Revisiting Pro-Social Rule-Breaking: Suggestions for Improvements

De Peiris, T. N. S.
University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka
nayomipeiris@sjp.ac.lk

Kaluarachchi, K. A. S. P.
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka
samanthakaluarachchi@mos.cmb.ac.lk

Abstract

The existing literature on the concept of deviant behaviour in Management and Organizational Studies includes two streams of research on deviant behaviour, which consider both positive and negative consequences. Under positive deviant behaviour, Pro-Social Rule-Breaking (PSRB) is considered as an important concept, which addresses the motives, behaviour, and consequences of positive deviant behaviour in the organisational context. This paper intends to examine the construction of PSRB within the existing literature to identify its strengths and limitations. Further, if gaps are available in the existing notion of the concept, the paper intends to propose constructs to be incorporated in the re-conceptualisation. With the review of the literature it was found that PSRB falls short in explaining the motive(s) of positive deviant behaviour linked with the 'self' by emphasising the pro-social motive of rule-breaking which is linked to a concern for the 'other'. It also gives prominence to breaking formal rules by ignoring deviance from informal norms. Moreover, the emphasis of the existing literature on the construction of PSRB is mainly on explaining the impact of organization-specific constructs related to deviant behaviour, with less consideration paid to constructs in the extra-organizational context. Hence, in order to overcome the limitations of the concept, constructs considered in the literature were analysed with a view to re-conceptualising PSRB with suitable sub-constructs. Consequently, the paper proposes to incorporate discourses, norms, and identity work in re-conceptualising the construction of PSRB of organizational actors. This re-conceptualisation will facilitate understanding the self's and the other's motives, the breaking of formal as well as informal rules/norms, and organizational as well as extra-organizational motives in the construction of PSRB. Hence, the proposed sub-constructs go beyond a surface-level analysis by overcoming the limitations of the existing notion of the construction of PSRB. The proposed re-consideration broadens the understanding of PSRB while enabling practitioners to manage positive deviant behaviour desirably in the organizational context.

Keywords: Deviant Behaviour, Discourses, Identity Work, Norms, Pro-Social Rule-Breaking

INTRODUCTION

Deviant Behaviour describes behaviour that deviates from the social norms which control and guide socially accepted behaviour (Hirschi, 1969; Warren, 2003) or violate crucial organizational norms and thus threaten the well-being of the organization (Zhuang, Chen, Chang, Guan, & Huan, 2020). Deviance is a construct which includes a variety of behaviours exhibited in the diverse milieu. Rule-bending behaviour (e.g.- Ferreira, et al., 2017; Sekerka & Zolin, 2007), rule-breaking behaviour (e.g - Bryant, et al., 2010; Larsson, et al., 2014), courageous principle actions (Reid, Anglin, Baur, Short, & Buckley, 2018), aggression, bullying, counterproductive work behaviour, emotional abuse, incivility, mobbing retaliation, revenge, violence (Cropanzano, Anthony, Daniels, & Hall, 2017), discrimination, harassment, violations, and corruption (e.g - Hudson, et al., 1998; Loyens, 2014) are a few behavioural types studied under deviant behaviour within Management and Organizational Studies (MOS).

The notion of deviance has traditionally been used to study criminal behaviour (Hirschi, 1969) in the societal context. Hence, deviance from norms/rules seems to signify something pejorative at the outset. Yet, within the recent deviant behaviour literature, it cannot be categorized as negative behaviour or as malpractice all the time (For example, see Ghosh & Shum, 2019; Chen et al., 2019; Majeed et al., 2018; Reid et al., 2018) and deviant behaviour is classified as positive deviant behaviour and negative deviant behaviour. For instance, taking an opposite view to the traditional notion of deviance, positive or constructive deviant behaviours in organizations has attracted the attention of scholars, mainly after the expansion of the positive organizational psychology movement (Ferreira et al., 2017). Under this positive deviant behaviour, Pro-Social Rule-Breaking (PSRB) is an important concept which addresses the nature of the construction of positive deviant behaviour in the organisational context. Yet, the empirical studies using the concept of PSRB are mainly explaining person-centred and organization-specific motives contributing the deviant behaviour, with less consideration paid to motives in the extra-organizational context.

