2023

Expanding the Dimensionality of Team Deviance: An Organizing Framework and Review

Trevor Spoelma
University of New Mexico, tspoelma@unm.edu

Tamanna Chauhan
University of New Mexico

Recommended Citation

Spoelma, T.M., & Chauhan, T. (2023). Expanding the dimensionality of team deviance: An organizing framework and review. Small Group Research, 54(1), 77–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964221127982

Expanding the Dimensionality of Team Deviance: An Organizing Framework and Review

Trevor M. Spoelma[1] and Tamanna Chauhan[1]

[1]University of New Mexico

This paper is published in *Small Group Research.* This is the final accepted version but it may not exactly reflect the version of record. The version of record can be found here: https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964221127982

Please cite this paper as: Spoelma, T., & Chauhan, T. (2023). Expanding the Dimensionality of Team Deviance: An Organizing Framework and Review. *Small Group Research, 54*(1), 77–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964221127982

Author Note

Trevor M. Spoelma and Tamanna Chauhan, Department of Management, Anderson School of Management, University of New Mexico.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Trevor M. Spoelma, Department of Management, Anderson School of Management, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87106. E-mail: tspoelma@unm.edu

Expanding the Dimensionality of Team Deviance: An Organizing Framework and Review

Abstract

Although team deviance is known to detract from team functioning, extant literature largely focuses on deviance that is independently enacted and directed internally toward other members. This relatively narrow focus poses limitations to the practical application of strategies to reduce the incidence and negative impact of team deviance. We offer a four-dimensional typology that takes into account features of team deviance that are important yet undertheorized: level of coordination and target membership. We use this typology to summarize current research, highlight the narratives on team deviance that underlie each dimension, and discuss how to advance the research domain.

Keywords: workplace deviance; teams; groups; team performance; review

Expanding the Dimensionality of Team Deviance: An Organizing Framework and Review

Over the past few decades, organizations have undergone a transformation in how work is structured. Specifically, there has been a rise of collective-based work structures wherein employees work interdependently in teams to perform complex tasks (Kaplan et al., 2016). Estimates indicate that employees spend about 80% of their time engaging in some form of collaborative work (Cross et al., 2016). Teams are frequently used in industries such as health care, technology, and engineering (e.g., Wuchty et al., 2007).

The dominance of collective work structures has produced a need to understand factors that contribute to and detract from effective team performance. One factor that is known to inhibit team effectiveness is workplace deviance. Deviance—voluntary behavior that "violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556)—is a label that subsumes many types of behaviors, such as aggression, sabotage, and wasting resources (Bennett et al., 2019). Attesting to the impact of this behavior in teams, recent meta-analytic evidence shows a strong, negative correlation between team deviance and performance ($\rho = -.17$; Carpenter et al., 2021).

However, our current understanding of team deviance has largely centered on a unidimensional view wherein deviance represents an aggregation of members' independent actions targeted toward other team members. For instance, operationally, the modal approach in this literature has team members rate levels of interpersonal deviance using scales adopted from research on individual-level deviance (e.g., Bennett & Robinson, 2000), and then uses a mean value of these responses to represent team deviance. While certainly informative, without considering a broader range of dimensions, the modal approach fails to fully incorporate aspects of what makes deviance unique at the team level (e.g., coordination). Further, strategies to

reduce team deviance may be misapplied if they are implications drawn from existing research that lacks a multidimensional view of team deviance and a comprehensive understanding of whether the causes and consequences of certain forms of deviance differ.

Therefore, the purpose of the present paper is to offer a novel typology that takes into account core features of team deviance and use it to review and integrate existing research. In doing so, we aim to make three central contributions. First, by introducing a typology that explicitly considers the deviance target and the level of coordination among members, we provide a framework by which to examine features of team deviance that are fundamental yet undertheorized. To date, following research on individual-level deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), discussions of dimensionality have been limited to whether the deviance targets other individuals (i.e., interpersonal deviance) or the organization (i.e., organizational deviance). Unfortunately, these dimensions were established largely before the widespread adoption of team-based work structures and thus fail to consider team membership of the target. In addition to the target dimension limitations, there is no typology to account for the level of coordination or interdependence involved in team deviance despite being features theorized to differentiate collective deviance from individual deviance (Carpenter et al., 2021; Morgeson & Hofmann,1999; Palmer, 2008). Our typology offers a framework by which to consider the target and level of coordination of team deviance.

Our second contribution lies in organizing existing research on team deviance using this typology. In doing so, we are able to offer an explanation for why different forms of team deviance have different antecedents and consequences. Without this typology, it is difficult to understand why in some cases, team deviance has no relationship with team performance (e.g., Loughry & Tosi, 2008; Varella et al., 2012) or why high-quality member relationships can

contribute to both more and less deviance (e.g., Pearsall & Ellis, 2011; Rispens et al., 2011; Schwieren & Glunk, 2008). By focusing on the nature of the deviance and its underlying assumptions, our typology offers an explanation for existing research findings and provides an important framework for future research. Practically, organizing findings in this way is important because it shows that strategies effective for managing the incidence and impact of one form of team deviance may not be effective for other forms.

Our final contribution is providing a more in-depth view of the correlates of team deviance in the literature that goes beyond recent reviews on the topic. There are two recent reviews that have considered some of the same studies we review (Carpenter et al., 2021; Götz et al., 2019). Our review extends these works in two main ways. First, both reviews had limited discussion of team deviance's dimensions because their focus was not strictly on team-level deviance. Götz et al. (2019) focused on categorizing antecedents of deviance with a multilevel focus and Carpenter et al.'s (2021) meta-analysis included team and organizational-level studies to examine broad categories of direct effects. Our exclusive focus on the team-level analysis enabled us to critique the construct of team deviance specifically and draw distinctions between core dimensions rather than collapsing them together. By relaxing the assumption that team deviance is overall harmful to teams, we go beyond prior reviews to show there are other narratives in the literature that can help further our understanding of the phenomenon. Second, our review includes a larger amount of and more recently published team-level studies than previous reviews, providing an updated state of the science in this domain.

In the sections that follow, we first describe the scope of our literature review and the process used to identify relevant articles. We then provide an overview of the methodological features of these articles. Following this, we introduce our typology and its dimensions. We then

review the literature using this typology, with special attention to the different narratives that have emerged regarding the correlates of these relationships. We conclude our review with a discussion of our typology's implications and offer directions for future research intended to energize conceptual and empirical work in this domain.

Literature Search

To identify articles, we searched Web of Science and PsycInfo for journal articles and conference papers. We also searched ProQuest for unpublished theses and dissertations. We paired the syntax "group* OR team* AND" with behaviors that have been used to identify workplace deviant behavior in individual-level deviance reviews (e.g., incivility, bullying, aggression; see Appendix 1). We followed prior reviews and grouped these behaviors together under the higher-order deviance label (c.f., Bennett et al., 2019; Robinson et al., 2014). We also included unethical behaviors under this label because, although unethical behavior is defined as violating societal norms as opposed to organizational, there is substantial overlap between unethical and deviant behavior, and in most cases, organizational norms coincide with societal norms (Treviño et al., 2006). As a final step, we made sure to include the relevant articles reviewed by Götz et al. (2019) and Carpenter et al. (2021).

We then examined the articles to ensure they met several criteria. To be included in our review, articles first needed to test empirical relationships between team-level deviance and another construct (e.g., relationship conflict) at the team level of analysis. Studies that considered relationships among individual-level variables or only used deviance as a team-level moderator were not included. We did not include articles on withdrawal or absenteeism because these behaviors are not defined as having a target (Carpenter & Berry, 2017). Our final criterion was to ensure each article was relevant for management and applied psychology audiences—we were

not, for instance, interested in articles on violence by adolescent gangs. Articles in our review examined groups or teams[1] in work organizations or explicitly generalized to them. From this search, we identified 50 independent studies within 46 articles. In Table 1, we summarize core features of these studies, presenting methodological characteristics and focal correlates.

Methodological Characteristics

Sample Characteristics

As shown in Table 1, of the reviewed studies, most used samples in North America (34 studies; e.g., Ambrose et al., 2013; Ogunfowora, 2013). Research was also conducted using samples in Europe (7 studies; e.g., Kauffeld & Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2012; Skogstad et al., 2011), Asia (6 studies; e.g., Yang, 2016; Zhang & Jia, 2013), and Australia (3 studies; e.g., Ayoko & Callan, 2010; Paulin & Griffin, 2017). These studies had tremendous diversity in sampled industries, ranging from technology (e.g., Lin et al., 2016), to healthcare (e.g., Brown & Treviño, 2006), to government agencies (e.g., Aube & Rousseau, 2014). The average number of teams in a given study was 104. Together, this attests to the global relevance of team deviance and its pervasiveness throughout many different industries.

Research Design

A large majority of the studies used field survey methods (82%), with the remaining percentage using experiments (14%) or archival methods (4%). Of the studies using field survey methods, over half used team members as the source of the deviance measure (61%). Bennett

[1] While we use the term "team" consistently throughout this review for simplicity, articles differed slightly on what they labeled the collection of individuals working interdependently toward a common goal. For instance, included in our review are articles among samples labeled as work groups, units, teams, and departments. Because these articles often relied on the same theoretical frameworks, cited common references, and used similar measures, we felt justified in following norms of other team reviews by joining them together under the common "team" label. We did not include articles that considered organizational-level or branch-level deviance, because a) members within an organization may not work together in the same way members of a team do (e.g., members in different areas of a company may never interact) and b) the team boundary distinction is important for the internal vs. external dimension of our typology.

and Robinson's (2000) workplace deviance scale was the most commonly used scale to assess deviance—it was used in 34% of studies that used a survey. In terms of other field study design features, only 12% had same-source ratings for all study variables but 70% of studies measured all the study variables at the same time.

