim within the last 12 months.
See Table 12 for frequencies of occurrence for each Type of Perpetrator subcategory from the present study. Higher-level employees were the most frequently reported perpetrator, followed by the company itself (in terms of culture or company policies), followed by lower-level employees and employees of unknown level. No previous studies on unethical workplace behavior included a dimension for type of perpetrator, and therefore no previous studies reported frequencies in terms of type of perpetrator.

**Q6. Do different types of unethical workplace behavior tend to involve different victims and perpetrators?**

Chi-square tests were conducted using the 23-category Type of Behavior variable cross-tabulated against each dichotomous Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategory variable. All were significant, signifying that there is an association between the type of unethical behavior and the types of victims and perpetrators involved. See Table 13 for the results of these omnibus chi-square tests.

Chi-square tests were then conducted between each dichotomous Type of Behavior subcategory variable and each dichotomous Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategory variable to test for the association between the individual subcategories. See Tables 14 through 19 for cross tabulations and Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior subcategories and Type of Victim subcategories, and see Tables 20 through 23 for cross tabulations and Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior subcategories and Type of Perpetrator subcategories.

Different types of unethical workplace behavior were clearly associated with different victims and perpetrators, as evidenced in the Chi-square tests in Tables 14 through 23. Each type of unethical behavior was positively associated with at least one victim subcategory, and most

---

5 The *other* and *not enough information* subcategories were excluded from these analyses, as they represent a collection of coding exceptions rather than their own definitive content subcategories.
Table 12: Frequency rates for each Type of Perpetrator subcategory from the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Perpetrator Subcategory</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Interviews</th>
<th>Percent of Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level Employee(s)</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>61.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Company (Policy, Culture, etc)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>25.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-level Employee(s)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee(s) of unknown level</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>17.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Chi-square tests between the Type of Behavior content category variable and each Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator subcategory variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Tabulated Variables</th>
<th>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Victim - Employee(s)</td>
<td>1227.37, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Victim - Customers/Patients</td>
<td>800.43, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Victim - The Company</td>
<td>663.11, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Victim - Other company(s)</td>
<td>146.44, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Victim - The Community</td>
<td>91.23, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Perpetrator - Higher-level Employee(s)</td>
<td>343.45, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Perpetrator - The Company</td>
<td>283.56, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Perpetrator - Low-level Employee(s)</td>
<td>349.72, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Behavior (23-category variable) * Type of Perpetrator - Employee(s) of unknown level</td>
<td>155.48, 22, &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Victim - Employee(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Victimized Employee(s)</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Employee(s) victim subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Employee(s) victim subcategory.
Table 15: Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Victim – Customers/Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Victimized Customers/Patients</th>
<th>(\chi^2) Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subcategories</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Customers/Patients victim subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Customers/Patients victim subcategory.
Table 16: Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Victim – The Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Victimized Company</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>Count 271</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 11.2%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>62.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.4%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>Count 18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>Count 161</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 15.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>Count 17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 15.2%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>Count 32</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 4.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>Count 41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 3.7%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>28.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 2.4%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 4.9%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>Count 42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>125.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 72.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>34.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>Count 35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 63.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>Count 7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 13.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>Count 0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( Df = 1 \) for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with The Company victim subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated The Company victim subcategory.
Table 17: Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Victim – Other Company(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Victimized Other Company(s)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count Present</td>
<td>Count Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Subcategories</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Other Company(s) victim subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Other Company(s) victim subcategory.
Table 18: Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Victim – Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Victimized Applicants /Potential Employees</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Applicants victim subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Applicants victim subcategory.
Table 19: Chi-square tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Victim – The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Victimized Community</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harming the natural environment</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety violations</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with The Community victim subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated The Community victim subcategory.
Table 20: Chi-square tests between Type of Beh. and Type of Perp. – Higher-level Employee(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Higher-level Employee Perpetrators</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harms the natural environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Higher-level Employee(s) perpetrator subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Higher-level Employees perpetrator subcategory.
Table 21: Chi-Square Tests between Type of Behavior and Type of Perpetrator – The Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>The Company Perpetrator</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behavior</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with The Company perpetrator subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated The Company perpetrator subcategory.
Table 22: Chi-Square tests between Type of Beh. and Type of Perp. – Lower-level Employee(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Lower-level Employee Perpetrators</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm the natural environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Lower-level Employee(s) perpetrator subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Lower-level Employees perpetrator subcategory.
### Table 23: Chi-Square tests between Type of Beh. and Type of Perp. – Unknown-level Empl.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Unknown-level Employee Perpetrators</th>
<th>χ² Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Unethical Behaviors</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Df = 1 for each test. Bolded behavior subcategories were positively associated with the Unknown-level Employee(s) perpetrator subcategory, while italicized behavior subcategories were negatively associated the Unknown-level Employees perpetrator subcategory.
types of unethical behavior had positive associations with at least one perpetrator subcategory. The employee(s) victim subcategory was positively associated with 11 different types of unethical workplace behavior, which was the most of any victim group. Bullying, abuse & incivility as well as sexual misconduct had significant positive associations with the employee(s) victim subcategory and the lower-level employees perpetrator subcategory. Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity, retaliation, and wrongful termination were also all positively associated with the employee(s) victim subcategory, but were associated with the higher-level employees perpetrator subcategory. False accusations of unethical or bad behavior and unfair scheduling were also both positively associated with the employee(s) victim subcategory, but were not significantly positively associated with any perpetrator subcategory. However, false accusations of unethical or bad behavior was negatively associated with the company perpetrator subcategory. Discrimination was positively associated with both employee(s) and applicants victim subcategories, was not positively associated with any perpetrator subcategory, but was negatively associated with the lower-level employees perpetrator subcategory.

The customers/patients victim subcategory was positively associated with four types of unethical behavior: working unqualified, safety violations, falsifying documents, and privacy and confidentiality issues. Working unqualified was associated with the customers/patients victim subcategory and the lower-level employee(s) perpetrator subcategory. Safety violations was associated with both the customers/patients and the community victim subcategories, and with the company and lower-level employees perpetrator subcategories. Falsifying documents was associated with the customers/patients, the company, and other company(s) victim subcategories, and with the lower-level employees and unknown level employees perpetrator subcategories.
Finally, privacy and confidentiality issues was associated with the customers/patients victim subcategory and no perpetrator subcategories.