Against this backdrop, the current paper intends to examine how PSRB is constructed within an organizational context to identify its strengths and limitations. This paper is organised into three sections. First, a review of the concept of PSRB is presented and this review intends to identify the strengths and limitations of the constructs utilized in explaining PSRB. Then, the paper presents an analysis of the literature related to the organizational context in order to uncover the constructs involved in the construction of PSRB. This leads to an identification of three sub-constructs to be incorporated in the re-conceptualisation of PSRB in the organizational context, followed by a discussion and the conclusion of the paper.

PRO-SOCIAL RULE-BREAKING

PSRB is described as intentional violations of formal organizational policies, regulations, or prohibitions with the primary intention of promoting the welfare of the organization or one or more of its stakeholders (Morrison, 2006). The term PSRB was first coined by Morrison in 2006, where the author highlighted the 'pro-social' or 'non-selfish' motive of rule-breaking. Consequently, PSRB has several important characteristics. First, it considers violations of formal organizational rules. Secondly, intentional violation of rules is considered as rule-breaking. Accordingly, individuals have the power to decide whether or not to engage in PSRB, and this choice is not accidental or unintentional. Finally, the main motive for PSRB or the reason behind the construction of PSRB is identified as the motive to help the organization or its stakeholders such as its co-workers and customers. Morrison (2006) considers this as a non-selfish act of the employee and highlights the construction of PSRB as a behaviour engaged in with the motive of 'concern for the other'.

Although PSRB is considered as a landmark concept describing positive deviant behaviour, it does have significant limitations. When considering PSRB as a concept which promotes the welfare of the organization and its stakeholders, the conceptualization falls short in explaining PSRB as promoting both self-benefit as well as benefits for others. For instance, one person may help a co-worker with the expectation of intrinsic happiness—not highlighted in PSRB by Morrison—and highlight that behaviour as a pro-social or non-selfish motive. But one can argue that the behaviour which seeks intrinsic happiness is not just for the other's benefit but also for the benefit of the self. Thus, it is doubtful whether the self is absent in PSRB (Ghosh & Shum, 2019) and researchers view the possibility of altruistic motivations within pro-social motives (Bolino & Grant, 2016).

Further, PSRB only includes breaking the formal rules and ignores deviating from informal norms. However, in some social settings, informal norms are even more powerful and more effective than formal, explicit rules (Anomaly & Brennan, 2014). For example, some cultures promote social norms such as respecting elders. In such contexts, an employee may break rules to serve an older customer according to his/her cultural cognition, thus deviating from formal organizational rules. This behaviour is evidence for the power of social norms over formal

organizational rules. In such a setting ignoring informal norm by adhering to formal rules may consider as the deviant behaviour by the respective society—though formally it is not.

Most previous studies have taken one or two person-centred and contextual/situational motives into account when examining the construction of PSRB, and have omitted other motives (see Table 1). Moreover, very few studies have considered the interaction of person-centred motives and contextual/situational motives in the construction of PSRB even when the consideration is limited to understanding the relationship between one or two motives. For instance, Fleming (2019) has studied the roles of referents and social contexts in determining one's feelings and behaviour and has identified the influence of co-worker behaviour on reinforcing the PSRB of an individual. Further, Alsadullah et al., (2019) have studied moral conviction as a motive which does not mediate the relationship between workplace spirituality and PSRB. Even in these two studies, only one motive has been considered when exploring the interaction between PSRB and situational motives.

It is noteworthy that most of the empirical studies of PSRB have emphasised the motives in the organizational context with minimal attention paid to extra organizational motives. Yet, organizational actors can shape institutional conditions in favourable ways in their social interactions and can gain performance benefits by influencing institutions of the broader society (Yu & Lee, 2019). Accordingly, Yu & Lee, (2019) have identified institutional conditions [of the broader social context] such as regulatory and policy environments which organizational actors are trying to violate favourably for their organization, using different means. Further the representation of values, attitudes, taken-for-granted norms in the social context are also acting as motivators in the reflective actions—like deviant behaviour—of organizational actors. For instance Karunanayake (2011) exemplify how historical, social-cultural and political realities [such as specific behaviour norms] that workers encounter as objective [organizational] structures are socially constructed by workers through their daily practices and conversation.

