The interplay of low identification, psychological detachment, and cynicism for predicting counterproductive work behaviour

Tong, Jiajin; Chong, SinHui; Chen, Jiayu; Johnson, Russell E.; Ren, Xiaopeng

2019

Tong, J., Chong, S., Chen, J., Johnson, R. E., & Ren, X. (2020). The interplay of low identification, psychological detachment, and cynicism for predicting counterproductive work behaviour. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 69(1), 59-92.
doi:10.1111/apps.12187

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/142905>

<https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12187>

© 2019 International Association of Applied Psychology. All rights reserved. This paper was published by Wiley in *Applied Psychology: An International Review* and is made available with permission of International Association of Applied Psychology.

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 07:24:02 SGT

Article type : Special Issue

**The Interplay of Low Identification, Psychological Detachment, and Cynicism for
Predicting Counterproductive Work Behavior**

Submission for the Special Issue: Why, when and for whom are resources beneficial

Running Head: HARMFUL PSYCHOLOGICAL DETACHMENT

Jiajin Tong

School of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences

Beijing Key Laboratory of Behavior and Mental Health

Peking University

tongttong@163.com

SinHui Chong

Division of Strategy, Management & Organisation

Nanyang Technological University

sinhui.chong@ntu.edu.sg

Jiayu Chen

School of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences

Beijing Key Laboratory of Behavior and Mental Health

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/apps.12187

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Peking University
chenjiayupku@163.com

Russell E. Johnson
Department of Management
Broad College of Business
Michigan State University
johnsonr@broad.msu.edu

Xiaopeng Ren
Key Laboratory of Behavior Sciences
Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences
renxp@Psych.ac.cn

Corresponding author:

Jiajin Tong,
School of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, Peking University,
Beijing 100871, China
Tel/fax: 86-10-62751830
E-mail address: tongttong@163.com

Funding: This work was supported by the National Natural Science Fund of China (No. 31400905 & No. 91324201), Foundation of Beijing Key Laboratory of Behavior and Mental Health (Z151100001615053), and Beijing Positive Psychology Foundation (#0020344).

Abstract

Prior research suggests that psychological detachment buffers the detrimental effects of negative work events and stressors on employees' subsequent performance and well-being. This, however, assumes that employees are motivated to reengage in their work following detachment, which may not always be true. Our paper examines the potential dark side of psychological detachment by exploring its moderating effects on the relationship of low organizational identification with counterproductive work behavior (CWB) via cynicism toward work. Based on self-discrepancy theory, we argue that detachment strengthens the link from low identification to cynicism because it reinforces the psychological distance of lowly identified employees with the organization and provides them with additional resources to more deeply reflect on their mismatch with their organization, thus generating stronger feelings of doubt and distrust that characterize cynicism. We also hypothesize that detachment strengthens the relation from cynicism to CWB, because detachment reinforces personal separation from work in cynical employees and because cynical employees may leverage their replenished resources to fuel deviant acts. Multi-wave data collected from two field samples support our hypotheses. We discuss the implications of our study and propose future research directions.

Keywords: Psychological detachment; Organizational identification; Cynicism;
Counterproductive work behavior; Self-discrepancy theory

Accepted Article

As employees experience a variety of work-related demands and stressors, successful functioning at work requires employees to establish some form of psychological distance from work and to replenish their cognitive, emotional, and physical resources when outside of the office by, for example, engaging in positive leisure and family activities (e.g., Sonnentag, 2001), exercising and eating a healthy diet (e.g., Neck & Cooper, 2000), and turning off work-related devices (e.g., Lanaj, Johnson, & Barnes, 2014). In particular, the extent to which employees can psychologically detach—that is, mentally and behaviorally disengage from work during off-hours—is a key contributor to prevent continued resource drain and to facilitate the replenishment of personal resources, which in turn improves well-being and productive work behaviors (Johnson, Lin, & Lee, 2018; Sonnentag, 2012).

To date, several studies have documented the beneficial role of psychological detachment, or “switching off,” for aiding employee recovery. One such role is that psychological detachment acts as a moderator to buffer the negative impact of job stressors and demands that deplete employees’ available resources (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). As Sonnentag and Fritz (2015, S92) pointed out, “letting go of work-related thoughts and mental representations of the job stressors [allows] the employee to recover from them and to rebuild psychological resources, thereby increasing well-being and reducing strain. As a result, psychological detachment should attenuate the negative relationship between job stressors and strain.” In support of this idea, psychological detachment has been shown to buffer, for example, the relations of workplace bullying with psychological strain (Moreno-Jiménez, Rodríguez-Munoz, Pastor, Sanz-Vergel, & Garrosa, 2009), of job demands with psychosomatic complaints (Sonnentag, Binnewies, & Mojza, 2010), and of relational conflict with poor well-being (Sonnentag, Unger, & Nägel, 2013).