The company victim subcategory was associated with five types of unethical workplace behavior. As described previously, falsifying documents is associated with the company, customers/patients and other company(s) victim subcategories, and with the lower-level employees and unknown level employees perpetrator subcategories. Drugs and intoxication, overcounting work hours, and wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties are all positively associated with the company victim subcategory and both lower-level employees and unknown level employees perpetrator subcategories. Finally, stealing is only positively associated with the company victim subcategory and unknown level employees perpetrator subcategory.

The applicants/potential employees victim subcategory was positively associated with discrimination as well as favoritism or conflicts of interest. Discrimination was positively associated with both applicants/potential employees and employees victim subcategories, and no perpetrator subcategories. Favoritism or conflicts of interest was positively associated with only the applicants/potential employees victim subcategory and higher-level employees perpetrator subcategory.

Finally, the community victim subcategory was associated with both safety violations and harming the natural environment. Safety violations tended to victimize the community as well as customers/patients, and was positively associated with the company and lower-level employees perpetrators. Harming the natural environment was positively associated with only the community victim subcategory, and no perpetrator subcategories.

Q7. Did the rate of reported unethical workplace behavior vary by organization?

Employees were nested by organization to determine how the rate of unethical workplace behavior varied by organization. To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only
organizations with 50 or more participating employees were included in this analysis. This limited the sample to 101 organizations with a total of 27,447 employees. The reported frequency rates of unethical workplace behavior per organization ranged from 0% to 16.7%; see Table 24 for the rate of unethical workplace behavior per organization. The ICC1 was calculated to determine the extent to which the rate of reported unethical workplace behavior varied by organization. Grouping employees by organization explained 6.6% of the variation in employees’ likelihood of reporting an ethical violation (ICC1 = .066).

**Q8. Did the rate of reported unethical workplace behavior vary by industry, and if so, which industries had the highest and lowest rates?**

Logistic regression was run while nesting employees by organization, using industry as a level 2 variable to predict employees’ likelihood of reporting an unethical workplace behavior. As with Research Question 7, to avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only organizations with 50 or more participating employees were included in these analyses. Furthermore, only industries with 10 or more organizations (each with 50 or more participating employees) were included. This limited the sample to two industries (healthcare and manufacturing), 69 organizations, and a total of 19,839 employees. Industry was a significant organization-level predictor of employees’ likelihood of reporting an unethical workplace behavior ($F(1,4) = 9.09$, $p = .038$). See Table 25 for the predicted probability of an employee reporting an ethical violation for both included industries, along with the range of reporting rates by organization. Healthcare employees were more likely to report an ethical violation compared to manufacturing employees (predicted probability of .049 versus .037). However, all manufacturing companies reported at least one incident of unethical workplace behavior, whereas at least one healthcare company reported no

---

6 See Appendix F for the full list of 131 organizations with the rate of unethical workplace behavior per organization.

7 See Appendix G this same analysis performed while including all industries and all 131 organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Interviews</th>
<th>Total Violations</th>
<th>% with Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Interviews</th>
<th>Total Violations</th>
<th>% with Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Interviews</th>
<th>Total Violations</th>
<th>% with Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To avoid overgeneralization of small samples, only organizations with at least 50 participating employees are included in this table.
Table 25: Percent of Reported Ethical Violations by Industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Predicted Probability of Reporting an Unethical Workplace Behavior</th>
<th>Number of Interview</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Range of Reporting Rates by Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only industries with 10 or more organizations consisting of 50 or more participating employees were included in this analysis.
incidents of unethical workplace behavior. The healthcare industry included a much broader range of reporting rates (0.0% – 12.0%) compared to the manufacturing industry (2.2% - 4.4%), but the present study also included a much larger sample of healthcare organizations compared to manufacturing organizations (598 companies versus 10 companies).

Q9. Did the types of reported unethical workplace behaviors vary by organization?

Employees were grouped by organization and the range of organization-wide reporting rates were examined for each type of unethical workplace behavior. The organization-wide reporting rates of each type of unethical workplace behavior were calculated in terms of percent of interviews and percent of ethical violations. For example, for a given organization, the percent of interviews that included a reported bullying incident would be calculated, and the percent of reported ethical violations that included a bullying incident would be calculated. To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, when calculating reporting rates based on percent of interviews, only organizations with 50 or more participating employees were included; this limited the sample to 101 companies with a total of 27,447 participating employees. When calculating reporting rates based on percent of ethical violations, only organizations with 20 or more reported ethical violations were included; this limited the sample to 16 organizations with a total of 12,099 employees. See Table 26 for the range of organization-wide reporting rates for each type of unethical workplace behavior. Among the 101 organizations with 50 or more participating employees, there were no types of unethical workplace behavior that were universal; in other words, for each type of unethical workplace behavior, there was at least one organization with zero reported incidents. However, among all 16 of the organizations with 20 or more reported ethical violations, there was at least one reported incident each of (1) bullying, abuse &

---

8 Although there were a total of 70 healthcare companies in the present study, only 59 of those healthcare companies had over 50 participating employees.
Table 26: Range of Reporting Rates by Organization for each Type of Unethical Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ethical Violation Subcategory</th>
<th>Range of Reporting Rates by Organization</th>
<th>% of Interviews(^1)</th>
<th>% of Violations(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.7%</td>
<td>4.8% - 37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 2.2%</td>
<td>0.0% - 15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.3%</td>
<td>0.0% - 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.2%</td>
<td>0.0% - 9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.8%</td>
<td>3.0% - 31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.7%</td>
<td>0.0% - 13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 0.9%</td>
<td>0.0% - 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.7%</td>
<td>9.6% - 40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 2.4%</td>
<td>1.5% - 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.1%</td>
<td>0.0% - 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.8%</td>
<td>0.0% - 22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 2.6%</td>
<td>0.0% - 15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.9%</td>
<td>0.0% - 10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 4.8%</td>
<td>0.0% - 45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 2.8%</td>
<td>0.0% - 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.7%</td>
<td>0.0% - 12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 3.3%</td>
<td>2.2% - 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.8%</td>
<td>0.0% - 9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.6%</td>
<td>0.0% - 8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.6%</td>
<td>0.0% - 11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% - 1.9%</td>
<td>0.0% - 13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, the values reported in this column only include companies with at least 50 interviews.

\(^2\)To avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, the values reported in this column only include companies with at least 20 reported ethical violation
incivility, (2) falsifying documents, (3) inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, (4) ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity, and (5) underpaying wages and benefits.