IDENTIFYING THE CONSTRUCTS NEEDED TO RE-CONCEPTUALISE PSRB

In line with the literature on the construction of PSRB and its observed limitations, the section below presents an analysis of the *motives* considered in conceptualising PSRB within the existing literature in order to identify sub-constructs that can be incorporated when re-conceptualising PSRB.

The analysis was done in two steps.

Step 1 – Analysing motives discussed in conceptualising PSRB in the existing literature. Within this analysis, it was identified that different studies have incorporated different motives (see Table 1), albeit at a surface level.

Three strategies were used to identify studies to be included in the literature search. First, an electronic search using the Google Scholar database (https://scholar.google.com) was carried out. The choice of Google Scholar database was mainly due to its inclusion of a broad range of scientific journal articles. The search was based on the study of Morrison, 2006, 'Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule-breaking' as it is the first article to coin the term pro-social rule-breaking. This reference search generated 361 studies. Secondly, these citing articles were subjected to a search using the search terms: Pro-social rule-breaking with the exact phrase of (organization OR work) with at least one of the words from (reasons, antecedents, constructs, why, motives, causes). This search generated 184 studies which have been published from 2006 to 2020. Thirdly, from those 184 studies, journal articles on PSRB were searched in top-ranked journals in the area of management—organizational behaviour and human resource management, strategy and management, business and management—(based on the Scimago Intuitions Ranking by mid of the year 2020). Accordingly, the search generated 24 articles from those journals as Academy of Management Studies (6), Organization Science (3), Leadership Quarterly (2), Journal of Organizational Behaviour (7), Organization Studies (3), Public Management Review (1), American Review of Public Administration (1), The Social Science Journal (1), and Journal of Management (1). The title and abstract of all the articles were read and scanned through to decide whether to include/exclude the article in the review. Accordingly, 8 possible articles were included within the review of the construction of PSRB in organizational contexts.

Table 37: Constructs involved in the construction of PSRB in organizational contexts

Study	Person-centred Motives	Contextual and Situational Motives	Interactive Motives
Bolino & Grant (2016)	Traits of an individual	Not considered	Not considered
Dahling & Gutworth (2017)	Not considered	Organizational identity	Not considered
Dahilling, Chau, Mayer, & Gregory (2012)	Perceptions of others' PSRB	Not considered	Not considered
Busby & Iszatt-White (2016)	Intention of individuals	Not considered	Not considered

Fleming (2019)	Not Considered	Formalization, Threat of punishment, Rule consistency, Co-worker rule violation	Roles of referents and social contexts
Borry & Henderson (2019)	Personal characteristics (conformist personality, risk-taking experience on the job)	Ethical climate	Not Considered
Borry et al. (2018)	Not Considered	Formalization, Rule consistency	Formalization and rule consistency
Morrison (2006)	Risk-taking propensity	Job autonomy, Co-worker behaviour	Not Considered

Source: Developed by Authors

Inclusion criteria were: the type of the study (studies should be fully or partially concerned with how PSRB is constructed within an organizational contexts), language (the studies that are published in English only), publication details (studies that are published only in high-ranked journals were included to safeguard the quality of the review), and the year of publication (only the studies published between 2006 and 2020 were included).

Step 2 – Following the analysis of the constructs behind PSRB, three sub-constructs—discourses, norms, and identity work— are proposed to be incorporated in future work with PSRB since these three sub-constructs can represent the essence of the motives identified in table 01.

• Language in use, social practices and context are the core elements of discourses (Jaynes, 2015; Paroutis & Heracleous, 2013; Wenzel & Koch, 2017)). Accordingly, oral or written communication around a particular construct can be considered as discourses around that construct (in this case, PSRB). This communication includes language in use as a facilitator for interactions in a particular context. Further, context is where the language in use and the resultant PSRB is located. Social practices exhibited through interactions are embedded in the meanings of the resultant PSRB. The consideration of context enables one to consider both organizational and extra-organizational contexts by overcoming limitations in the existing conceptualisation of PSRB that over-emphasises the organizational context.