Team Deviance Typology

Team deviance refers to a team-level variable capturing the presence of norm-violating behaviors perpetrated by team members that threaten the well-being of specific members within the team, the team as a whole, and/or those outside of the team (e.g., the organization; Carpenter et al., 2021). Individual and team deviance share the same elemental content (i.e., norm-violating behavior that can threaten individual, team, and/or organization well-being) but are distinct in terms of composition and structure (Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999). For instance, most research conceptualizes team deviance as a shared perception around the level of deviance in the team that forms as members interact (e.g., Brown & Treviño, 2006; Mayer et al., 2009). Team deviance is also distinguishable in that some of its forms require interdependence to enact the behavior (e.g., Palmer, 2008; Pearsall & Ellis, 2011). Within this broad conceptualization, scholars have considered different forms of team deviance that are related but not identical. To more closely consider and distinguish core features of team deviance, we forward a typology that explicitly considers different dimensions to provide a framework by which to organize research in this domain.[2]

[2] While this conceptualization helps us consider a wide range of deviant behaviors that are relevant to team settings, it is worth illustrating how it can be used to incorporate behaviors that have received less attention. For example, included in our definition are behaviors that may have negative implications for individual members within the team but not necessarily for the team as a whole (e.g., coordinated ostracism of a poor-performing member; Hales et al., 2017). It also includes behaviors that may threaten well-being in the short term but ultimately bring long-term improvements. For instance, teams may coordinate deviance toward external targets through behaviors like coordinated work slowing (e.g., Kelloway et al., 2010)—actions to right an injustice or ultimately improve the team's long-term state. As we describe in later sections, this conceptualization enables us to consider forms of team deviance that are important, yet undertheorized.

There are two main factors that distinguish types of team deviance. The first factor is the level of coordination. Team deviance can be a product of independent action or coordinated action. Generally speaking, coordination can be defined as "the use of strategies and behavior patterns aimed at integrating and aligning the actions, knowledge, and objectives of interdependent members with a view to attaining common goals" (Rico et al., 2008, p. 163). As noted by Schabram et al. (2018, p. 1060), "coordinated deviance, in contrast to independently executed deviance, requires mutual helping, cooperation, dependency, and information sharing with other members in the process of engaging in deviance." For example, independent action would be when team deviance represents an aggregate of individual behaviors such as members cursing at each other, making racial remarks, or coming in late to work (e.g., Dunlop & Lee, 2004). Regarding coordinated action, this would be when team deviance represents either an aggregate of coordinated behaviors such as ostracizing nonconforming members (e.g., Varella et al., 2012) or events such as collectively engaging in rule-breaking behavior (e.g., Brief et al., 2001; Pearsall & Ellis, 2011).

Coordinated deviance differs from individual deviance in at least two additional ways. First, drawing from the premise that teams can achieve more complex solutions than individuals, coordinated deviance tends to be more sophisticated than independently enacted deviance. To illustrate, consider the example described by Mars (1974) of how longshoremen instituted a system of theft among their docking crews based on functional roles. The holdsmen, stowers, and checkers were responsible for handling the cargo and were key to the theft from an access standpoint. For instance, one of the checkers' roles in the theft was to recognize the contents of the cargo from its markings and documents to inform the crew of the most fruitful packages to open. In contrast, the winchmen, signalers, and fork truck drivers did not have direct access to

the cargo, but played key support roles, like intentionally dropping crates to damage them and expose contents and moving cargo to block the view from supervisors. This form of deviance would not be possible by just one member—all roles were necessary to coordinate and conceal the crew's theft. Second, coordinated deviance—as a product of group action—is perceived differently than independent deviance. From the perpetrator standpoint, for example, coordinated deviance is viewed as more justifiable (Kocher et al., 2018), enabling actors to more easily maintain positive self-regard afterward (Gino et al., 2013; Wiltermuth, 2011). Further, targets of coordinated deviance likely perceive the information conveyed by the deviance differently than targets of independent deviance (e.g., Kelly, 1967; Latané, 1981).

A second factor that distinguishes types of team deviance is the target. Target refers to the entity whose well-being is immediately being threatened or affected by the deviance (Robinson & Bennet, 1995). While target is usually implicit, if it is explicitly considered, scholars adopt individual-level target dimensions—whether the deviance targets other individuals (i.e., interpersonal deviance) or the organization more broadly (i.e., organizational deviance). Unfortunately, this categorization scheme is less useful at the team level because many of the behaviors that traditionally represent organizational deviance (e.g., put little effort into your work, excessive breaks, coming into work late) *also* can be considered interpersonal deviance when one is working in an interdependent team with common goals. As the interpersonal vs. organizational target distinction was created before team structures emerged as a dominant form of organization, we believe there is a pressing need for an updated approach that more closely aligns with the team context. In light of this, we forward an approach that considers whether the deviance targets those within the team or outside of the team (i.e., an internal or external target). This approach has conceptual advantages for the team context

because it raises the referent level of the target to the shared team-level membership boundary rather than the individual person-level boundary. In addition, this approach allows for the notion that the same deviant behavior may be directed at different targets instead of defining the deviance target by certain behaviors. Finally, the internal vs. external target dimension aligns with social psychological research where intra- and inter-group distinctions are commonly made, providing many theories to draw from to enrich research in this area (e.g., Brewer, 1999; Stephan et al., 2009; Tajfel, 1982; Wildschut et al., 2003).

Putting these two dimensions together, we forward a two-by-two typology that categorizes team deviance by the level of coordination (coordinated vs. independent action) and the target of the deviance (internal vs. external to the team). We coded the studies in our review according to these dimensions by considering the assumptions, theoretical arguments and measures used by the authors.[3] In the section that follows, we use this typology to organize and integrate existing team deviance research and to review correlates of team deviance in line with our typology. We organized research using the dominant theoretical framework and underlying assumptions in each dimension. While we do not propose that the theories we use are the only way to examine each form of deviance, they are helpful in illustrating the different approaches, mechanisms, and evidence that underlie different dimensions of team deviance. Organizing extant research using this typology has the additional benefit of showcasing that the team deviance literature to date focuses largely on one form of deviance at the neglect of other forms.

Literature Review Using the Team Deviance Typology

[3] Although studies that used Bennett and Robinson's (2000) organizational deviance scale (e.g., Kuenzi et al., 2020; Mayer et al., 2009) may suggest the target is external to the team, we included these studies within the internal target category. This is because of the issues mentioned earlier with using organizational deviance scale in team contexts (e.g., it blurs internal and external team boundary distinctions in practice) and because the authors of these studies used the same theoretical arguments to explain antecedents of organizational deviance that were used to explain antecedents of interpersonal deviance.

Team Deviance as an Independent Behavior with an Internal Target

Team deviance that is conceptualized as independent member actions targeted toward other members within the team is by far the most commonly studied form, composing 80% of the studies in this literature (40 of 50 studies). Studies in this category commonly used Bennett and Robinson's (2000) workplace deviance scale, which captures norm-violating behaviors directed toward other members that require no interdependence to enact (e.g., Aube & Rousseau, 2011; Karaca, 2016). For instance, this includes behaviors such as cursing at teammates, making racial remarks, or making fun of others.

In line with Carpenter et al.'s (2021) meta-analysis, research on this form of team deviance can be effectively integrated using social information processing theory (SIP; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). According to this framework, the team's social context influences how members construct, understand, and act within the team environment. Team deviance is thereby a product of member sensemaking and observations of how the team is treated and members behave within the team. Antecedents are theorized to compose perceptions that deviance is acceptable and normative within the team environment, and in turn, deviance impacts consequences as members infer team attitudes and motivation from levels of deviance in the team. Because deviance of this form has been the topic of prior reviews (Carpenter et al., 2021; Götz et al., 2019), our goal is not to review every study in this category, but to illustrate this narrative with some exemplar findings.

Antecedents

In line with SIP, contextual factors such as leadership influence levels of team deviance because leaders' behavior and the climate they establish are important sources that directly and indirectly communicate how a team should behave. Supporting this, studies have found that

abusive supervision (Mawritz et al., 2012), leader solecism (i.e., a focus on errors and mistakes; Pearce & Giacalone, 2003), and overall injustice climate (Priesemuth et al., 2013) are positively related to this form of team deviance. In contrast, ethical leadership (Borchert, 2011; Mayer et al., 2009; Mayer et al., 2012), interactional and procedural justice (Ambrose et al., 2013; Schulte et al., 2015), and inclusive leadership (Lin et al., 2016) are negatively related to team deviance.

Team composition and structure also serve as lenses by which members think about and evaluate workplace phenomena, impacting levels of team deviance. Team members are more likely to target each other with deviance when the team is composed of members higher in traits like moral disengagement (Ogunfowora et al., 2021), procrastination, and learning-avoidance goal orientation (Van Hooft & Van Mierlo, 2018). Member sensemaking processes are also influenced by team structure. Zhang and Jia (2013) found that the presence of stretch goals is positively related to deviance, arguing that stretch goals conveyed the organization held the team in low regard. In addition, Aube et al. (2011) found that larger team sizes increase deviance, theorizing that diffusion of responsibility and moral disengagement are heightened in larger teams.

Beyond direct effects, research adopting this view of team deviance has shown support for team emergent states to serve as mediators reflecting the sensemaking and perception processes detailed by SIP. According to this line of reasoning, cues in teams' shared environments produce emergent states reflecting attitudes and team perceptions that facilitate or inhibit deviance toward other members. This logic has been supported by studies that find when teams have a climate where deviance is explicitly not permissible, such as cultural tightness (Kim & Toh, 2019; Qin et al., 2019) or an ethical climate (Kuenzi et al., 2020; Mayer et al., 2010), deviance is less likely. Deviance is also lower in teams with emergent states reflecting

high-quality relationships and task engagement, such as high commitment (Pearce & Giacalone, 2003), relational orientation (Skogstad et al., 2011), and task reflexivity (Ren et al., 2021).

Studies have also considered factors that strengthen or weaken the relationship between antecedents and this form of team deviance. In line with SIP, cues that further inform the context of task functioning, such as leadership, team structure, and emergent states, influence the extent to which deviance toward other team members is perceived to be appropriate and thus enacted. For example, research has focused on how team structure informs reactions to the team environment. Two studies in our review have examined how structural cues affect the weight of the social information teams derive from leadership influences. In terms of strengthening the influence of "good" leaders (e.g., leaders committed to realizing justice), Ambrose et al. (2013) found that supervisor perceptions of interactional justice negatively related to team deviance through interactional justice climate, but only when the work group structure was organic (i.e., flexible, loose, decentralized), as opposed to in a mechanistic structure (i.e., rigid, tight, bureaucratic) where it had no effect. They reasoned that in organic structures, members typically have more opportunity for interaction and are therefore more likely to be influenced by their supervisors. In terms of weakening the influence of "bad" leaders, Priesemuth et al. (2013) found that functional dependence moderated the positive relationship between overall injustice climate and deviance such that this relationship was weaker when functional dependence was high, relative to low. They suggested that high levels of functional dependence place greater focus on behaviors that help the group and can weaken impulses to follow cues to engage in self-serving behavior that exist in an unfair climate.