None of the subcategories of unethical workplace behavior had a sufficient rate of occurrence to allow for multilevel logistic regression; therefore, the intraclass correlation coefficient was not calculated to statistically test the extent to which the reporting rates of individual subcategories of unethical workplace behavior varied by organization.

Q10. Did the types of reported unethical workplace behaviors vary by industry? If so, how?

Employees were grouped by industry and the industry-wide reporting rates were examined for each type of unethical workplace behavior. Because this analysis did not group employees by organization, participants from organizations with fewer than 50 participating employees were included. However, to avoid overgeneralizations of small samples, only industries with 10 or more participating organizations were included. This limited the sample to three industries (healthcare, manufacturing, and finance), representing 92 organizations with a total of 22,410 employees. See Table 27 for the reporting rate of each type of unethical workplace behavior for the three included industries. The finance and insurance industry had only half the reported incidents of bullying, abuse & incivility (0.5% of interviews) compared to the healthcare and manufacturing industries (1.1% of interviews). Safety violations were reported twice as frequently in the healthcare industry (1.2% of interviews) compared to the manufacturing industry (0.6% of interviews) and were reported very infrequently in the finance industry (0.04% of interviews). Furthermore, privacy or confidentiality issues were reported more frequently in

---

9In order for a subcategory of unethical workplace behavior to be tested using multilevel logistic regression, the prevalence rate must be high enough such that 50 or more organizations have an expected rate of occurrence of 2 or more (Moineddin, Matheson, & Glazier, 2007). This stipulation was to ensure valid estimates of within- and between-group variance.

10 See Appendix H for this same report, but with all industries included.
Table 27: Reporting Rate for each Type of Unethical Behavior by Industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Finance and Insurance</th>
<th>Health Care and Social Assistance</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>16,638</td>
<td>3,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying, abuse &amp; incivility</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs, alcohol and intoxication</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely accusing others of unethical or bad behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism or conflicts of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response to reported workplace issue</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting work hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork or work break issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy or confidentiality issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages or benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
finance (0.4% of interviews) and healthcare (0.5% of interviews) compared to manufacturing (0.1% of interviews). While this provides some preliminary evidence of differences in types of unethical workplace behaviors by industry, I was not able to test for the statistical significance of these differences because none of the subcategories of unethical workplace behavior had a sufficient rate of occurrence to allow for multilevel logistic regression\textsuperscript{11}.

Finally, the most frequently reported type of unethical behavior, victim, and perpetrator was examined for each industry. See Table 28 for the top reported unethical workplace behavior, victim, and perpetrator for the three included industries\textsuperscript{12}. The most commonly reported victim and perpetrator subcategories were the same across all three industries (employees and higher-level employees respectively), but the most commonly reported type of unethical behavior varied by industry. The top reported type of unethical workplace behavior was inadequate response to a reported workplace issue for finance and insurance as well as healthcare and social assistance companies, while bullying, abuse and incivility was the most commonly reported unethical workplace behavior in manufacturing companies.

\textsuperscript{11} In order for a subcategory of unethical workplace behavior to be tested using multilevel logistic regression, the prevalence rate must be high enough such that 50 or more organizations have an expected rate of occurrence of 2 or more (Moineddin, Matheson, & Glazier, 2007). This stipulation was to ensure valid estimates of within- and between-group variance.

\textsuperscript{12} See Appendix I for this same report, but with all industries included.
Table 28: Top Type of Unethical Behavior, Victim, & Perpetrator Subcategories by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Top Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Top Type of Victim</th>
<th>Top Type of Perpetrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>Inadequate Response</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>Inadequate Response</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subcategory titles were shorted to improve table formatting.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

**Major findings**

**Typography of unethical workplace behavior**

Through the inductive content analysis process, three main content categories were identified to distinguish between different types of unethical workplace behavior: Type of Behavior, Type of Victim, and Type of Perpetrator. Within each content category, subcategories define the diverse range of content that exists within the construct of unethical workplace behavior.

*Type of Behavior.*

Twenty-one subcategories of Type of Behavior were included in the final iteration of the present study’s coding scheme. These subcategories covered a wide variety of topics, from interpersonal abuses such as bullying, abuse & incivility, discrimination, and sexual misconduct, to financial abuse like falsifying documents, underpaying wages and benefits, stealing, and overcounting work hours, to employment abuses like wrongful termination, overwork or work break issues, and unfair scheduling. Other subcategories focused on physical health risks such as safety violations, drugs, alcohol and intoxication, and harming the natural environment, and still other subcategories featured less tangible abuses such as favoritism or conflicts of interest, privacy or confidentiality issues, wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties, and working unqualified. Some of the subcategories could be considered “secondary” forms of unethical workplace behavior that either generate or perpetuate other forms of unethical workplace behavior, such as inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity, and retaliation.

---

13 Excluding the other and not enough information subcategories.
Type of Victim.

Six subcategories of Type of Victim were included in the final iteration of the present study’s coding scheme\textsuperscript{14}. Victim subcategories were present for the company itself and virtually every representative group that is in some way touched by the organization, starting with employees and customers/patients, branching out to other companies, applicants/potential employees, and even the community that surrounds the organization.

Type of Perpetrator.

Four subcategories for Type of Perpetrator were included in the final iteration of the present study’s coding scheme\textsuperscript{15}. All subcategories of perpetrator come from within the organization, whether employees or the company itself (in terms of policies or culture). In terms of job level, higher-level employees (generally management) and lower-level employees (non-management) were represented, as well as employees of unknown level for when the participant did not specify the job position of the perpetrator.

Typography comparisons to past research.

The present study included more content categories and many more content subcategories compared to past studies on unethical workplace behavior. Many of the subcategories within Type of Behavior from the present study had no comparable subcategories (or even items) to represent them in any past unethical workplace behavior research study. Furthermore, the Type of Perpetrator content category was unique to the present study. The presence of these unique content categories and subcategories suggest that the present study may have identified distinct features and a wider spectrum of unethical workplace behavior than previously identified in past research.