• Norms are unwritten rules that guide individuals' behaviour in specific situations (Cummings & Worley, 2009). Norms guide the way of being. It is proposed to include formal and informal as well as written and unwritten construct which guides behaviour within this sub-construct in the re-conceptualisation of PSRB. Consideration of both

formal and informal as well as written and unwritten rule/norms will overcome the limitation of the consideration of formal rules in the existing conceptualisation of PSRB.

- Identity work is the set of active processes/ range of activities which serve to construct a sense of identity or to create, present, and sustain identities that are congruent with and supportive of the self-concept' (Brown, 2017; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). The behaviour exhibited in the re-construction of the sense of identity through PRSB needs to be considered in a re-conceptualisation of PSRB. Accordingly, the sense of identity may link with the self and/or the other, with this re-conceptualisation considering the self-motives as well as non-self-motives in the construction of PSRB behaviour. This will reduce the negative influence of considering only the non-self-motive in understanding PSRB.

Thus, discourses, norms, and identity work can be proposed as the sub-constructs to be incorporated in understanding the construction of PSRB. Therefore, it is proposed that these sub-constructs need to be incorporated in re-conceptualising the construction of PSRB since these constructs can help to ascertain the premise of PSRB discussed above while overcoming the identified limitations.

INCORPORATING DISCOURSES, NORMS, AND IDENTITY WORK IN THE RE-CONCEPTUALISATION OF PSRB

Scholars with the linguistic turn suggest that for a proper understanding of societies, social institutions, identities and even cultures need to be viewed as discursively constructed ensembles of text (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000) and that 'how and why' social phenomena or discourses are constructed the way they are, and the process by which they become [relatively] objective social realities should be explored (Karunanayake, 2011). By considering the 'language used in explaining workplace bullying' as micro discourses of organizations, Johnson (2015) points to the way individuals express their behaviour, justifications of behaviour and the impact of the spatial-temporal context on their behaviour. Floris et al., (2019), have shown how (macro) discourses of accounting standards and global economic crises have been interwoven into the organizational discourses of new organizational strategy, illustrating the impact of the extra-organizational context on behaviour when deviating from

old practices. Scholars have also shown how macro discourses of government—control of corruption, regional deregulation, legal systems and economic policies, as well as tax and bankruptcy laws—can strongly influence individuals' entrepreneurial decisions and entrepreneurial activity (Aidis et al., 2012; Anokhin & Schulze, 2009; Lim et al., 2010; Zhou, 2011 as cited in Su et al., 2017). Further, 'production of knowledge discursively', as evidenced by Floris et al., (2019), shows how macro discourse has impacted organizational strategic change, which, if successful, will result in the implementation of a new set of practices. Various mechanisms have been discussed that enhance the awareness/sense-making of organizational actors on strategy (Davis et al., 2012; Gioia & Thomas, 2006; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Vaara et al., 2004), and norms have been identified as an effective mechanism in sense-making. Accordingly, if organizational actors internalize the processes to be carried out with strategy as norms, then, it is easier to achieve successful strategizing (Weaver & Weaver, n.d.; Beech, 2017; Karunanayake, 2011; Peteraf & Shanley, 1997) by deviating from certain behaviours linked with the previous strategy. These studies provide evidence for the impact of macro discourses on organizational behaviour, including strategizing, which will impact on behaviour at other levels.

Accordingly, understanding discourses—macro or micro—will provide reliable links to explaining the construction of PSRB, since it leads to a deeper level inquiry from surface-level reasoning with language-in-use in social interaction or speech acts, the linguistic repertoire of terminology, habitual forms of argument, story themes, social practices, and context.

In line with this argument, constructs such as the societal context, rules of society, and morality in society can be considered under macro discourses related to the construction of PSRB within society. Thus, these constructs are linked with discourses of ethics and morality, religion, and culture, etc. On the other hand, constructs of ethical climate, workplace spirituality, co-workers' behaviour, and roles of referents can be considered under micro discourses related to the construction of PSRB.