Outcomes

In addition to SIP's ability to explain antecedents of independent, internally-targeted team deviance, it also enables an explanation for why team deviance impacts team outcomes. For instance, scholars have explained that members' observations of others' deviant behavior impact impressions of the team, its members, and their task—ultimately conveying that accomplishing goals and member harmony are not valued (e.g., Aube & Rousseau, 2016). This manifests in processes and emergent states reflecting disengagement from the team. Supporting this view, studies in our review show that team deviance adversely impacts how members work together: it negatively relates team processes like collaboration among members (Aube & Rousseau, 2014) and teamwork behavior (Yang, 2016), and attitudes and emotions about the team environment such as team goal commitment (Aube & Rousseau, 2011), task meaningfulness (Aube & Rousseau, 2016), team positive affect (Motro et al., 2021), and cohesion (Coyne et al., 2004; Paulin & Griffin, 2017; Raver & Gelfand, 2005).

Because the quality of team processes and emergent states greatly influence team performance (e.g., LePine et al., 2008), the harmful effect of deviance on team performance has generally been supported. Scholars have found team deviance to have direct negative relationships with measures of rated (Aube & Rousseau, 2016; Cole et al., 2008; Coyne et al., 2004; Dunlop & Lee, 2004), objective (Kauffeld & Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2012), and financial team performance (Raver & Gelfand, 2005). Overall, this considerably supports the view that this form of team deviance is harmful for several aspects of team dynamics and performance because it conveys cues that members are not concerned about team well-being.

A small number of studies have examined moderators of the relationship between deviance in teams and team outcomes. In line with SIP theorizing, these studies consider contextual factors that provide information which amplify or counteract the cues evoked by high

levels of team deviance. In terms of amplifiers, Aube and Rousseau (2016) proposed that when members are more dependent on each other to perform their work (i.e., high task interdependence), they interact more and are more influenced by each other, making perceptions of task meaningfulness more sensitive to deviance. In contrast, Lin et al. (2016) found that when teams had higher resource adequacy (i.e., when a team perceives to have enough resources like time and equipment), they perceived themselves as more able to constrain the impact of each other's deviant behavior, altogether weakening the impact of team deviance.

Team Deviance as an Independent Behavior with an External Target

While the vast majority of research on team deviance focuses on independent forms of deviance directed toward other members within the team, deviance also can be directed toward those outside the team. Many of the behaviors found in the previous section can also be found here (e.g., aggression) but the key distinction is that the intended target is not members within the team. Examples of this type of deviance in the literature can be found in studies on sports teams. For instance, this includes acts of aggression toward opposing team members, such as disallowed violent acts or excessive aggressive contact (Taylor et al., 2017).

Research in this area is clearly linked to research traditions in social psychology where "group" refers to social category ingroups and outgroups and the examined phenomena are at the individual level (e.g., Golec de Zavala et al., 2013; White et al., 2021). This tradition connects with organizational research where group demarcations are drawn around team membership (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). This form of deviance tends to emerge as a product of interaction with and exposure to those outside the team. Because this form of deviance occurs in intergroup contexts, team identities are more salient (Paolini et al., 2010). In this sense, research on this form of deviance can be explained by theories of social identity and intergroup threat. The core

assumption here is that deviance is motivated by a perception of a conflict of interests or goals between the team and another party, which is ultimately perceived as a threat to the team. As a result, deviance is enacted to protect resources and gain control (Jackson, 1993; Sherif, 1961; Stephan et al., 2009).

Antecedents

This form of team deviance has rarely been examined in organizational contexts, attesting to the notion that research in this domain has primarily focused on internal team dynamics. In line with the approach that this form of deviance should manifest when teams are interacting with those outside their boundary, Taylor et al. (2017) considered a context where professional sports teams were competing against each other. The fact that teams could lose highlighted a threatening potential for resource loss, creating an impulse to engage in deviance to preserve resources. The authors integrated conservation of resources theory (e.g., Halbesleben et al., 2014) to explain factors that impacted teams' ability to refrain from acting on this impulse, hypothesizing that travel stress, and low levels of concentration produced by it, would prevent teams from restraining themselves from engaging in externally directed deviance. They found mixed support for their propositions in two samples of sports teams. In a sample of football teams, they found that aggregate levels of travel stress had a positive, indirect relationship with deviance, mediated by team concentration. Travel stress did not directly increase team deviance. In a sample of basketball teams, they again found that travel stress had a positive indirect effect on deviance via team concentration. However, they found that travel stress had a negative direct effect on team deviance.

In another study that examined this form of deviance, Schwieren and Glunk (2008) examined intergroup discrimination in undergraduate business student teams. Members in these

teams were privately asked whether they would like to add a new member and were told that this new member was either a part of their ingroup or outgroup (i.e., the same or different nationality). Supporting a social identity perspective, the researchers found that teams were more likely to discriminate against a potential new member of a different nationality when identification with their own team was higher. Taken together, while existing research provides some evidence for factors that influence externally-directed independent deviance, the literature's reliance on individual-level target typologies, which do not consider team boundaries, leaves us without understanding a broader range of antecedents or consequences.

Team Deviance as a Coordinated Behavior with an Internal Target

In contrast to team deviance conceptualized as independent behavior directed toward internal targets, team deviance directed toward internal targets may rely on coordinated action among members. An example of this kind of team deviance is what Varella et al. (2012, p. 588) refer to as sanctioning, or "the extent to which group members engage in punitive actions and sanctions against nonconforming members." This includes behaviors such as ostracizing, criticizing, and avoiding those who do not follow the team's norms. This type of deviance is treated as more strategic in nature and stemming out of a motivation to influence non-conforming members—as noted by Varella et al. (2012, p. 584), it can be motivated by an "attempt to secure compliance with rules and procedures." Workplace hazing is also traditionally considered a form of coordinated, internally-directed deviance. In their conceptual model, Thomas et al. (2021) proposed that hazing—while stressful and negative for the member experiencing the hazing—can ultimately increase group homogeneity and cohesion by influencing newcomers to adjust their values to match the group. Such deviance is coordinated

insofar as the actions cannot be done alone by one person without coordination from at least another team member and stems out of a shared motivation.

Studies on this form of team deviance can be effectively integrated using agency theory (e.g., Eisenhardt, 1989). Agency theory suggests that the delegated and distributed nature of teamwork can create problems when members act in their own self-interests that undermine collective interests. In turn, teams act to address these problems by influencing the costs of engaging in self-interested ways—costs such as being targeted with deviant behavior. For instance, Loughry and Tosi (2008) used agency theory to suggest that incentive alignment and monitoring—in their study, gossiping about and avoiding poorly performing team members—was done to align individual members' goals with team goals.

Antecedents

There is some support for an agency theory approach to understanding antecedents of this form of deviance. For instance, Varella et al. (2012) proposed and found that socialized charismatic leadership had a negative relationship with team deviance. They theorized that when charismatic leadership is higher, there is less of a need for deviance targeted toward other members because the leaders' actions to activate collective group interest prevent agency problems (e.g., non-conforming members) from arising. While supporting the perspective of agency theory, research on antecedents of this form of deviance is limited to a single study and has not empirically considered team dynamics that may give rise to coordinated, internally-directed deviance.

Outcomes

The agency theory perspective of this form of deviance suggests that actions to align self and team interests—even if threatening to the target or against organizational norms—should

serve to help teams in the long run because the internal target of the deviance tends to be members who are detracting from team norms (e.g., for performance or interpersonal reasons). While this notion has not been fully supported, coordinated deviance directed toward internal targets does not appear to generate the strong, negative impacts found in studies on independent, internally-directed deviance. For instance, Varella et al. (2012) found that deviance was not significantly related to the extent to which coworkers supported each other in their responsibilities. In addition, Spoelma and Hetrick (2021) found that team deviance did not increase subsequent social loafing behavior. In turn, among the studies in this category that examined relationships of team deviance with team performance, team deviance had no significant relationship (Loughry & Tosi, 2008; Spoelma & Hetrick, 2021; Varella et al., 2012). This provides important—albeit limited—evidence about the uniqueness of this form of deviance. While team deviance as a coordinated behavior with an internal target is not associated with team performance, there could be more complex processes going on within teams with this form of deviance. For instance, while the act of coordinating to target others with deviance may bring the actors closer together, it may be undermining the productivity of the deviance targets; effects counteracting team-level functioning.

Team Deviance as a Coordinated Behavior with an External Target

The last dimension in our typology consists of studies examining team deviance as a coordinated behavior among members directed toward those outside of the team (e.g., other teams, the leader, the organization). In this case, the party who experiences the primary and immediate threat to their well-being is outside of the team boundary. For example, in the case of coordinated production deviance, teams may coordinate to reduce team performance to correct an injustice (Kelloway et al., 2010). Here, the harm could be experienced by other teams or

organizational members who suffered due to missing their production targets as a result of the team's deviance. As another example, this type of deviance includes behaviors such as team members working together to break rules set by an external authority to gain advantages that they would not otherwise receive (e.g., Trzebiatowski, 2011). Such deviance can threaten the well-being of stakeholders outside of the team who are either directly put into a disadvantaged position (e.g., missing out on a reward for performance) or who are indirectly affected by threats to justice and fairness (e.g., Skarlicki & Kulik, 2004).

Much like forms of deviance that are independently enacted toward an external target, studies examining team deviance as a coordinated behavior with an external target can be effectively integrated using social identity theorizing (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to this perspective, when team membership is salient, members self-categorize and think and act according to what is in the best interests of the team, which motivates this form of team deviance and shapes responses to its enactment (c.f., Leavitt & Sluss, 2015). When team identity is strong, members' moral judgments are guided by ethics of ingroup favoritism and loyalty (Greene, 2014). Therefore, behavior that advances the team's goals is likely to be acted upon, even if viewed as deviant by those outside the team (Quade et al., 2017; Scott et al., 2013; Weisel & Shalvi, 2015).