\textsuperscript{14} Excluding the other and unknown subcategories.
\textsuperscript{15} Excluding the other subcategory.
Interestingly, the subcategories of unethical workplace behavior that did not have an equivalent subcategory represented in past studies (*inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity, retaliation, working unqualified, unfair scheduling, and harming the natural environment*) all disproportionally victimize entities other than the company itself, particularly employees. This suggests an overemphasis in the current literature on unethical workplace behavior affecting the company, and underemphasis on unethical workplace behavior affecting other stakeholders. This bias could potentially be due to a combination of several factors. First, the vast majority of empirical research on unethical workplace behavior uses quantitative scales made up of close-ended survey items to measure unethical workplace behavior (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Lehnert, Park, & Singh, 2015; O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005; Randall & Gibson, 1990). Secondly, when developing items for these quantitative scales to measure of unethical workplace behavior, researchers often rely on resources that come from the perspective of the organization, such as company ethics statements (Kaptein, 2008) or SMEs that favor the interests of the organization, such as company management (Akkah & Lund, 1994). Other studies recycle items from the research literature, therefore restricting the potential types of unethical workplace behavior to those already existing in past research (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Spector et al., 2006). This approach to scale development likely biases the resulting measure to focus on examples of unethical workplace behavior that affect the company, such as theft, absenteeism, and wasting time on the clock. Finally, because of the heavy reliance on close-ended survey items, most measures of unethical workplace behavior do not allow participants to include additional examples of unethical workplace behavior in their response that are not already covered by the survey items. In short, the most popular measurement strategy for unethical workplace behavior will detect expected forms of unethical workplace behavior (which are mostly those that affect the organization) and
will not detect unexpected forms of unethical workplace behavior (which are mostly those that affect less powerful entities, such as employees and customers).

No past research study included *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* as a subcategory of unethical behavior. One might argue this is because *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* is actually a lack of action rather than a discrete behavior; however, past typographies of unethical workplace behavior have included other inaction subcategories such as poor attendance (Gruys & Sackett, 2003) and withdrawal (Spector et al., 2006). The closest subcategory to *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* found in past research was called accessory to unethical acts (seeing something unethical and not reporting it; Cherrington & Cherrington, 1992). Interestingly, the study that identified this similar subcategory also performed content analysis on qualitative data to create their subcategories of unethical workplace behavior, although these researchers analyzed articles from the Wallstreet Journal rather than employee interviews. Even though these subcategories are similar, I contend that ignoring reports of unethical behavior is a more serious violation than seeing something unethical and not reporting it. Employees typically report unethical behavior to their manager or to another authority figure within the organization; these higher-level employees represent the organization and are expected to be responsible for the actions of their subordinates. Therefore, although it may be unethical to witness a workplace ethics violation and not report it, it is even more severe an infraction for individuals in positions of organizational authority to fail to respond to reports of unethical workplace behavior.

No past studies included Type of Perpetrator as a content category. This could partially be due to lack of opportunity, as several of prominent research studies that focused on the dimensionality of unethical workplace behavior measured unethical workplace behavior in terms of observed behavior rather than self-report, and did not include an option for participants to
indicate who committed the observed unethical workplace behavior (Kaptein, 2008; Kaptein, 2010). Other research on the dimensionality of unethical workplace behavior measured self-report likelihood of engaging in unethical behavior, but surveyed primarily management (Gruys & Sackett, 2003) or only management (Akaah & Lund, 1994), and therefore did not have an ideal sample with which to distinguish the behaviors by type of perpetrator.

*Frequency of occurrence comparisons to past research.*

In the present study, the top five most commonly reported types of unethical workplace behavior were (1) *Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue*, (2) *bullying, abuse & incivility*, (3) *safety violations*, (4) *falsifying documents*, and (5) *underpaying wages or benefits*. In contrast, the top types of unethical workplace behavior were (1) misuse of time and resources, (2) poor attendance, (3) unsafe behavior, (4) inappropriate verbal actions, and (5) misuse of information for Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) typography, and (1) wasting, mismanagement, or abusing organizational resources, (2) discriminating against employees, (3) violating workplace health and safety rules or principles, (4) engaging in (sexual) harassment or creating a hostile work environment, and (5) breaching employee privacy for Kaptein’s (2010) scale. The present study aligned well with past studies in terms of finding safety violations to be among the most common unethical workplace behaviors. Interpersonal abuses such as bullying, ‘inappropriate verbal actions,’ and sexual harassment were found to be common in the present study as well as past studies, although the present study found *bullying, abuse & incivility* to be reported nearly four times as often as *sexual misconduct* (20% of narratives versus 6% of narratives).

Furthermore, all studies found topics related to misuse of information, such as falsifying documents and breaching employee privacy, to be fairly common forms of unethical workplace behavior.
While comparable past studies (Gruys & Sackett, 2003; Kaptein, 2010) both found wasting organizational time or resources to be the most common form of unethical workplace behavior, the present study found this issue was reported relatively infrequently. This difference could be due to the method for data collection. The present study measured unethical workplace behavior by asking participants if they were aware of any unethical behavior in their former organization, and then relied on the participant to describe the specific examples. This limited participant’s responses to those incidents that the participant could recall, which were more likely to be relatively severe incidents or incidents that impacted the participant personally. Other studies provided participants with an inventory of different types of unethical behavior for the participant to rate on a Likert scale; this method is likely to prompt participants’ memories of the less severe forms of unethical workplace behavior, therefore allowing those lesser behaviors to be measured more often. This may explain why past studies found minor offenses like wasting time on the clock and mismanaging company resources to be the most frequent forms of unethical workplace behavior, whereas those behaviors were reported less often with the present study’s interview method.

While the Likert scale method of past studies may have provided a more balanced perspective on the relative frequencies of different forms of unethical workplace behavior, the present study’s interview approach has the advantage of providing an understanding of unethical workplace behavior from the unique prospective of the employee, while emphasizing the types of unethical workplace behavior that employees found to be most troubling. This unprompted interview method also allowed the present study to identify forms of unethical workplace behavior that frequently affect employees but that are not included on existing scales, such as inadequate response to a reported workplace issue.
The present study found *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* to be the most commonly reported type of unethical workplace behavior. Amazingly, none of the past research studies on the typography of unethical workplace behavior included a subcategory related to this issue. Because past research studies did not include items related to this topic, none of the scales used by past studies detected any incidents of this type of unethical workplace behavior. The high prevalence of *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* in the present study could partially be due to the nature of the interview question used to measure unethical workplace behavior: participants were asked to describe the incidents of unethical workplace behavior they experienced, then were asked follow-up questions, including whether they had previously reported this incident. This would prompt participants to discuss their reporting behavior related to the incident. Participants were not asked, however, whether the incident was adequately addressed by the company. Still, 22% of participants who disclosed an incident of unethical workplace behavior in their interview opted to share the fact that they had previously reported the incident and were dissatisfied with the way their company or their supervisor handled their concerns.

