Internet Appendix A140: Organisational Psychology

Pitcher's Name	Mylyn C. Dat	**FoR category**	Organisational Psychology	**Date Completed**	04/10/2016

(A) Working Title	Responding to jerks at work: When and why employees prefer to reintegrate or punish workplace offenders
(B) Basic Research Question	Does the organisational identification of those who observe workplace transgressions influence their willingness to reintegrate and/or punish workplace offenders and what are the mechanisms that explain why this occurs?
(C) Key paper(s)	Gromet, D. M., & Darley, J. M. (2009). Retributive and Restorative Justice: Importance of Crime Severity and Shared Identity in People's Justice Responses. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *61*(1), 50–57. doi.: 10.1080/00049530802607662 van Prooijen, J. W. (2006). Retributive reactions to suspected offenders: The importance of social categorizations and guilt probability. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(6), 715-726. doi: 10.1177/0146167205284964
(D) Motivation/Puzzle	Workplace transgressions happen every day and can lead to reduced employee productivity and engagement due to damaged interpersonal relationships. It is important for organisations to understand the factors that influence employees' responses to transgressions to facilitate the repair of these damaged relationships and minimise negative consequences. I aim to define the mechanisms that explain how observers' appraisals of a transgression result in responses to reintegrate and/or punish the offender and specify the boundary conditions that determine when a particular response (or combination of responses) is preferred. The literature has examined reintegration and punishment in isolation and has typically conflated the two as opposite ends of a bipolar scale. I aim to study reintegration and punishment as distinct constructs within the same project to determine whether the conflation of the two is accurate and test whether preferences to engage in each response may change over time following a transgression.
THREE	**Three** core aspects of any empirical research project i.e. the "**ID**io**T**s" guide
(E) Idea?	A predominant finding in the literature is that when observers' organisational identification is high (vs. low), this can amplify reintegrative responses when transgressions are seen as less wrongful (e.g., less severe and less intentional, or the offender has offered amends) and amplify punitive responses when transgressions is seen as more wrongful. I aim to consolidate explanations for why this happens. The literature has examined the explanatory role of contextual features such as transgression severity, emotions, cognitive judgements such as blame, and group dynamic features such as liking of the offender. But instead of looking at these explanations in isolation, my idea is to consolidate them into higher-level themes and then test the competing explanations. I aim to test whether an observer's response is offender-centric and shaped by observer cognitive evaluation about the offender and the certainty that they as the observer feel the offender is guilty or whether their response is about the degree of personal threat that they as the observer feel and the idea that they just want to respond in a way that allows them to deal this threat. This leads to a competing set of hypotheses: 1. When observers are high in organisational identification they will be more reintegrative when: 1a. information about the transgression leads them to giving the offender a lower judgment of guilt certainty, or 1b. they as the observer feel less threatened. 2. When observers are high in organisational identification they will be more punitive when: 2a. information about the transgression leads them to giving the offender a higher judgment of guilt certainty 2b. they as the observer feel more threatened.
(F) Data?	Self-reported quantitative and qualitative measures will be used in a correlational retrospective study, experimental scenario studies, and a correlational experience sampling method (ESM) study. Working US adults will be sampled via Amazon Mechanical Turk for the cross-sectional retrospective ($N = 400$) and scenario studies ($N = 240$ per study). A community sample of working Australian adults (minimum $N = 240$) will participate in the short-term longitudinal ESM study. Individuals are the unit of analysis for the first two sets of studies and the time points measured for each individual will be the unit of analysis for the ESM study.

	Common method variance is a potential limitation of using only self-reported measures; however self-report is the best way to measure participant's perceptions, which is what we are interested in. Missing data is unlikely to be an issue as the surveys for each study is designed to be short and easy to complete. Interest in each study will be measured as a statistical control for non-response error to allow for an interest-level analysis.
(G) Tools?	I will create and pilot-test new scales and experimental manipulations and use established scales from the literature that are psychometrically valid and reliable. Regression-based analyses using SPSS, PROCESS, and Mplus will test the hypothesised moderated mediation models using the quantitative data. Qualitative analysis using the Grounded Theory Approach will allow me to gain insights at each stage to best inform the design of subsequent studies.
TWO	**Two** key questions
(H) What's New?	The treatment of reintegration and punishment as distinct constructs will allow for the examination of unique underlying mechanisms and boundary conditions that lead to preferences to engage in a particular response. I will clarify when and why observers prefer reintegrative and/or punitive responses by examining the dynamic relationship between observers' organisation identification, the contextual features of a transgression, and response preference over time.
(I) So What?	The understanding gained will inform new organisational-level interventions to help individual employees respond in more constructive ways to offenders who commit transgressions.
ONE	**One** bottom line
(J) Contribution?	The project will facilitate richer understanding of when and why observers choose to reintegrate and/or punish offenders which will lead to interventions to help organisations maintain productivity, engagement, and healthy employee relationships following the inevitable and common occurrence of workplace transgressions.
(K) Other Considerations	No collaboration for data or tools required. Some feedback for the idea will be sought from leading researchers and practitioners in the field. Follow-up to the project to develop an organisational intervention will require industry partnership.

I will present at social and organisational psychology and management conferences and aim to publish in A and A* journals (based on where the key papers have been published). I'm also conscious about conducting high quality and meaningful research that allows me to present compelling and relevant findings at organisational psychology practitioner conferences and in practitioner newsletters to ensure that my research can be easily applied in practice.

No result risk is not an issue. Though I have initial hypotheses that have strong theoretical underpinnings, I am open to what the data will tell me. A richer understanding of reintegration and punishment that can lead to the creation of practical interventions that alleviate applied problems means that obsolescence is not an issue. Competitor risk is low due to strong established working relationships with other researchers in this area.

Ethical issues of anonymity, confidentiality, and informed consent have been addressed through the completely voluntary nature of participation, comprehensive explanation of study requirements, and lack of identifying information collected in the research. Ethical clearance has been obtained from the UQ School of Psychology Ethics Committee. |