Instructions from co-workers/superiors also provide justifications for the performance of suitable actions in a particular context. For instance, co-workers' PSRB, observations of that behaviour, and the consequences of that behaviour such as praise from the superior/ customer provide examples for other workers on the suitable courses of action to follow. Organizational members who witness positive reinforcements achieved through superiors' or co-workers' PSRB, may take that reinforcement as a stimulus for their own behaviour. Therefore, to be on

par with the other, individuals may follow the behaviour recommended through instructions or the behaviour exhibited by the other. All these can be grouped under the 'language used in explaining deviant behaviour, social context, and practices' which comes, as explained by Johnson (2015), under discourses.

Behavioural norms linked to preferable practices are normalized within the organization. Organizational discourses facilitate this task since organizational practices evolve into norms/rules through the relevant organizational discourses. These normalized practices linked with PSRB can be related to various organizational strategies. For instance, lack of supervision and job autonomy may be linked with innovative or differentiation strategies, while rule consistency and formalization are linked to a low-cost strategy. Consequently, organizational members will follow them, irrespective of their legality and formality, and those norms will become a part of the work culture of the organization as a sense-making tool. With this sense-making, if organizational actors are deeply conscious of or understand the roots these practices attached, then, that understanding counts for a large part of the success of the organizational strategy as well (eg: Davis at al., 2012; Seidl & Werle, 2018). Thus, any practice resulting from a change has the potential of becoming a normalized norm in the long run, through organizational discourse. Therefore, deviant behaviour also has the potential of becoming a norm within the organizational context. For instance, a norm like helping a customer/co-worker by breaking rules is identified (in almost all PSRB studies, as discussed earlier) as a motive for PSRB— although the term "norm" is not used explicitly. Some examples of norms include rule consistency, lack of supervision, formalization, punishment, job autonomy, ethical climate and workplace spirituality. Within the organizational context, these have been identified as motives for PSRB (Alsadullah et al., 2019; Borry & Henderson, 2019; Borry et al., 2018; Fleming, 2019; Loyens, 2014; Morrison, 2006).

Social norms spur and guide behaviour in direct and meaningful ways (Schultz et al., 2007). Accordingly, what other people do and think matters a great deal to individuals. Farrow et al., (2017) mention the reasons behind individuals' acceptance of social norms as; wish to fit in/ stand out, to avoid social disapproval, or to seek social esteem. Thus, people may take the behaviour of others as an indication of what is most effective, or they may expect reciprocity in exchange for their own conformity. Within the organizational context, people tend to deviate from rules with the impact of the social norms of the context. Loyens, (2014) has shown how individual-level reference to higher goals or values (moral justification) and social norms have

impacted the PSRB of members of the police, irrespective of organizational contextual factors. These higher goals or values and social norms are examples of discourses of social norms which impact PSRB at the level of operational strategies.

Accordingly, the behaviour of others which individuals tend to imitate and learn from and attributions observed from the behaviour of others (Morrison, 2006; Larsson et al., 2014; Fleming, 2019) can be identified as social norms linked with PSRB. Norms within teams largely determine whether employees break rules since they are a powerful controlling mechanism. Thus, norms determine the socially demanded roles of the individual. Furthermore, norms impact on the signals internalized by individuals and on their cognitive mechanisms. Accordingly, previous work experiences also contribute to the internalisation of norms within an individual (Larsson et al., 2014).

Finally, the PSRB exhibited by organizational actors in the way of deviating from norms/rules (eg: Nag, Corley and Giola, 2007; Xing and Liu, 2015; Chreim *et al.*, 2019) and normalising norms (Balogun & Johnson, 2005; Chreim et al., 2019; Jarzabkowski, Lê, & Balogun, 2019; Stensaker & Falkenberg, 2007; Wooldridge, Schmid, & Floyd, 2008; Xing & Liu, 2015) with changes can be identified as the identity work of organizational actors. Identity is a 'root' organizational construct and it can be linked to everything in organizations (Caza et al., 2018) and identity work signifies all the generic processes performed by identity holders concerning their identities. 'Generic' processes of identity work—though there is little consensus on these— include 'claiming', 'affirming', 'accepting', 'complying', 'resisting', 'separating', 'joining', 'defining', 'limiting', 'bounding', 'stabilizing', 'sense-making', 'forming', 'repairing', 'maintaining', 'strengthening', 'revising' 'reconciling' and 'restructuring', and the differentiation between work that is 'active' and 'passive' and that which is 'conscious' and 'subconscious' (Caza et al., 2018; Kreiner et al., 2006; Levy et al., 2003; Petriglieri & Stein, 2012). Further, Sveningsson and Alvesson (2003) define identity work as a set of active processes which serve to construct a sense of identity. Thus, it can be argued that PSRB in way of deviating from rules/norms, following rules/norms, following others' PSRB, and normalising the deviations as the identity work of organizational actors which serves to construct a sense of identity.