In terms of Type of Victim, the present study found *employees* to be the most common victim group, followed by (2) *customers/patients*, (3) *the company*, (4) *other companies*, (5) *applicants/potential employees*, and (6) *the community*. Past studies that ranked unethical workplace behavior by victim group found very similar results, although financiers were ranked above customers as victims, and applicants were not included as a type of victim (Kaptein, 2008).

In terms of Type of Perpetrator, the present study found *higher-level employees* to be the most frequently reported perpetrator, followed by (2) *the company*, (3) *lower-level employees*, and (4) *employees of unknown level*. No other study ranked unethical workplace behaviors by perpetrator, so no comparison data was available.
**Relationships between content categories**

Studying the relationships between the Type of Perpetrator, Type of Behavior, and Type of Victim subcategories provides a more complete picture of the context surrounding many unethical workplace behaviors. Employees are the main victims of unethical workplace behavior perpetrated by higher-level employees, such as *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity, retaliation, and wrongful termination*. The company (in terms of policy or culture) also victimizes employees through *underpaying wages or benefits and overwork or work break issues*. However, lower-level employees engage in unethical workplace behaviors that victimize many entities. Lower-level employees are the primary perpetrators of unethical workplace behavior that victimizes the company, including *falsifying documents, wasting time on the clock or neglecting duties, overcounting work hours, and drugs, alcohol and intoxication*. Lower-level employees are also the main perpetrators of most of the unethical behaviors that victimize customers/patients (*working unqualified and falsifying documents*) and several of the unethical workplace behaviors that victimize other employees (*bullying, abuse, & incivility and sexual misconduct*). Both lower-level employees and the company (in terms of policy or culture) engage in *safety violations*, which tends to victimize customers/patients as well as the community.

Examining the relationships between certain subcategories of Type of Behavior also led to meaningful insights. Although lower-level employees were the primary perpetrators of *working unqualified* and *falsifying documents*, these two types of unethical workplace behavior had significant positive associations with *ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity*, which was primarily perpetrated by higher-level employees. This suggests that higher-level employees may pressure lower-level employees to engage in *working unqualified* and *falsifying documents*, although it tends to be lower-level employees who ultimately commit these acts.
Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue frequently cooccurred with (1) bullying, abuse, & incivility, (2) drugs, alcohol, and intoxication, (3) safety violations, and (4) sexual misconduct. These four types of unethical behavior differ in terms of typical victim, but all four are associated with the same type of perpetrator: lower-level employees. It seems that inadequate response to a reported workplace issue often occurs when higher-level employees fail to act on reports of lower-level employees’ unethical behavior. Finally, sexual misconduct was positively associated with both inadequate response to a reported workplace issue and retaliation. This may suggest that employees who attempt to report their experiences of sexual abuse at work are often met with resistance and even retribution.

Variation by organization and industry

The range of company-wide reporting rates varied somewhat by organization: although overall only 4% of the variation in employees’ likelihood of reporting an unethical workplace behavior was at the organization level, among individual organizations with at least 50 participating employees, the reporting rate ranged from 16.7% to 0%. The rate of reported unethical workplace behavior also varied by industry, although for most industries, there were insufficient organizations and employees represented to include in the analyses. Still, of the two industries that were most heavily represented in the sample, it was found that employees in the health care and social assistance industry had a significantly higher predicted probability of reporting an unethical workplace behavior compared to employees from the manufacturing industry. This insight was based on 59 companies within the health care and social assistance industry and 10 companies within the manufacturing industry, with at least 50 former employees representing each company.

The rates of individual types of unethical workplace behavior also varied by organization. Among the 101 organizations with at least 50 interviews, there was no type of unethical behavior
that was present in every organization. However, among the 16 organizations with at least 20 reported ethical violations, all organizations had at least one reported case of inadequate response to a reported workplace issue, bullying, abuse, & incivility, falsifying documents, underpaying wages and benefits, and ordering others to engage in illegal or unethical activity. Within the present study’s sample, the rates of safety violations seemed to vary the most, as safety violations had the largest organization-wide reporting range in terms of percent of total interviews\textsuperscript{16} (0.0\% - 4.8\%) as well as in terms of percent of all violations\textsuperscript{17} (0.0\% - 45.5\%). However, given the sample size of the present study, no individual subcategory of Type of Behavior had a sufficient rate of occurrence to be tested using multilevel logistic regression. To properly test even the most frequently occurring subcategory (inadequate response to a reported workplace issue) using multilevel logistic regression, the present study’s sample would need to contain at least 50 organizations with 176 or more participating employees; the present study contained 49 organizations with 176 or more participating employees.

**Limitations**

**Data collection and coding process**

The subcategories of Type of Behavior generated through the present study’s inductive content analysis process covered the vast majority of the 1,445 instances of unethical workplace behavior that were described in the employee narratives. However, the present study’s typography could have included even more subcategories under each content category if not for certain constraints related to interrater reliability. For example, it could have been valuable to separate falsifying documents into multiple subcategories for different types of documents, such as financial disclosure documents, billing statements, expense reports, and others. Additionally,

\textsuperscript{16} Including the 101 organizations with at least 50 participating employees
\textsuperscript{17} Including the 16 organizations with at least 20 reported ethical violations
some subcategories like contract violations and lying were originally included in the coding scheme but were later removed due to low interrater reliability. There were limitations in the present study’s methodology that made the coding process difficult, such as the fact that the interviews were archival and were not designed with this study in mind. In many cases, there was not enough detail included in the participant narratives to accurately code the unethical workplace behaviors; this issue could have been remedied with the inclusion of additional follow-up questions to get all pertinent information related to the unethical workplace behavior. For instance, it could have been constructive to separate the employees subcategory into higher-level and lower-level under the Type of Victim content category as they were under the Type of Perpetrator content category, but lack of detail in the narratives made this unfeasible. Furthermore, numerous differences in terminology and industry vernacular made it difficult to understand the context behind some of the unethical workplace behaviors described in the narratives. Finally, the use of undergraduate coders was less than ideal. Most of the undergraduate coders had limited workplace experience, and occasionally lacked the knowledge necessary to understand the narratives enough to reliably code them.