Antecedents

According to the studies in our review, the motivation to engage in coordinated team deviance that violates external rules and norms can be triggered from team composition and climate antecedents. For instance, Pearsall and Ellis (2011) found that teams composed of members higher on utilitarianism engaged in more coordinated deviance targeted toward those outside of the team. They suggested that, "[a] utilitarian weighs the costs versus the benefits of

an action and chooses the course with the greatest total utility for the individual and his or her group as a whole" (p. 402). In terms of team climate, Thornton and Rupp (2016) found that teams engaged in more deviance in unfair justice climates. The authors reasoned that being treated unfairly by leaders as a team in part threatens a team's identity, generating retribution for injustice through violating norms.

In line with the social identity approach, studies have also considered moderators that further heighten motivation to act in team-serving ways, producing greater team deviance. In terms of emergent state moderators, Pearsall and Ellis (2011) found that psychological safety moderated the effects of team member utilitarianism on deviance such that the positive effect of utilitarianism on team deviance was stronger in teams with a higher level of psychological safety. Thornton and Rupp (2016) found that the positive effect of injustice climate on deviance was stronger when team moral identity was strong relative to weak—these groups stole more when treated unfairly than when treated fairly. This suggests that teams with higher moral identity care more about violations of ethical norms—especially when there are transgressions directed against the team—and seek to in turn punish external wrongdoers through coordinated action.

Outcomes

Consequences of coordinated, externally-targeted team deviance can also be understood using an identity perspective. In terms of outcomes, the identity perspective suggests that team-serving deviance may strengthen identification with the team and in the process, create outgroup biases that interfere with dealings outside of the team. Supporting this notion, Spoelma (2018) found that team deviance had a marginally negative effect on inter-team coordination. A social identity perspective also suggests that when members strongly identify with their team, their

appraisals of team deviance should be colored in a team-serving manner—even if the deviance violates broader normative standards. Providing support for this logic, in a lab experiment, Trzebiatowski (2011) found that when the perceived level of team member similarity was high, team deviance had a positive effect on team pride and no effect on team shame or guilt. Taken together, these studies show the potential of explaining this form of team deviance using an identity perspective and reveal a much different narrative about team deviance from studies on independently enacted forms of deviance directed toward other members.

Discussion and Future Research Directions

As illuminated by our review of 50 studies, deviance is both common and influential in teams. Our goal was to advance team deviance research by introducing a novel typology and using it to organize and highlight diverging narratives within research in this domain. In contrast to the dominant view that conceptualizes team deviance as the product of independent member actions directed toward other members within the team, we integrate core features of team deviance to shed light on important yet undertheorized forms of deviance. While we believe our review provides important proof-of-concept for our typology, it revealed many areas in which our understanding of team deviance can be improved. In the following section, we discuss the implications of this typology and use it to suggest future research directions on team deviance.

Theoretical Implications and New Directions for Team Deviance

By organizing team deviance research using our typology, it is clear that the most common type of deviance studied is team deviance that is independently executed and directed toward other members of the team. Forty of the fifty studies in our review focus on individuals' deviant actions in teams rather than team deviance as coordinated member action. In this sense, it is understandable why team deviance tends to have strong negative correlations with team

effectiveness (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2021). However, this unidimensional view provides a relatively narrow approach to team deviance. We believe that for research in this area to progress, it is crucial to have a framework that incorporates two key features of team deviance in modern teams: that team deviance may be the product of coordinated action (e.g., Mars, 1974; Palmer, 2008; Zapf et al., 2003) and that the *team* boundary shapes the target, rather than the *individual* boundary (e.g., Ramsay et al., 2011; Stuart & Moore, 2017). Our typology responds to calls for a more fine-grained understanding of the dimensionality of team deviance (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2021) by providing a framework around common, yet undertheorized, aspects of team deviance.

Another contribution of the present study is showing our typology's potential for organizing antecedents and outcomes of existing team deviance research that makes sense of seemingly incompatible findings. Existing reviews on team deviance (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2021; Götz et al., 2019) adopt approaches that lump existing research into a unitary framework. For instance, Carpenter et al. (2021) used a social information processing framework to review and meta-analyze a portion of the research reviewed here. While useful, approaches like the social information processing framework have a difficult time explaining findings such as why in some cases, team deviance has no relationship with team performance (e.g., Loughry & Tosi, 2008; Varella et al., 2012) or why high-quality member relationships can both contribute to more and less deviance (e.g., Pearsall & Ellis, 2011; Rispens et al., 2011; Schwieren & Glunk, 2008). By considering more fine-grained dimensions of team deviance, we reveal that different forms of team deviance have unique underlying assumptions and motivations—such as responding to external threats, enforcing norms, and enhancing team identity—that have not been considered in

existing reviews. This organization offers an important footing for using our typology to understand empirical research.

Future Research on Coordinated Deviance

The typology presented in the current study can be used to advance our understanding of team deviance in a few key areas. For instance, it is notable the relative lack of understanding around coordinated forms of deviance. Coordination and interdependence are hallmarks of team-level constructs (Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999) and neglecting interdependent forms of deviance means the field is likely focused on a narrow subset of all the forms deviance may manifest in teams. Indeed, Palmer (2008, p. 108) wrote that "much organizational wrongdoing, even of the simplest variety, requires coordinated action of many participants" and anecdotal examples of coordinated deviance are common in the media (e.g., Stein & Pinto, 2011).

Research on coordinated deviance could be enriched by further study of how it might emerge. In some cases, such as distributed teamwork settings or when deviance is particularly risky, coordinated deviance may start with an initiating member who approaches another member who is most likely to join and not report the wrongdoing (Briggs et al., 2013). From this, the two members can then convince a third to join, gaining more validation and influence with each subsequent joining member. In other types of situations, coordinated deviance might emerge differently. Leib et al. (2021) provided some support that joint decisions, relative to simultaneous or sequential group decisions, produce more collective deviance. It would also be worthwhile to focus on other mechanisms that underlie coordinated deviance. This might draw from Kocher et al. (2018), who found evidence of a dishonesty shift in groups wherein groups are more deceptive than individuals. They proposed that the two core mechanisms which explained this effect are communication and learning about norm compliance. Through

communication, group members are likely to exchange arguments to justify deviant behavior, which shifts norm perceptions. This propensity for groups to shape and coalesce around justifications for deviance likely creates the shared team mental models that facilitate explicit and implicit coordinated deviance (c.f., Rico et al., 2008). Lastly, future research on coordinated deviance might consider how it impacts teams over time. For instance, for severe forms of coordinated deviance that carry severe penalties if detected by authorities (e.g., unethical behavior), teams face a trade-off in the risk of under-communicating and not reaching their goal and over-communicating and risking detection, driving them to communicate less at the outset but increasing as they build trust (Aven, 2015).

Future Research on Antecedents

Using our typology, scholars may consider antecedents that do and do not produce certain forms of team deviance. First, research on coordinated deviance could be enhanced by considering factors that create situations where deviance may help members reach a common goal, as coordinated action stems out of a need to attain common goals (Rico et al., 2008). For instance, incentive structures that reward the achievement of team goals (vs. individual goals) or leadership that heightens collective performance pressure (e.g., bottom-line mentality) are likely to spur coordinated forms of deviance rather than independent forms. In addition, given collaborating to engage in deviance may be risky if it violates broader organizational norms, positive team emergent states, such as cohesion, trust, and team potency, are likely ingredients that predict coordinated deviance because teams with more psychological safety are more likely to take risks (e.g., Pearsall & Ellis, 2011).

Our review also shows that much of the team deviance that has been examined to date has been targeted at other members *within* the team. Yet, teams (and their members) operate in

open systems within organizations and are often required to interface with other teams or span other organizational boundaries (Marrone, 2010), which are contexts that the team deviance literature has largely overlooked. Using our typology, scholars may distinguish the target of the team deviance to uncover antecedents. For instance, we would expect that situations that trigger perceived threat to the team, such as inter-team conflict (e.g., Wombacher & Felfe, 2017) or contexts with low multi-team system identification (e.g., Cuijpers et al., 2016) would spur members to engage in externally-directed deviance in ways that would not similarly trigger internally-directed, independent forms of team deviance.

Future Research on Outcomes

In terms of consequences, this review confirmed conventional wisdom that when deviance is independently executed and targeted toward other team members, it generally leads to damaging outcomes. However, the typology presented in the current study can also be used to pinpoint which types of deviance may lead to more positive outcomes for teams. Focusing on potential positive outcomes for the teams is important, because to the extent team deviance generates positive outcomes—or fails to produce negative outcomes the dominant theoretical view in the existing literature usually predict—it can offer an explanation for why team deviance remains so prevalent in the workplace (Zhong & Robinson, 2021). In this respect, highlighting a broader range of narratives regarding team deviance is crucial to shift the consensus that deviance is overwhelmingly harmful for teams.

Although the number of studies on forms of team deviance that are not independent or internally-targeted is small, team deviance that is coordinated and directed toward external targets appears to be the strongest candidate to generate positive (or at least, not negative) outcomes for teams. Teams that engage in this form of deviance have members that share high

similarity, which may contribute to a strong sense of team identity that explains why these teams do not experience shame and guilt—emotions that are theorized to prevent deviance (Ilies et al., 2013)—but rather experience elevated pride from team deviance (Trzebiatowski, 2011). Further supporting this idea, in an individual-level study, Schabram et al. (2018) found that deviants trust members who coordinated to cheat more than members cheating independently, because they felt a greater sense of connection with those who engaged in coordinated deviant behavior. To the extent that deviance is coordinated to achieve a shared goal, it is likely not perceived in the same negative manner as other forms of deviance.