Thus, understanding the taken-for-granted norms, discourses behind, and identity work will provide a setting to investigate and manage the construction of PSRB in the organizational context.

CONCLUSION

Deviant behaviour is about deviating from socially accepted norms. Within the organizational context, rules play the role of socially accepted norms. Though deviance from rules seems to have a pejorative connotation at the outset, within the deviant behaviour literature, it cannot be categorized as a negative behaviour per se or even as malpractice all the time. Therefore, deviant behaviour can be classified as positive deviant behaviour and negative deviant behaviour. Under positive deviant behaviour, Pro-Social Rule-Breaking (PSRB) is described as intentional violations of formal organizational policies, regulations, or prohibitions with the primary intention of promoting the welfare of the organization or one or more of its stakeholders. PSRB is considered as a landmark concept describing positive deviant behaviour—in contrast to the traditional negative notion of deviant behaviour. Yet, it does have a few significant limitations. In view of this, the current paper analysed and synthesised the literature on PSRB to identify three sub-constructs, namely, discourses, norms, and identity work, which were incorporated within a re-conceptualisation of PSRB.

Discourses, norms, and identity work can be considered as sub-constructs which go beyond a surface-level analysis used to understand the construction of PSRB. This consideration leads to promote the incorporation of the essence of the existing notion of PSRB into a re-conceptualisation. The notion of discourses will provide reliable links to explaining the nature of PSRB since it leads to deeper level roots from surface-level reasoning. Further, organizational actors may have normalized the norms of PSRB in their efforts of organizational changes by capitalising on the positive effects associated with PSRB. On the other hand, understanding the discourses behind taken-for-granted norms will provide an opportunity to manage the PSRB in a way that is favourable to the organization. Moreover, understanding the identity work linked with PSRB such as deviating from rules/norms, following rules/norms, following others' PSRB, and normalising the deviations can be incorporated in managing organizational actors' 'sense of self as well as the other' in a process of organizational change carried out through understanding and managing deviations.

REFERENCES

Alsadullah, M., Fayyaz, I., & Amin, R. (2019). Spirituality, moral conviction and prosocial rule-breaking in healthcare. *Journal of Business Management*, *59*(February), 3–15. Retrieved from

https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1367-2630/18/1/015002/pdf

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000). Taking the Linguistic Turn in Organizational Research. *Journal of Applied Bahavioural Science*, *36*(2), 136–158.

Anomaly, J., & Brennan, G. (2014). Social Norms, The Invisible Hand, and The Law. *University of Queenslank Law Journal*, *33*(2), 263–283.

Balogun, J., & Johnson, G. (2005). From intended strategies to unintended outcomes: The impact of change recipient sensemaking. *Organization Studies*, *26*(11), 1573–1601. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840605054624

Beech, N. (2017). Identity at Work: An Enquiry-based Approach to Therapeutically Inspired Management. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *19*(3), 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12151

Bolino, M. C., & Grant, A. M. (2016). The Bright Side of Being Prosocial at Work, and the Dark Side, Too: A Review and Agenda for Research on Other-Oriented Motives, Behavior, and Impact in Organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, *10*(1), 599–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2016.1153260

Borry, E., DeHart-Davis, L., Kaufmann, W., Merrit, Cu., Mohr, Z., & Tummers, L. (2018). Formalization and Consistency Heighten Organizational Rule Following : Experimental and Survey Evidence. *Public Administration*, *96*(4), 368–385.