Sample size

Although the present study had an exceptionally large sample at both the employee level (28,175) and the organization level (131), it was still difficult to draw conclusions from this sample regarding the organization-level or industry-level differences in unethical workplace behavior. This was partially due to some organizations having only a small number of participating employees, but mostly due to the low reporting rates for unethical workplace behavior. Only 5.1% of participants reported any unethical workplace behavior, so out of the 28,175 total participants, only 1,445 provided narratives describing their experiences with unethical workplace behavior. This could be due to former employees’ fears of damaging their
relationship with their former employer. Moreover, when examining individual subcategories of unethical workplace behavior, this number drops again: even the most frequently reported subcategory of unethical workplace behavior (*inadequate response to a reported workplace issue*) was only reported 320 times (1.14%) out of the 28,175 participants interviewed. When predicting dichotomous outcome variables using multilevel logistic regression, the lower the rate of occurrence, the larger the sample size is required, particularly at the employee level. For this reason, having fewer organizations with more participating employees each would have been advantageous when grouping employees by organization in the present study. At the same time, the present study had an insufficient number or organizations within most industries to draw meaningful inferences on differences between industries. This limited the exploration of differences between industries to the few industries that were most heavily represented within the sample (health care and social assistance, manufacturing, and finance and insurance). Because of the low rate of occurrence of unethical workplace behavior, the present study’s dataset was smaller than ideal for studying differences between organizations and between industries. Despite this limitation, the present study’s sample was still larger and more diverse than the typical study on this topic. That advantage, coupled with the use of rich qualitative data, enabled the present study to provide other meaningful contributions to the literature in terms of the typology of unethical workplace behavior.

**Future directions**

**Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue**

*Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* was the most frequently reported ethical violation in the present study, and yet this issue is not recognized as a type of unethical workplace behavior in past research. Although researchers are studying this topic, it appears to be siloed within the whistleblowing literature rather than the unethical workplace behavior literature.
One study found that only 25% of nurses who reported an incident of poor patient care felt their organization responded adequately to their concerns (Moore & McAuliffe, 2009). In fact, much of the whistleblowing literature is focused on determining how to encourage whistleblowing, and a lack of confidence in the organization’s ability or willingness to take corrective action has been identified as a major deterrent to whistleblowing (Berry, 2004; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Moore & McAuliffe, 2009). Moreover, increased whistleblowing activity can be an effective deterrent of unethical workplace behavior, as fear of detection and punishment discourses employees from engaging in unethical workplace behavior (Miceli & Near, 1994).

Therefore, *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* likely has the effect of encouraging other forms of unethical workplace behavior. If organizational leadership properly addressed all employees’ concerns regarding ethical violations within their organization, this would hold wrong-doers accountable, discourage future unethical workplace behavior, and demonstrate the organization’s willingness to address ethics concerns within the workplace, which would in turn increase future reporting behaviors (Berry, 2004; Moore & McAuliffe, 2009).

Although there is a vast body of research on how to measure unethical workplace behavior and how to prevent it, it appears that many researchers have overlooked this important and prevalent subcategory of unethical workplace behavior. More should be done to study *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* as a unique form of unethical workplace behavior in terms of its role in increasing other forms of unethical workplace behavior. Additionally, *inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* likely represents a breach of psychological contract between the employee reporting the unethical behavior and the organizational authority figure who responds inadequately; this could affect employees’ attitudes towards their employer (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). *Inadequate response to a reported workplace issue* could be examined as a correlate of these employee attitudes, such as procedural
justice, organizational trust, organizational identification, and organizational commitment (Robinson, 1995). Finally, efforts should be made to link the unethical workplace behavior literature with the whistleblowing literature in order to better understand this phenomenon.

Scale development

The insights gained from the present study could be used to improve the measurement of unethical workplace behavior in future studies. A new quantitative scale of unethical workplace behavior could be designed using the content categories, subcategories, and individual examples of unethical workplace behavior derived from the employee narratives. Alternately, existing inventories could be improved by incorporating new subscales designed around the unique subcategories of unethical workplace behavior identified in the present study. This would provide future studies with a measure of unethical workplace behavior that is in a convenient scale format but that is able to detect the additional forms of unethical workplace behavior that were identified through the present study’s exhaustive qualitative content analysis process. However, I maintain that any quantitative scale of unethical workplace behavior should include at least one open-ended item so that researchers can continue to identify new types of unethical workplace behavior that are not covered by the existing survey items.

Conclusions

No previous study has simultaneously differentiated unethical workplace behavior along the dimensions of type of behavior, type of victim, and type of perpetrator, and no previous study has identified as many different subcategories of unethical workplace behavior as the present study. As such, the present study has the unique opportunity to increase the understanding of the context surrounding unethical workplace behavior. By triangulating the present study’s findings against that of past research, this study demonstrated the unique value of qualitative methodology to increase our understanding of complex constructs such as unethical workplace behavior. By
broadening the spectrum of the types of behaviors that encompass unethical workplace behavior, describing who is affected by it, and describing who is engaging in it, the present study paints a more complete picture of unethical behavior in the workplace. Future research efforts should incorporate the present study’s findings into existing scales of unethical workplace behavior. Additionally, increased attention should be placed on inadequate response to a reported workplace issue and how to prevent it.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Initial Coding Scheme

Type of Behavior Subcategories

1. **Bullying/Abuse** (Bullying, assault, abusive behavior, offensive/unprofessional behavior, or any behavior that creates a hostile work environment. Also includes physical assault.)

2. **Business Reports** (Falsifying business or financial reporting information, like invoices, billing statements, accounting information, etc.)

3. **Conflicts of Interest** (Engaging in conflicts of interest – accepting or giving bribes/kickbacks, having conflicting business roles, etc.)

4. **Contract Violation** (Any violations of the terms of a contract or business agreement.)

5. **Discrimination** (Discrimination based on race, gender, nationality, age, etc.)

6. **Environmental Harm** (Harming the environment or risking potential harm to the environment.)

7. **Expense Reports** (Falsifying employee expense reports, like travel receipts or employee reimbursement forms.)

8. **Favoritism** (Showing favoritism to friends, family, etc.)

9. **Inadequate Response** (Failing to respond or providing an inadequate response after someone reports workplace issue.)

10. **Lying** (Lying or misrepresenting the truth.)

11. **Pay/Benefits Issues** (Denying fair pay or benefits to those who are owed them.)

12. **Poor Quality Work** (Working in a sloppy, negligent, or careless way. Cutting corners. Delivery of substandard goods or services.)

13. **Privacy & Confidentiality Violations** (Violating others’ privacy or improperly handling confidential information.)

14. **Retaliation** (Punishing or taking negative actions against someone, not because they broke any rules, but because they did something you didn’t like.)

15. **Safety Issues** (Putting others’ health or safety at risk.)

16. **Sexual Misconduct** (Sexual harassment or sexual assault. Sexual behavior that creates a hostile work environment.)