Regarding other potentially fruitful areas for future research, it is possible that some forms of coordinated deviance directed at internal targets might have short-term harmful consequences for specific members but hold long-term beneficial outcomes for the team. For example, ostracism—ignoring or excluding other team members when it is socially appropriate to engage them (Robinson et al., 2013; Williams, 2007)—serves an evolutionary function in social groups (Kurzban & Leary, 2001). It allows groups to distance members who do not add value, punish cheaters, and incentivize pro-group behavior (Hales et al., 2017). These evolutionary motives explain why poorly performing (Wesselmann et al., 2015; Wirth et al., 2015) and disagreeable (Rudert et al., 2020) team members are likely targets of ostracism, and ostracizing such members may bring long-term performance benefits for the group. Further, the act of ostracizing unsavory team members may have other interpersonal benefits: perpetrators of ostracism feel psychologically closer to each other than they do to ostracism targets (Wyer &

Schenke, 2016), and ostracizing unlikeable members can prevent self-regulatory depletion (Sommer & Yoon, 2013).[4]

Another direction for future research on outcomes of team deviance would be to more closely consider perpetrator and target sensemaking due to the informational value inherent in the different types of team deviance. For instance, when comparing coordinated and independent deviance, the number of people involved in the action makes a difference in what conclusions the target infers from the behavior and how likely they are to change their own behavior. In line with attribution theory (Kelly, 1967), when consensus is high, recipients perceive positions as reflecting objective truth rather than an idiosyncratic opinion. Thus, team members may be more likely to conform to the team's standard when they are a target of coordinated deviance compared to being a target of independent deviance. Considering team deviance through this lens can also lead to moderating predictions regarding the implications of different types of deviance. For example, because coordinated deviance is more likely to be viewed as feedback and generate behavioral change, on tasks where uniformity benefits team performance (e.g., quick decisions, intergroup competitions), coordinated deviance directed toward internal members may be effective for maintaining solidarity in ways that independent, internally-directed deviance is not. Altogether, it is important for future research to consider outcomes of different forms of deviance because, to the extent that it generates greater team effectiveness, it would shed light on an important dilemma in organizations.

Team Deviance through a Differentiation Lens

[4] While ostracism can reflect a coordinated behavior in groups, it is also possible for people to be ostracized in dyadic interactions (akin to independently enacted behavior; e.g., Smith & Williams, 2004). In the case of the latter, we would expect ostracism to operate more in line with independently enacted, internally-targeted forms of deviance. The level of coordination involved in ostracism is a worthwhile distinction for future research on this topic.

In the existing literature, the dominant approach used to operationalize deviance at the team level is through consensus-based assumptions (e.g., Chan, 1998). Through this lens, team deviance emerges as a shared property of a team, where individual members' deviance levels converge through processes such as socialization, contagion, norms, and leadership (e.g., Cole et al., 2008). Essential to this practice is theory and statistical evidence that supports agreement in line with the direct consensus or referent shift models (Chan, 1998). This is also the assumption when leaders offer the focal ratings—there is a certain level of behavior at which all members coalesce (e.g., Mayer et al., 2012).

However, team members may *not* converge in their individual levels of deviance and thus *differentiation* in team-level deviance should be examined. With this lens, team deviance represents a configural property, which captures the "variability or pattern of individual characteristics, constructs, or responses across the members of a unit" (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000, p. 29). Although Schabram et al. (2018, p. 1058) acknowledged that "team deviance is most accurately conceptualized as a configural property," all but two studies in our review treated deviance as a shared property of a team. One way to conceptualize team deviance as a configural property would be to use statistical metrics that represent dispersion or variance. For instance, research on conflict within teams has used standard deviation metrics (e.g., Jehn et al., 2010) and skew metrics (e.g., Sinha et al., 2016). Network approaches have also gained traction (e.g., Park et al., 2020); for instance, one could consider the density or centralization of team deviance.

We think a differentiation lens could be especially important for advancing research on forms of team deviance that are independently executed and internally targeted. While studies in that dimension nearly exclusively examine deviance that emerges through convergence

processes, the independently enacted nature of the behavior suggests that deviance as a shared property may not always be the case. Members may observe others' deviance and decide not to engage in it (O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2011). Further, a differentiation lens may help researchers distinguish independently executed team deviance from individual-level deviance. While existing research shows team deviance independently executed and targeted toward other team members generally leads to damaging outcomes, incorporating a differentiation lens may yield new insight into when deviance does or does *not* relate to negative outcomes.

Methodological Implications

Organizing research around the typology presented in the current study uncovered where methodological advances are needed. First, it would be useful for future research to use measures that more appropriately capture core features of team deviance. As others have noted (e.g., Robinson et al., 2014), the measures used in deviance research share significant overlap and largely fail to capture the attribute distinctions presented in the current study. In the existing literature, researchers usually adopt deviance scales that were not originally designed to measure deviance in team contexts—for instance, almost 40% of the studies that used a survey measure to assess deviance used Bennett and Robinson's (2000) individual-level deviance scale. Yet, as we noted earlier, this measure is deficient for team contexts because a) interdependent acts of deviance cannot be captured and b) it conflates internal and external targets of the behavior. To date, the dominant way to measure deviance in teams does not allow researchers to account for crucial elements that likely matter when examining deviance as a team-level property.

To address this limitation, one approach would be to create scales to measure specific dimensions of team deviance. This would be particularly impactful for capturing the subjective perception of coordinated, externally-targeted team deviance because in all instances to date, this

behavior has been measured through observation or manipulated in lab experiments. Without a scale to measure this behavior, it is difficult to study it in field contexts and fully understand the complexities and nuances of coordinated deviance. A second approach would be to explicitly specify the target of the deviance when creating measures. This can be done, for instance, by changing the referent of the deviance measure to refer to an internal or external target (e.g., rate aggressive behavior targeted toward parties *outside* the team boundary).

The second way to improve the research methods in this area is to provide stronger evidence of causality. Experiments that utilize random assignment are an important tool for testing causal relationships. Although we found examples of studies that examined both antecedents (e.g., Thornton & Rupp, 2016) and consequences (e.g., Motro et al., 2021) of deviance in teams using experiments, this approach is still relatively underutilized (only 14% of reviewed studies). Instead, field survey methods are much more common. However, over two-thirds (70%) of the field studies in our review measured all their variables at the same point in time (i.e., were cross-sectional in nature). Of the studies that did time-separate their measures, many did not include temporal references that enable stronger causal inferences intended by the use of longitudinal designs. Without specifying the time frame by which the criterion variable is rated, it is unclear whether the phenomenon truly took place following the measurement of the predictor. Future research should test causal relationships with rigorous designs by either specifying the time frame for their criterion variable to capitalize on time-separated data collection efforts or by using lab experiments.

Practical Implications

Our typology and review also have practical implications for reducing the incidence and negative impact of team deviance. First, our review highlighted factors that may reduce the

incidence of independently enacted, internally-targeted team deviance. For instance, it is important to eliminate or reduce the amount of abusive supervision that teams experience (Mawritz et al., 2012; Ogunfowora, 2013). However, if this is not feasible, mechanistic structures (Ambrose et al., 2013) or functional dependence (Priesemuth et al., 2013) may shield teams from abusive supervisors, garnering less deviance. If this form of deviance is already prevalent in teams, one may consider factors that constrain its impact. For instance, since independently enacted, internally-targeted team deviance damages teams' social climate, boosting team emotional regulation abilities (e.g., Jiang et a., 2013) or team mindfulness (e.g., Yu & Zellmer-Bruhn, 2018) would effectively weaken the effect of team deviance on the social climate.

Our review also shows the importance of being aware of what kind of deviance one is trying to reduce, as certain interventions may backfire. For instance, while fostering tight-knit team relationships may be good for reducing some types of deviance (e.g., independent, internally-targeted; Rispens et al., 2011), it may unleash other forms (e.g., coordinated, externally-targeted; Pearsall & Ellis, 2011; independent, externally-targeted; Schwieren & Glunk, 2008; coordinated, internally-targeted; Thomas et al., 2021). Further, teams with high team identification may be especially likely to appraise their coordinated deviance positively (Trzebiatowski, 2011). As another example, our review shows that stacking teams with members high on moral identity to reduce internally-targeted deviance (e.g., Kuenzi et al., 2020) may have the unintended effect of galvanizing members to engage in coordinated, externally-targeted deviance when treated unfairly (e.g., Thornton & Rupp, 2016). Taken together, this shows that a finer-grained approach to team deviance is useful for targeted interventions aimed at reducing team deviance.

Limitations

Our contributions should be viewed in light of certain limitations. First, we adopted an extreme groups approach through which each of our reviewed studies is identified as having only one of the four types of team deviance in our typology. This follows the general approach of research in the team deviance literature which to date examines one type of deviance at a time. Yet, there could be some instances where, over time, teams engage in some mix of independent and coordinated deviance or internal and external deviance. One way to approach team deviance with overlapping classifications would be to examine co-occurrence as an interaction. This has been done in the organizational citizenship behavior literature, where scholars have considered interactions between levels of different types of citizenship (e.g., Whiting et al., 2008). In the deviance context, for example, it would be possible for researchers to measure and consider the interactive effects of independent, internally- and externally-directed deviance. We would expect that when both forms are higher, teams would experience high levels of negative outcomes. However, teams may experience fewer negative outcomes when independent, internally-directed deviance is lower while externally-directed deviance is high. A second way to approach the co-occurrence of the four types of team deviance, especially over time, would be to consider the presence and level of multiple categories through the lens of latent profiles (e.g., see O'Neil et al., 2018, for an example in the team conflict literature). Instead of relying on interactive effects, this approach could consider levels of the four categories *simultaneously*. This method could be used to uncover, for example, how teams with high levels of coordinated and independent externally-directed deviance and low levels of the other two categories differ on given outcomes from teams with high levels of all four types of team deviance. To illustrate our typology of team deviance, the present study adopted a non-overlapping classification approach that is generally

used in the existing literature, but it could be useful for future research to engage in more complexity when identifying the types of team deviance.

Second, only a small number of studies were classified into some of the categories of our team deviance typology. This is a common limitation in review research, where the scope of the review depends on what is available in the existing literature. Specific to team deviance, there is simply not much empirical research on forms of deviance that are not products of independent action and targeted toward other members. While in one light, this shows the importance of our typology for providing conceptual footing needed to distinguish different forms of team deviance, it is crucial that future research test the validity of our team deviance typology.

Conclusion

Teams offer advantages for performance on complex tasks that is unmatched by individual employees working alone. Unfortunately, the prevalence of deviance can counteract these benefits and generate harmful outcomes for teams and those with whom they interact. By offering a novel typology for identifying less-understood forms of team deviance, we aim to energize research in this domain to reduce both the incidence and negative impact of team deviance through a more fine-grained understanding of its dimensionality.