Borry, E. L., & Henderson, A. C. (2019). Patients , Protocols , and Prosocial Behavior : Rule Breaking in Frontline Health Care. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074019862680

Brown, A. (2017). Identity Work and Organizational Identification. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *19*(3), 296–317. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12152

Bryant, P. C., Davis, C. A., Hancock, J. I., & Vardaman, J. M. (2010). When rule makers become rule breakers: Employee level outcomes of managerial pro-social rule breaking. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *22*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-009-9114-6

Busby, J. S., & Iszatt-White, M. (2016). Rationalizing Violation : Ordered Accounts of Intentionality in the Breaking of Safety Rules, *37*(1), 35–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840615593590

Caza, B. B., Vough, H., & Puranik, H. (2018). Identity work in organizations and occupations: Definitions, theories, and pathways forward. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(7), 889–910. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2318

Chen, Y., Wang, L., Liu, X., Chen, H., Hu, Y., & Yang, H. (2019). The trickle-down effect of leaders' pro-social rule breaking: Joint moderating role of empowering leadership and courage. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*(JAN), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02647

Chreim, S., Langley, A., Reay, T., Comeau-Vallée, M., & Huq, J.-L. (2019). Constructing and Sustaining Counter-institutional Identities. *Academy of Management Journal*. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2017.0528

Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(1), 479–516.

https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099

Cummings, C., & Worley, C. (2009). *Organization Development and Change. Minneapolis: West Publishing Company*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Dahilling, J., Chau, S., Mayer, D., & Gregory, J. (2012). Breaking rules for the right reason? An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1002/job

Dahling, J. J., & Gutworth, M. B. (2017). Loyal rebels? A test of the normative conflict model of constructive deviance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38*(8), 1167–1182. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2194

Davis, P. S., Allen, J. A., & Dibrell, C. (2012). Fostering strategic awareness at an organization's boundary. *Psychology Faculty Publications.*, *33*(4), 322–341. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731211229287

Farrow, K., Grolleau, G., & Ibanez, L. (2017). Social Norms and Pro-environmental Behavior: A Review of the Evidence. *Ecological Economics*, *140*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.017

Ferreira, M., De Sourza, M., Torres, C., & Leonardo, M. (2017). Positive Rule Breaking and Implications for Organizations Maria. *Organizational Psychology and Evidence-Based Management*, *5*(10), 187–203. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64304-5

Fleming, C. J. (2019). Prosocial rule breaking at the street level : the roles of leaders , peers , and bureaucracy. *Public Management Review*, *00*(00), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1619817

Floris, M., Grant, D., & Oswick, C. (2019). A Disocurse perspective on creating organizational knowledge: the case of Strategizing. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, *59*, 141–156. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20190000059008

Ghosh, A., & Shum, C. (2019). Why do employees break rules? Understanding organizational rule-breaking behaviors in hospitality. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *81*(December 2018), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.02.003

Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (2006). Identity, Image, and Issue Interpretation: Sensemaking During Strategic Change in Academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(3), 370. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393936

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*.

Hudson, P. T. W., Verschuur, W. L. G., Parker, D., & Lawton, R. (1998). Bending The Rules: Managing Violation in the Workplace, (May), 1–11.

Jarzabkowski, P., Lê, J., & Balogun, J. (2019). The social practice of coevolving strategy and structure to realize mandated radical change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *62*(3), 850–882. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0689

Jaynes, S. (2015). Making strategic change: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *28*(1), 97–116. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-04-2013-0053

Johnson, S. L. (2015). Workplace bullying prevention : a critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *7*(10), 2384–2392. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12694

Karunanayake, G. P. (2011). *Identity as Discursive Practice: Historical, Social?Cultural and Political Interactions in Understanding Workers' Identities in Tea Plantations in Sri Lanka being*.

Kreiner, G. E., Ashforth, B. E., & Sluss, D. M. (2006). Identity Dynamics in Occupational Dirty Work: Integrating Social Identity and System Justification Perspectives. *Organization Science*, *17*(5), 619–636. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1060.0208

Larsson, J., Ramstedt, J., & Wickenberg, J. (2014). On the diffusion of rule breaking norms to organizational newcomers. In *9th Colloquium on Organizational Change & Development, Sep 12-13, Essen, Germany Citation* (pp. 1–32).