17. **Stealing** (Stealing money, materials, products, etc.)

18. **Time Report Violations** (Falsifying time reports or hours worked. Also, wasting time on the clock or working off the clock.)

19. **Unfair Scheduling** (Being unfair when assigning work hours, shifts, or duties to workers. Unfairly giving certain workers more or fewer hours than they want. Unfairly changing workers’ schedules.)
20. **Wasting Resources** (Wasting or mismanaging company resources (money, supplies, labor, etc. Not stealing company resources, but being irresponsible when using or spending company resources. Can be a specific event like making a wasteful purchase with company money, or it can be ongoing like managing the company in a neglectful and inefficient way.)

21. **Work Break Issues** (Forcing workers to delay or skip lunch; denying bathroom or rest breaks.)

22. **Working Impaired** (Working while impaired or intoxicated.)

23. **Working Unqualified** (Individuals performing work that they are unqualified to perform because they do not have proper license, certification, etc.)

24. **Wrongful Termination** (Firing someone for no justifiable reason, or firing someone under false pretenses.)

25. **Unknown** (Cannot tell what happened based on narrative; not enough information.)

26. **Other** (Write-in)

### Type of Victim Subcategories

1. **Customers** (Customers or clients of the respondent’s company.)
2. **Employee(s)** (One or more employees within the respondent’s company.)
3. **The Company** (The company itself was the victim. For example, the ethical violation caused the company to lose money.)
4. **Outside Company(s)** (Other companies besides the respondent’s company.)
5. **The Community** (The general community or environment around the respondent’s company were the victims. For example, the properties around the respondent’s company were harmed by the ethical violation.)
6. **Unknown** (Based on the narrative, there is a victim, but it is unclear who it is.)
7. **Other** (Write-in)

### Type of Perpetrator Subcategories

1. **Upper Management Employees** (President, VPs, Officers, Directors, etc.)
2. **Mid- and Lower-level Management Employees** (Immediate managers and mid-level managers. These managers primarily work directly with non-management employees.)
3. **Non-management Employees** (Hourly employees)
4. **Mix of Employees** (A mix of employees from various levels were the perpetrators.)
5. **Non-employees** (Non-employees, like customers, contractors, etc.)
6. **Unknown** (Based on the narrative, there is a perpetrator, but it is unclear who it is.)
7. **Other** (Write-in)
Appendix B

Initial Coding Instructions

Coding Unethical Workplace Behavior

Coding Instructions

1. Read all the coding subcategories and their descriptions, and make sure you understand what type of behavior falls under each subcategory.

2. Take your time and read the whole narrative carefully. If the narrative is confusing, read it several times until you feel you understand it.

3. Code the narrative using only the information that is stated in the narrative. Try not to make any assumptions. Also, code the narrative based on the respondent’s perspective. What did they think happened?

4. After careful consideration, code the subcategories that fit the narrative. You can code more than one subcategory per narrative. Type a “1” under each subcategory column that fits the narrative.

5. If you have any questions or comments about any part of the coding system or about a particular narrative, email me or make a note in your coding assignment. Your questions and comments can help to improve the coding system.

NOTE: Take frequent breaks while coding. It is easy to lose your focus when coding for long periods of time. This will affect your accuracy! Take a break every 20 minutes or so. Ideally, break up your coding assignment into several sessions over multiple days.
Appendix C

Coding Assignment for Type of Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8794</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am not comfortable giving names at this time but I believe there are leaders within senior leadership having work be performed that they know is wrong. Senior leadership identifying that certain employees utilizes machines without the proper training. They are bypassing safety for the sake of production. This could result in citations and penalties from the federal government. I noticed this in or around September 2015 and is an ongoing situation. This is at the facility located in [City, State].</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only some subcategory columns are shown in this example in order to fit the spreadsheet onto a single page.
## Appendix D

### Coding Assignment for Type of Victim and Type of Perpetrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Ethical Violation Verbatim</th>
<th>Overall Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Type of Victim</th>
<th>Type of Perpetrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customer(s)    Employer(s)    Company</td>
<td>Outside Company</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am not comfortable giving names at this time but I believe there are leaders within senior leadership having inappropriate meetings about the wrong strategies to be performed. Some leaders value that are wrong Senior leadership identifying that certain employees utilize machines without proper training. They are bypassing safety for the sake of production. This could result in citations and penalties from the federal government. I noticed this no or around September 2015 and is an on-going situation. This is at the facility located in [City, State].</td>
<td>Safety Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Working Unqualified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Final Coding Scheme and Instructions

Coding Instructions

1. Read all the coding categories and their descriptions (listed on the following pages), and make sure you understand the meaning of each category and the type of behavior that should fall under each subcategory.

2. Take your time and read the whole narrative carefully. If the narrative is confusing, read it several times until you feel you understand it. If you feel there is information missing, ask me and I can check to see if there is additional information available for that respondent.

3. Code the narrative using only the information that is stated in the narrative. Try not to make any assumptions. Also, code the narrative based on the respondent’s perspective. What did they think happened?

4. After careful consideration, code the subcategories that fit the narrative. You can code more than one subcategory per narrative. Type a “1” under each subcategory column that fits the narrative.

5. Don’t talk with other coders to help you code – I want each coder to make their own decisions. If you have any questions or comments about any part of the coding system or about a particular narrative, email me or make a note in your coding assignment. Your questions and comments can help to improve the coding system.

NOTE: Take frequent breaks while coding. It is easy to lose your focus when coding for long periods of time. This will affect your accuracy! Take a break every 20 minutes or so. Ideally, break up your coding assignment into several sessions over multiple days.

Type of Behavior Categories

1. Bullying, Abuse, and Incivility (Bullying, assault, mean behavior, or any behavior that creates a hostile work environment. On the extreme end is physical, verbal, psychological, or emotional abuse. On the mild end is acting meanly towards others or saying rude things to others.)

2. Discrimination (Discrimination based on protected classes: race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, age, physical/mental disability, sexual orientation.)

3. Drugs, Alcohol & Intoxication (Working while impaired or intoxicated. Being in possession of drugs or alcohol while on the job.)
4. **Falsifying Documents** (Falsifying information on a company document, like invoices, billing statements, accounting information, HR documents, etc.)

5. **Falsely Accusing Others of Unethical or Bad Behavior** (Any false or unfair blaming/accusations related to unethical or bad behavior. Examples include (1) blaming one’s own misbehaviors/mistakes on others, (2) giving an employee an unfairly harsh performance review, (3) starting false rumors related to another’s bad behavior.)