References (* Denotes Articles Included in Review)

Akaah, I. P. (1996). The influence of organizational rank and role on marketing professionals' ethical judgments. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *15*(6), 605-613. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00411794

*Allen, J. A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2018). Let's get this meeting started: Meeting lateness and actual meeting outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(8), 1008-1021. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2276

*Ambrose, M. L., Schminke, M., & Mayer, D. M. (2013). Trickle-down effects of supervisor perceptions of interactional justice. A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(4), 678-689. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032080

*Aube, C., & Rousseau, V. (2011). Interpersonal aggression and team effectiveness: The mediating role of team goal commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(3), 565-580. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317910X492568

*Aube, C., & Rousseau, V. (2014). Counterproductive behaviors: Group phenomena with team-level consequences. *Team Performance Management*, *20*(5/6), 202-220. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-05-2013-0014

*Aube, C., & Rousseau, V. (2016). Yes, we complain … so what? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(7), 1137-1151. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-08-2015-0304

Aube, C., Rousseau, V., Mama, C., & Morin, E. M. (2009). Counterproductive behaviors and psychological well-being: The moderating effect of task interdependence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *24*, 351–361. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9113-5

*Aube, C., Rousseau, V., & Tremblay, S. (2011). Team size and quality of group experience: The more the merrier? *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 15*(4), 357-375. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025400.

Aven, B. L. (2015). The paradox of corrupt networks: An analysis of organizational crime at Enron. *Organization Science*, *26*(4), 980-996. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0983

*Ayoko, O. B., & Callan, V. J. (2010). Teams' reactions to conflict and teams' task and social outcomes: The moderating role of transformational and emotional leadership. *European Management Journal*, *28*(3), 220-235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2009.07.001

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(3), 349-360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Bennett, R. J., Marasi, S., & Locklear, L. (2019). *Workplace deviance*. Oxford University Press

*Borchert, D. M. (2011). *A meta-model of ethical behavior: An empirical examination of ethical leadership, ethical identity, ethical climate and emotions on unethical work behavior*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Saint Louis University.

Brady, D. L., Brown, D. J., & Liang, L. H. (2017). Moving beyond assumptions of deviance: The reconceptualization and measurement of workplace gossip. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000164

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*(3), 429-444. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126

Brief, A. P., Buttram, R. T., & Dukerich, J. M. (2001). Collective corruption in the corporate world: Toward a process model. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 471-499). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Briggs, K., Workman Jr, J. P., & York, A. S. (2013). Collaborating to cheat: A game theoretic exploration of academic dishonesty in teams. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *12*(1), 4-17. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2011.0140

*Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 954-962. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.954

Carpenter, N. C., & Berry, C. M. (2017). Are counterproductive work behavior and withdrawal empirically distinct? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Management*, *43*(3), 834-863. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314544743

Carpenter, N. C., Whitman, D. S., & Amrhein, R. (2021). Unit-level counterproductive work behavior (CWB): A conceptual review and quantitative summary. *Journal of Management*, *47*(6), 1498-1527. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320978812

Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(2), 234-246. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.234

*Cole, M. S., Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2008). Affective mechanisms linking dysfunctional behavior to performance in work teams: A moderated mediation study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(5), 945-958. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.945

*Coyne, I., Craig, J., & Smith-Lee Chong, P. (2004). Workplace bullying in a group context. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *32*(3), 301-317. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880410001723530

Cross, R., Rebele, R., & Grant, A. (2016). Collaborative overload. *Harvard Business Review*, *94*(1), 74 –79.

Cuijpers, M., Uitdewilligen, S., & Guenter, H. (2016). Effects of dual identification and interteam conflict on multiteam system performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *89*(1), 141-171. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12113

*Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: the bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(1), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.243

Einarsen, S., & Hoel, H. (2001, May). *The Negative Acts Questionnaire: Development, validation and revision of a measure of bullying at work.* [Paper presentation]. 10th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology, Prague, Czech Republic.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), 57-74. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4279003

Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ—DoD). *Military Psychology*, *11*(3), 243-263. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327876mp1103_3

Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2013). Self-serving altruism? The lure of unethical actions that benefit others. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *93*(9), 285-292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2013.04.005

Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Iskra-Golec, I. (2013). Collective narcissism moderates the effect of in-group image threat on intergroup hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*(6), 1019-1039. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032215

Götz, M., Bollmann, G., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2019). Contextual undertow of workplace deviance by and within units: a systematic review. *Small Group Research*, *50*(1), 39-80. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496418790044

Greenbaum, R. L., Mawritz, M. B., Bonner, J. M., Webster, B. D., & Kim, J. (2018). Supervisor expediency to employee expediency: The moderating role of leader–member exchange and the mediating role of employee unethical tolerance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(4), 525-541. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2258

Greene, J. (2014). *Moral tribes: Emotion, reason, and the gap between us and them*. The Penguin Press.

Halbesleben, J. R., Neveu, J. P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the "COR" understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Management*, *40*(5), 1334-1364. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527130

Hales, A. H., Ren, D., & Williams, K. D. (2017). Protect, correct, and eject: Ostracism as a social influence tool. In S.G. Harkins, K.D. Williams, & J.M. Burger (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social influence* (pp. 205-217). Oxford University Press.

*Hohenstein, J. B. H. (2007). *Does the bad outweigh the good? An examination of the effects of team member citizenship behavior and deviance on team performance*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Pennsylvania State University.

Ilies, R., Peng, A. C., Savani, K., & Dimotakis, N. (2013). Guilty and helpful: An emotion-based reparatory model of voluntary work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(6), 1051-1059. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034162

Jackson, J. W. (1993). Realistic group conflict theory: A review and evaluation of the theoretical and empirical literature. *The Psychological Record*, *43*(3), 395-413.

Jehn, K. A., Rispens, S., & Thatcher, S. M. (2010). The effects of conflict asymmetry on work group and individual outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(3), 596-616. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468978

Jiang, J. Y., Zhang, X., & Tjosvold, D. (2013). Emotion regulation as a boundary condition of the relationship between team conflict and performance: A multi-level examination. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(5), 714-734. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1834

Kaplan, M., Dollar, B., Melian, V., Van Durme, Y., & Wong, J. (2016). *Human capital trends 2016 survey*. Deloitte University Press. https://deloitte.com/us/en/pages/human-capital/articles/ introduction-human-capital-trends.html

*Karaca, A. (2016). *Conflict about conflict: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators of conflict asymmetry in teams*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Wayne State University.

Kauffeld, S. (2006). *Kompetenzen messen, bewerten, enwickeln* [Measuring, evaluating, and developing competencies]. Schaffer-Poeschel.

*Kauffeld, S., & Lehmann-Willenbrock, N. (2012). Meetings matter: Effects of team meetings on team and organizational success. *Small Group Research*, *43*(2), 130-158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411429599.

Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review*, *20*(1), 18-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.014

Kelly, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 192-238). University of Nebraska Press.

Kocher, M. G., Schudy, S., & Spantig, L. (2018). I lie? We lie! Why? Experimental evidence on a dishonesty shift in groups. *Management Science*, *64*(9), 3995-4008. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2800

Kozlowski, S. W., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *7*(3), 77-124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations: Contextual, temporal and emergent processes. In K. J. Klein & S. W. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 3-90). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

*Kim, Y. J., & Toh, S. M. (2019). Stuck in the past? The influence of a leader's past cultural experience on group culture and positive and negative group deviance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *62*(3), 944-969. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.1322.

*Kuenzi, M., Mayer, D. M., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2020). Creating an ethical organizational environment: The relationship between ethical leadership, ethical organizational climate, and unethical behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *73*(1), 43-71. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12356

Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: the functions of social exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(2), 187-208. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.187

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist*, *36*(4), 343-356. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.4.343

Leavitt, K., & Sluss, D. M. (2015). Lying for who we are: An identity-based model of workplace dishonesty. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(4), 587-610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0167

Leib, M., Köbis, N., Soraperra, I., Weisel, O., & Shalvi, S. (2021). Collaborative dishonesty: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *147*(12), 1241-1268. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000349

LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Saul, J. R. (2008). A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(2), 273-307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00114.x

*Lin, C. P., Tsai, Y. H., & Liu, M. L. (2016). Something good and something bad in R&D teams: Effects of social identification and dysfunctional behavior. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *104*(3), 191-199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.01.001.

*Loughry, M. L., & Tosi, H. L. (2008). Performance implications of peer monitoring. *Organization Science*, *19*(6), 876-890. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0356

Marrone, J. A. (2010). Team boundary spanning: A multilevel review of past research and proposals for the future. *Journal of Management*, *36*(4), 911-940. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309353945

Mars, G. (1974). Dock pilferage: A case study in occupational theft. In P. Rock & M. McIntosh (Eds.), *Deviance and social control* (pp. 209-228). Tavistock Institute.

*Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A trickle-down model of abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, *65*(2), 325-357. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x

*Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(1), 151-171. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2008.0276

*Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2010). Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: the mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0794-0

*Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.04.002

Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (1999). The structure and function of collective constructs: Implications for multilevel research and theory development. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(2), 249-265. https://doi.org/10.2307/259081

* Motro, D., Spoelma, T. M., & Ellis, A. P. (2021). Incivility and creativity in teams: Examining the role of perpetrator gender. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *106*(4), 560-581. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000757

O'Neill, T. A., McLarnon, M. J., Hoffart, G. C., Woodley, H. J., & Allen, N. J. (2018). The structure and function of team conflict state profiles. *Journal of Management*, *44*(2), 811-836. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315581662

O'Fallon, M. J., & Butterfield, K. D. (2011). Moral differentiation: Exploring boundaries of the "monkey see, monkey do" perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *102*(3), 379-399. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0820-2

*Ogunfowora, B. (2013). When the abuse is unevenly distributed: The effects of abusive supervision variability on work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(8), 1105-1123. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1841

*Ogunfowora, B., Stackhouse, M., Maerz, A., Varty, C., Hwang, C., & Choi, J. (2021). The impact of team moral disengagement composition on team performance: the roles of team cooperation, team interpersonal deviance, and collective extraversion. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 36,* 479-494. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09688-2

Palmer, D. (2008). Extending the process model of collective corruption. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 107-135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.005

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*(12), 1723-1738. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210388667

Park, S., Grosser, T. J., Roebuck, A. A., & Mathieu, J. E. (2020). Understanding work teams from a network perspective: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Management*, *46*(6), 1002-1028. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320901573