Levy, D. L., Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2003). Critical approaches to strategic management. *Studying Management Critically*, 92–110. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446220030.n5

Loyens, K. (2014). Rule bending by morally disengaged detectives: an ethnographic study. *Police Practice and Research*, *15*(1), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2013.770941

Maitlis, S., & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in Organizations: Taking Stock and Moving Forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, *8*(1), 57–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.873177

Majeed, N., Jamshed, S., & Mohd Mustamil, N. (2018). Striving To Restrain Employee Turnover Intention Through Ethical Leadership And Pro-Social Rule Breaking. *International Online Journal of Educational Leadership*, *2*(1), 39–53. https://doi.org/10.22452/iojel.vol2no1.4

Morrison, E. W. (2006). Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Management*, *32*(1), 5–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305277790

Nag, R., Corley, K. G., & Giola, D. A. (2007). The Intersection of Organizational Identity, Knowledge, and Practice: Attempting Strategic Change via Knowledge Grafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 821–847.

Paroutis, S., & Heracleous, L. T. (2013). Discourse revisited: Dimensions and employment of first-order strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, (October 2017). https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2052

Peteraf, M., & Shanley, M. (1997). Getting To Know You: a Theory of Strategic Group Identity. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(S1), 165–186. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1097-0266(199707)18:1+<165::aid-smj914>3.3.co;2-r

Petriglieri, G., & Stein, M. (2012). The Unwanted Self: Projective Identification in Leaders' Identity Work. *Organization Studies*, *33*(9), 1217–1235. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612448158

Reid, S. W., Anglin, A. H., Baur, J. E., Short, J. C., & Buckley, M. R. (2018). Blazing new trails or opportunity lost? Evaluating research at the intersection of leadership and entrepreneurship. *Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(1), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.11.005

Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2007). The Constructive , Destructive , and Reconstructive Power of Social Norms, 1–9.

Seidl, D., & Werle, F. (2018). Inter-organizational sensemaking in the face of strategic meta-problems: Requisite variety and dynamics of participation. *Strategic Management Journal*, *39*(3), 830–858. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2723

Sekerka, L. E., & Zolin, R. (2007). Rule-Bending: Can Prudential Judgment Affect Rule Compliance and Values in the Workplace? *Public Integrity*, *9*(3), 225–243. https://doi.org/10.2753/PIN1099-9922090302

Stensaker, I., & Falkenberg, J. (2007). Making sense of different responses to corporate change. *Human Relations*, *60*(1), 137–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707075287

Su, J., Zhai, Q., & Karlsson, T. (2017). Beyond Red Tape and Fools : Institutional Theory in Entrepreneurship, 505–531. https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12218

Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, *56*(10), 1163–1193. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267035610001

Vaara, E., Kleymann, B., & Seristo, H. (2004). Strategies as Discursive Constructions: The Case of Airline Alliances Eero Vaara, Birgit Kleymann and Hannu Seristo. *Journal of Management Studies*, *41*(1), 1–36.

Warren, D. E. (2003). Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*(4), 622–632. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2003.10899440

Weaver, G. R., & Weaver, G. R. (n.d.). Virtue in Organizations : Moral Identity as a Foundation for Moral Agency, 341–368. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606062426

Wenzel, M., & Koch, J. (2017). Strategy as staged performance: A critical discursive perspective on keynote speeches as a genre of strategic communication. *Strategic Management Journal*, 804–828. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2

Wooldridge, B., Schmid, T., & Floyd, S. W. (2008). *The middle management perspective on strategy process: Contributions, synthesis, and future research*. *Journal of Management* (Vol. 34). https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308324326

Xing, Y., & Liu, Y. (2015). Linking leaders' identity work and human resource management involvement: the case of sociocultural integration in Chinese mergers and acquisitions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(20), 2550–2577. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1031156

Yu, J., & Lee, S. (2019). Bending the Rules or Changing Them ? MNE Responses to Institutional Challenges in Transition Economies. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650319843805

Zhuang, W. L., Chen, K. Y., Chang, C. L., Guan, X., & Huan, T. C. (2020). Effect of hotel employees' workplace friendship on workplace deviance behaviour: Moderating role of organisational identification.