6. ** Favoritism or Conflicts of Interest** (Showing favoritism to friends or family, accepting or giving bribes/kickbacks, or having conflicting business roles. Going against the interests of some innocent party in order to help yourself, or your friends or family.)

7. **Harming the Natural Environment** (Harming the natural environment or risking potential harm to the natural environment. Things like pollution, littering, and harming wildlife.)

8. **Inadequate Response to Reported Workplace Issue** (Ignoring reports of workplace issues, or not doing enough to address reports of workplace issues.)

9. **Ordering Others to Engage in Illegal/Unethical Activity** (Asking, forcing, or pressuring others to engage in illegal or unethical activities.)

10. **Overcounting Work Hours** (Claiming more work hours than were worked, having someone else clock you in before you get to work, clocking in and leaving work, not being present at work while on the clock.)

11. **Overwork & Work Break Issues** (Making employees work in a way that is too fast-paced or overly strenuous. Forcing workers to delay or skip lunch; denying bathroom or rest breaks.)

12. **Privacy or Confidentiality Issues** (Violating others’ privacy. Sharing confidential information. HIPAA violations.)

13. **Retaliation** (Punishing or taking negative actions against someone, not because they broke any rules, but because they did something you didn’t like.)

14. **Safety Violations** (Endangering others’ health or safety. Unnecessarily exposing others to health or safety risks.)

15. **Sexual Misconduct** (Sexual harassment or sexual assault. Saying or doing sexual things that makes others feel uncomfortable.)

16. **Stealing** (Stealing or intentional misappropriation of money, materials, products, or other valuable commodities.)

17. **Underpaying Wages or Benefits** (Denying fair pay or benefits to those who are owed them. Includes under-counting employees’ hours, employees working off the clock, & employees not receiving overtime pay.)

18. **Unfair Scheduling** (Being unfair when assigning work hours, shifts, or duties to workers. Unfairly giving certain workers more or fewer hours than they want. Unfairly giving some workers all the bad shifts. Unfairly changing workers’ schedule. Making
workers’ come in on their days off. NOTE: Must be seen as unfair from the perspective of the worker – does not count if the worker actually wants that schedule.)

19. **Wasting Time on the Clock or Neglecting Duties** (Working slowly, being off-task while on the clock, or neglecting work duties while on the clock)

20. **Working Unqualified** (Individuals performing work that they are unqualified to perform because they do not have proper license, certification, training, etc.)

21. **Wrongful Termination** (Firing someone for no justifiable reason, or firing someone under false pretenses.)

22. **Not Enough Info** (Cannot tell what happened based on narrative; not enough information.)

23. **Other** (Does not fit into any other category – write in a description.)

**Type of Victim Categories**

1. **Employee(s)** (One or more employees within the respondent’s company were the victims.)

2. **The Company** (The company itself was the victim. For example, the ethical violation caused the company to lose money.)

3. **Customers/Patients** (Customers or patients of the respondent’s company were the victims.)

4. **Other Company(s)** (Other companies besides the respondent’s company were the victims. This can include contract companies, insurance companies, competitor companies, etc.)

5. **Applicants/Potential Employees** (People who applied for a job opening at the company or people who were qualified for a job opening at the company were the victims. This can include current employees of the company who applied for or were qualified for a different job within the company.)

6. **The Community** (The general community or environment around the respondent’s company were the victims. For example, the properties around the respondent’s company were harmed by the ethical violation.)

7. **Unknown** (Based on the narrative, it is unclear who is the victim.)

8. **Other (Fill-in)** (There is a clear victim, but it does not fit any of the above categories.)

**Type of Perpetrator Categories**

1. **Low-level Employee(s)** (One or more low-level employees from the respondent’s company perpetrated the ethical violation. “Low-level” means these employees are generally lower-skilled and do not have authority over other employees.)

2. **Higher-level Employee(s)** (One or more higher-level employees from the respondent’s company perpetrated the ethical violation. “Higher-level” means these employees are management, or are in highly skilled and specialized job positions. *HINT:* The employee
should be considered high-level if they are in charge of things like hiring, firing, setting salaries, setting schedules, or disciplining other employees.)

3. **Employee(s) of an Unknown Level** (One or more employees are to blame, but it is not clear whether the perpetrator(s) are low-level or high-level. Specific employees may be named as perpetrators in the narrative, or the narrative may imply that one or more employees were the perpetrators.)

4. **The Company** (Use this category when the blame doesn’t fall to specific employees, but a company policy, company culture, or workplace environment is at fault for the ethical violation.)

5. **Other (Fill-in)** (There is a clear perpetrator, but it does not fit any of the above categories.)
## Appendix F

### Reporting Rate of Reported Unethical Workplace Behavior by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Interviews</th>
<th>Total Violations</th>
<th>% with Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Total Interviews</td>
<td>Total Violations</td>
<td>% with Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Total Interviews</td>
<td>Total Violations</td>
<td>% with Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

### Percent of Reported Ethical Violations by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Predicted Probability of Reporting an Unethical Workplace Behavior</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Range of Reporting Rates by Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental Leasing</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

### Reporting Rate for each Type of Unethical Behavior for each Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry N</th>
<th>Arts, Ent, Rec</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Educational Services</th>
<th>Finance and Insurance</th>
<th>Health Care and Social Assistance</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction</th>
<th>Other Services</th>
<th>Professional, Scientific, and Tech Services</th>
<th>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</th>
<th>Retail Trade</th>
<th>Transportation and Warehousing</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Wholesale Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying &amp; abuse</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs &amp; alcohol</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False accusations</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying docs</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harming nature</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate response</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering others</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcounting hours</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwork issues</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy issues</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety violations</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaying wages</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair scheduling</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglecting duties</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working unqualified</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrongful termination</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Top Type of Unethical Behavior, Victim, & Perpetrator Subcategories by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Top Type of Unethical Behavior</th>
<th>Top Type of Victim</th>
<th>Top Type of Perpetrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, &amp; Rec</td>
<td>Inadequate Response</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Inadequate Response, Stealing, Bullying, &amp; Favoritism</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>Inadequate Response, Bullying, &amp; Discrimination</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>Inadequate Response</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>Inadequate Response</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Inadequate Response, Bullying, Ordering Others to Act Unethically, &amp; Stealing</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Employees &amp; The Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>Underpaying Wages</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Tech</td>
<td>Underpaying Wages</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>Inadequate Response</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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