*Paulin, D., & Griffin, B. (2017). Team incivility climate scale: Development and validation of the team-level incivility climate construct. *Group & Organization Management, 42*(3), 315-345. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115622100

*Pearce, C. L., & Giacalone, R. A. (2003). Teams behaving badly: Factors associated with anti-citizenship behavior in teams. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 58-75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb02073.x

*Pearsall, M. J., & Ellis, A. P. J. (2011). Thick as thieves: The effects of ethical orientation and psychological safety on unethical team behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 401-411. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021503

*Priesemuth, M., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2013). Bad behavior in groups: The impact of overall justice climate and functional dependence on counterproductive work behavior in work units. *Group and Organization Management*, *38*(2), 230-257. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113479399

*Qin, X., Yam, K. C., Chen, C., Li, W., & Dong, X. (2021). Talking about COVID-19 is positively associated with team cultural tightness: Implications for team deviance and creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *106*(4), 530-541. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000918

Quade, M. J., Greenbaum, R. L., & Petrenko, O. V. (2017). I don't want to be near you, unless…: The interactive effect of unethical behavior and performance onto relationship conflict and workplace ostracism. *Personnel Psychology, 70*(3)*,* 675-709*.* https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12164

Ramsay, S., Troth, A., & Branch, S. (2011). Work-place bullying: A group processes framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(4), 799-816. https://doi.org/10.1348/2044-8325.002000

*Raver, J. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (2005). Beyond the individual victim: Linking sexual harassment, team processes, and team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(3), 387-400. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407904

Rayner, C. (1999). From research to implementation: Finding leverage for prevention. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 28-38. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268614

*Ren, S., Wang, Z., & Collins, N. T. (2021). The joint impact of servant leadership and team-based HRM practices on team expediency: the mediating role of team reflexivity. *Personnel Review, 50*(7/8), 1757-1773. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2020-0506

Rico, R., Sánchez-Manzanares, M., Gil, F., & Gibson, C. (2008). Team implicit coordination processes: A team knowledge–based approach. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*(1), 163-184. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.27751276

*Rispens, S., Greer, L., Jehn, K. A. & Thatcher, S. M. B. (2011). Not so bad after all: How relational closeness buffers the association between deviant group behaviors. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *4*(4), 277-296. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2011.00083.x

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(2), 555-572. https://doi.org/10.2307/256693

Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(6), 658-672. https://doi.org/10.5465/256963

Robinson, S. L., O'Reilly, J., & Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at work: An integrated model of workplace ostracism. *Journal of Management*, *39*(1), 203-231. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312466141

Robinson, S. L., Wang, W., & Kiewitz, C. (2014). Coworkers behaving badly: The impact of coworker deviant behavior upon individual employees. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 123-143. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091225

Rudert, S. C., Keller, M. D., Hales, A. H., Walker, M., & Greifeneder, R. (2020). Who gets ostracized? A personality perspective on risk and protective factors of ostracism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *118*(6), 1247-1268. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000271

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*(2), 224-253. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392563

Schabram, K., Robinson, S. L., & Cruz, K. S. (2018). Honor among thieves: The interaction of team and member deviance on trust in the team. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*(9), 1057-1066. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000311

Schulte, E. M., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Kauffeld, S. (2015). Treat us fairly and we won't complain: Multilevel effects of procedural justice on complaining behavior in team meetings. *Psychology*, *6*(14), 1795. 10.4236/psych.2015.614176

*Schwieren, C., & Glunk, U. (2008). Mechanisms underlying nationality-based discrimination in teams: A quasi-experiment testing predictions from social psychology and

microeconomics. *Small Group Research*, *39*(6), 643-672. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496408322279

Scott, K. L., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). A social exchange-based model of the antecedents of workplace exclusion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(1), 37-48. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030135

Sherif, M. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. University Book Exchange.

Sinha, R., Janardhanan, N. S., Greer, L. L., Conlon, D. E., & Edwards, J. R. (2016). Skewed task conflicts in teams: What happens when a few members see more conflict than the rest? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(7), 1045-1055. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000059

Skarlicki, D. P., & Kulik, C. T. (2004). Third-party reactions to employee (mis)treatment: A justice perspective. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 183-229. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(04)26005-1

*Skogstad, A., Torsheim, T., Einarsen, S., & Hauge, L. J. (2011). Testing the work environment hypothesis of bullying on a group level of analysis: Psychosocial factors as precursors of observed workplace bullying. *Applied Psychology*, *60*(3), 475-495. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00444.x

Smith, A., & Williams, K. D. (2004). R U there? Ostracism by cell phone text messages. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 8(4)*, 291-301. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.8.4.291

Sommer, K. L., & Yoon, J. (2013). When silence is golden: Ostracism as resource conservation during aversive interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *30*(7), 901-919. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512473006

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(3), 446–460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005

*Spoelma, T. M. (2018). *Examining the effects of team unethical behavior on boundary spanning activities in multiteam contexts: A conservation of resources approach*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Arizona.

*Spoelma, T. M., & Hetrick, A. L. (2021). More than idle talk: Examining the effects of positive and negative team gossip. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *42*(5), 604-618. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2522

Stein, M., & Pinto, J. (2011). The dark side of groups: A "gang at work" in Enron. *Group & Organization Management*, *36*(6), 692-721. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111423533

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Morrison, K. R. (2009). Intergroup threat theory. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 43-60). Psychology Press.

Stuart, H. C., & Moore, C. (2017). Shady characters: The implications of illicit organizational roles for resilient team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *60*(5), 1963-1985. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0512

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *33*(1), 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology of intergroup relations*. (pp. 7-24). Nelson-Hall.

*Taylor, E. C., Bernerth, J. B., & Maurer, J. D. (2017). Running on empty: The effects of aggregate travel stress on team performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *32*(5), 513-531. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9449-6

Thomas, B. J., Cimino, A., & Meglich, P. (2021). Workplace hazing: toward an organizational science of a cryptic group practice. *Group & Organization Management*, *46*(2), 286-326. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601121992893

*Thornton, M. A., & Rupp, D. E. (2016). The joint effects of justice climate, group moral identity, and corporate social responsibility on the prosocial and deviant behaviors of groups. *Journal of Business Ethics, 137*(4), 677–697. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2748-4

Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, *32*(6), 951-990. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306294258

*Trzebiatowski, T. M. (2011). *Team moral emotions in response to team performance*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Minnesota.

*Varella, P., Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A. (2012). A model of instrumental networks: The roles of socialized charismatic leadership and group behavior. *Organization Science*, *23*(2), 582-595. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0604

*Van Hooft, E. A. J., & Van Mierlo, H. (2018). When teams fail to self-regulate: Predictors and outcomes of team procrastination among debating teams. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9,* Article 464. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00464

Weisel, O., & Shalvi, S. (2015). The collaborative roots of corruption. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *112*(34), 10651-10656. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1423035112

Wesselmann, E. D., Wirth, J. H., Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., & Williams, K. D. (2015). The role of burden and deviation in ostracizing others. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *155*(5), 483-496. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1060935

White, F. A., Newson, M., Verrelli, S., & Whitehouse, H. (2021). Pathways to prejudice and outgroup hostility: Group alignment and intergroup conflict among football fans. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *51*(7), 660-666. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12773

Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Pierce, J. R. (2008). Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(1), 125-139. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.125

Wildschut, T., Pinter, B., Vevea, J. L., Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (2003). Beyond the group mind: A quantitative review of the interindividual-intergroup discontinuity effect. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(5), 698-722. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.698

Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 425-452. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085641

Wiltermuth, S. S. (2011). Cheating more when the spoils are split. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *115*(2), 157-168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.10.001

Wirth, J. H., Bernstein, M. J., & LeRoy, A. S. (2015). Atimia: A new paradigm for investigating how individuals feel when ostracizing others. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *155*(5), 497-514. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1060934

Wombacher, J., & Felfe, J. (2017). The interplay of team and organizational commitment in motivating employees' interteam conflict handling. *Academy of Management Journal*, *60*(4), 1554-1581. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0718

Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F., & Uzzi, B. (2007). The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science*, *316*(5827), 1036 –1039. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1136099

Wyer, N. A., & Schenke, K. C. (2016). Just you and I: The role of social exclusion in the formation of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *65*(7), 20-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.02.007

*Yang, J. (2016). Thriving organizational sustainability through innovation: Incivility climate and teamwork. *Sustainability*, *8*(9), Article 860. https://doi.org/10.3390/su8090860

Yu, L., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. (2018). Introducing team mindfulness and considering its safeguard role against conflict transformation and social undermining. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(1), 324-347. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0094

Zapf, D., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2003). Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse* in *the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 103-126). Taylor & Francis.

*Zhang, Z., & Jia, M. (2013). How can companies decrease the disruptive effects of stretch goals? The moderating role of interpersonal-and informational-justice climates. *Human Relations*, *66*(7), 993-1020. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713483630

Zhong, R., & Robinson, S. L. (2021). What happens to bad actors in organizations? A Review of actor-centric outcomes of negative behavior. *Journal of Management*, *47*(6), 1430-1467. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320976808

Table 1

Summary of Reviewed Studies

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Allen et al. (2018) - Study 3	1	48 teams of undergraduate students in the USA	Meeting lateness	1	Manipulated	N/A				Meeting satisfaction, group performance	Extended periods of meeting lateness
Ambrose et al. (2013)	2	83 departments across a diverse set of organizations in the USA	Deviance	1	Supervisors	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1	Interactional justice climate, Supervisor's perceptions of interactional justice		Work group structure
Aube & Rousseau (2011)	2	97 teams in a public safety organization in Canada	Interpersonal aggression	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1		Team goal commitment, Team effectiveness	
Aube & Rousseau (2014)	2	101 teams in a public safety organization in Canada	Counterproductive behaviors	1	Team members	Aube et al. (2009)	2	1		Collaboration, Team performance	
Aube & Rousseau (2016)	2	82 teams in a public safety organization in Canada	Complaining behaviors	1	Team members	Created scale based on prior measures	2	1		Team process improvement, Task meaningfulness, Team performance	Task interdependence
Aube et al. (2011)	2	97 teams from a public safety organization in Canada	Counterproductive behaviors	1	Team members	Aube et al. (2009)	2	1	Team size	Quality of group experience	

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Ayoko & Callan (2010)	2	97 work groups in a public works agency in Australia	Bullying	1	Team members	Rayner (1999)	2	1	Team members' destructive reactions to conflict		Transformational leadership, Leader emotional management behaviors, Leader conflict management behaviors
Borchert (2011)	2	57 teams within a diverse set of companies in the USA	Passive-aggressive behavior; bullying	1	Team members	Negative acts questionnaire (Einarsen & Hoel, 2001)	1	1	Ethical leadership		
Brown & Treviño (2006)	2	150 work groups in a health care organization in the USA	Workplace deviance	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1	Socialized charismatic leader behavior, Values congruence with leader		
Cole et al. (2008)	2	61 teams in a multinational automotive manufacturing company across Germany and the USA	Dysfunctional team behavior	1	Team members	Created scale based on prior measures	2	1		Negative team affective tone, Team performance	Team nonverbal negative expressivity
Coyne et al. (2004)	2	36 teams in a firefighting organization in the United Kingdom	Workplace bullying	1	Team members	Created scale	1	1		Cohesion, Perception of team success	
Dunlop & Lee (2004)	2	36 branches of a restaurant chain in Australia	Workplace deviance behavior	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1		Business unit performance	
Hohenstein (2007)	2	56 teams of students in the USA	Deviance, Incivility	1	Team members	Created scale based on prior measures	2	2		Team performance, Viability, Satisfaction	Task interdependence

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Karaca (2016)	2	81 teams of students in the USA	Deviance	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	2	Task and relationship conflict asymmetry		
Kauffeld & Lehmann-Willenbrock (2012)	2	92 teams across a diverse set of organizations in Germany	Dysfunctional communication	1	Observed	act4teams coding scheme (Kauffeld, 2006)	2	2		Meeting satisfaction, Team performance, Organizational success	
Kim & Toh (2019) - Study 1	2	91 sales groups across an office supplies manufacturing company in South Korea	Counterproductive work behaviors	1	Division heads	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	2	Cultural tightness of a leader's former group, Cultural tightness of a leader's current group		Leader identification with former group, Leader tenure in former group
Kuenzi et al. (2020) - Study 1	2	133 units across different organizations in the USA	Unethical behavior	1	Supervisors	Akaah (1996)	2	1	Ethical leadership, Ethical organizational climate		
Kuenzi et al. (2020) - Study 2	2	194 units across different organizations in the USA	Deviance	1	Supervisors	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1	Ethical leadership, Ethical organizational climate		Collective moral identity
Lin et al. (2016)	2	87 teams across several technology companies in Taiwan	Dysfunctional behavior	1	Team members	Cole et al. (2008)	2	2	Leader inclusiveness, Effort-respect mismatch	Team performance	Resource adequacy, Negative affective tone
Loughry & Tosi (2008)	2	67 teams in a theme park in the USA	Indirect peer monitoring	3	Team members	Created scale	2	1		Problem-free performance	Supervisory monitoring, Cohesion
Mawritz et al. (2012)	2	288 departments across a diverse set of organizations in the USA	Interpersonal deviance	1	Supervisors	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1	Abusive supervision		Hostile climate

TEAM DEVIANCE TYPOLOGY

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Mayer et al. (2009)	2	195 departments in companies across a diverse set of organizations in the USA	Deviance	1	Team members and Supervisors	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1	Top management ethical leadership, Supervisory ethical leadership		
Mayer et al. (2010)	2	300 work units across a variety of organizations in the USA	Misconduct	1	Supervisors	Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998)	2	1	Ethical leadership, Ethical climate		
Mayer et al. (2012) - Study 1	2	115 groups in companies across diverse industries in the USA	Unethical behavior	1	Managers	Akaah (1996)	2	1	Ethical leadership		
Mayer et al. (2012) - Study 2	2	195 groups in companies across diverse industries in the USA	Unethical behavior	1	Managers	Akaah (1996)	2	1	Ethical leadership		
Motro et al. (2021) - Study 2	1	126 teams of undergraduates students in the USA	Incivility	1	Manipulated	N/A				Team positive affect, Team creativity	Perpetrator gender
Motro et al. (2021) - Study 3	1	126 teams of university students in the USA	Incivility	1	Manipulated	N/A				Team positive affect, Team creativity	Perpetrator gender
Ogunfowora (2013)	2	58 work groups across several not-for-profit human services organizations in Canada	Counterproductive work behaviors	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	1	1	Abusive supervision variability, Interpersonal justice climate		
Ogunfowora et al. (2021)	2	95 teams of undergraduate students in Canada	Interpersonal deviance	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	2	Team moral disengagement	Team performance	Collective extraversion
Paulin & Griffin (2017)	2	50 work teams in companies across a diverse set of industries in Australia	Incivility climate	1	Team members	Created scale	1	1		Cohesion	

TEAM DEVIANCE TYPOLOGY

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Pearce & Giacalone (2003)	2	71 teams in an organization in the USA	Anti-citizenship Behavior	1	Team members	Created scale based on prior measures	2	1	Team leader solecism, Team size, Commitment, Perceived organizational support		
Pearsall & Ellis (2011)	2	126 teams of undergraduate students in the USA	Unethical behavior	4	Archival data	N/A	2	2	Team member utilitarianism		Psychological safety
Priesemuth et al. (2013)	2	113 work units across a variety of organizations in the USA	Interpersonal deviance	1	Supervisors	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1	Overall injustice climate		Functional dependence
Qin et al. (2021)	2	103 teams across a variety of industries in China	Deviance	1	Supervisors	Spector et al. (2006)	2	2	Team Covid-19 talk, Cultural tightness		Team virtuality
Raver & Gelfand (2005)	2	27 teams in a food service organization in the USA	Ambient sexual harassment	1	Team members	Fitzgerald et al. (1999)	2	1		Relationship conflict, Cohesion, Citizenship behavior, Financial performance	
Ren et al. (2021)	2	109 teams from firms in China	Team expedient behaviors	1	Team members	Greenbaum et al. (2018)	2	2	Servant leadership, Team reflexivity		Team-based HRM practices
Rispens et al. (2011)	2	26 work groups in a telecommunications company in the Netherlands	Counterproductive work behavior	1	Supervisors	Robinson and Bennett (1995)	2	1	Relationship conflict		Relational closeness
Schulte et al. (2015)	2	54 teams within automotive and electrical organizations in Germany	Complaining	1	Archival	act4teams coding scheme (Kauffeld, 2006)	2	1	Procedural justice climate, Team satisfaction with supervisor		

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Schwieren & Glunk (2008)	1	91 teams of students in the Netherlands	Discrimination	2	Team members	Created item			Ingroup status, Team identification, Team nationality		Competition strength
Skogstad et al. (2011)	2	362 departments across several organizations in Norway	Workplace bullying	1	Department members	Used item based on construct definition	1	1	Relations orientation, Task orientation		
Spoelma (2018)	1	108 teams of students in the USA	Unethical behavior	4	Manipulated	N/A				Team potency, Reputation maintenance concerns, Boundary spanning behavior	Interteam monitoring
Spoelma & Hetrick (2021)	2	63 teams of students in the USA	Negative team gossip	3	Team members	Brady et al. (2017)	2	2		Social loafing, Team performance	
Taylor et al. (2017) – Study 1	3	32 National Football League teams in the USA	Counterproductive work behaviors	2	Archival data	N/A			Aggregate travel stress, Team concentration		
Taylor et al. (2017) – Study 2	3	30 National Basketball Association teams in the USA	Counterproductive work behaviors	2	Archival data	N/A			Aggregate travel stress, Team concentration		
Thornton & Rupp (2016)	1	119 teams of undergraduate students in the USA	Organizational deviance	4	Archival data	N/A			Overall justice climate		Corporate social responsibility, Group moral identity
Trzebiatowski (2011)	1	47 teams of students in the USA	Cheating	4	Archival data	N/A				Pride, Shame, Guilt	Perceived similarity

Authors	Research design	Sample	Deviance label	Form of team deviance	Source of data for the deviance measure	Scale used to measure deviance	Same source	Time lag	Antecedents	Consequences	Moderators
Van Hooft & Van Mierlo (2018)	2	209 teams of undergraduate students in the Netherlands	Procrastination	1	Team members	Created scale based on prior measures	2	2	Team trait procrastination, Team learning-avoidance goal orientation, Team performance-avoidance goal orientation	Collective stress, Team performance	Team efficacy
Varella et al. (2012)	2	60 work groups across several companies in Canada and the USA	Group sanctioning behavior	3	Team members	Created scale	2	2	Socialized charismatic leadership	Instrumental network density, Group performance	Physical proximity
Yang (2016)	2	62 teams across several companies in service and manufacturing industries in China	Incivility climate	1	Team members	Bennett and Robinson (2000)	2	1		Teamwork behavior, Perceived support for innovation	
Zhang & Jia (2013)	2	117 departments across six banks in China	Unethical behavior	1	Managers	Akaah (1996)	2	1	Stretch goals		Interpersonal justice climate, Information justice climate

Note. For research design, 1 = experiment; 2 = field study; 3 = archival study. For form of team deviance, 1 = independent, internally-directed; 2 = independent, externally-directed; 3 = coordinated, internally-directed; 4 = coordinated, externally-directed. For same source, 1 = all variables measured by the same source; 2 = some or none of the variables were measured by the same source. For time lag, 1 = all variables were measured at the same time; 2 = some or none of the variables were measured at the same time.

Appendix 1

Terms Used in Literature Search

deviance
counterproductive work behavior
unethical behavior
unethical conduct
dysfunctional behavior
antisocial behavior
maladaptive behavior
bullying
gossip
misconduct
theft
sabotage
ostracism
piracy
cheating
lying
dishonesty
misrepresentation
deception
aggression
stealing
kickback
incivility
bribery
workplace violence
social exclusion
rejection
out-of-the-loop
discrimination

Author Biographies

Trevor Spoelma is an Assistant Professor of Management at the University of New Mexico. His research focuses on helping leaders effectively manage diverse teams and reduce the incidence and impact of deviant workplace behavior.

Tamanna Chauhan is a Research Assistant in the Department of Dermatology at the University of New Mexico. While pursuing her MS-ISA from the Anderson School of Management at UNM, her research focused on resilient supply chain, application of system thinking for sustainable operations strategy, and behavioral management.