Despite the accumulating evidence for its beneficial buffering properties, scholars have also highlighted the need for more research on the potential dark sides of psychological detachment. Existing research has taken some steps in addressing this. For example, Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate (2000) speculated that psychological detachment may strengthen the segregation between employees' work roles and nonwork roles, thus leaving them unmotivated to switch back to "work mode" when required. Related to this argument, some existing research found that employees' work engagement (Shimazu et al., 2016) and job performance (Fritz, Yankelevich, Zarubin, & Barger, 2010) were higher at an intermediate level of detachment than at extremely high levels of detachment. Empirical evidence of these detrimental main effects prompt the following question: Are the moderating effects of psychological detachment universally beneficial? The dearth of extant research that examines the potential dark side of psychological detachment as a moderator is a critical omission because it limits our ability to understand and predict when and how psychological detachment improves or worsens important employee outcomes.

We suspect psychological detachment has undesirable moderating effects that contribute to worse outcomes for employees experiencing self-discrepancies, which are represented by low organizational identification in the current research. We also argue that low organizational identification as a type of self-discrepancy is different from previously researched negative situations (e.g., relational conflict; see Sonnentag et al., 2013) because it implicates micro-role transitions (Ashforth et al., 2000). First, psychological detachment promotes a diversionary strategy to prevent resource drainage by amplifying the boundary between employees' work and non-work domains (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). However, the amplified boundary may make subsequent re-engagement in work more difficult (Ashforth et al., 2000). The discrepancy magnified by psychological detachment may also prevent people from thinking through and reconciling their misalignment with the organization, thus

worsening the effects of low organizational identification. Second, psychological detachment is desirable when employees invest their replenished resources in constructive ways at work (Sonnentag, 2012), but we challenge this view by asserting that psychological detachment can be ineffective or even destructive when employees' motivations are misaligned with those of the organization. In this case, disengagement from work can potentially provide people with a larger replenished reservoir of resources to reflect on their existing discrepancies with their organization and to further fuel cynical attitudes and counterproductive deeds.

Taking together, our study explores the possibility of whether psychological detachment bolsters the destructive acts of employees who have low organizational identification by taking a self-discrepancy theoretical perspective (Higgins, 1987). By low organizational identification, we mean employees who have not internalized the shared goals and values of their company and work colleagues, whose identities are not psychologically intertwined with those of work colleagues, and who do not derive self-worth from company successes. When employees do not identify with their company and coworkers, they perceive a discrepancy between their actual preferred self and how they are expected by their organization and colleagues to behave generally. According to Higgins (1987), individuals who possess this type of self-discrepancy are likely to experience doubt, mistrust, and resentment at work, which we argue are captured by cynicism (Abraham, 2000). To cope with this discomfort, individuals are likely to act in ways that help them reduce the self-discrepancy (Higgins, 1987). In this case, employees with low organizational identification may act in more counterproductive and deviant ways at work to establish their individuality and separateness from the organization (Jackson, Colquitt, Wesson, & Zapata-Phelan, 2006; Johnson & Saboe, 2011; Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012; Vadera & Pratt, 2013). Most importantly, Higgins (1987) also explained that "self-discrepancy [that] is

temporarily most accessible will be associated with [the] discomfort that people will suffer” (p. 324). Based on this notion and above arguments, we position psychological detachment as a dual-stage moderator in our model that accentuates the relations from low identification to cynicism, and from cynicism to counterproductive work behaviors (CWB).

We propose and test the moderated mediation model illustrated in Figure 1. This research offers three key contributions to the extant literature. First, it highlights a situation in which high psychological detachment is not associated with beneficial moderating functions for employees and companies, which answers calls (e.g., Sonnentag, 2012; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015) to provide a more balanced view of the pros and cons of both high and low detachment. It also sheds light on the complexity inherent in the construct of psychological detachment by suggesting that replenished resources (i.e., amount of energy) may not always be channeled into an adaptive outcome (i.e., direction of energy) unless guided by a constructive motivation. In other words, our research tests potential negative impact of resources (offered by high psychological detachment)—when people are not highly identifying with work—and highlights the value of paying attention to why, when, and for whom job resources are beneficial. Second, we contribute to the identity and identification literatures by highlighting one potential mechanism through which low identification with the organization leads to CWB, namely cynicism. To date, identity research has primarily focused on bivariate relations of low and high identification with behavior while overlooking explanatory mechanisms (e.g., Jackson et al., 2006; Johnson & Lord, 2010; Johnson & Saboe, 2011; Johnson et al., 2012). Doing so is unfortunate because knowledge of mechanisms carries important practical implications (e.g., the detrimental effects of low identification can be mitigated by interventions aimed at lessening employees’ cynicism). Third, we contribute to literature on CWB by suggesting a unique, complex contingency mechanism (i.e., dual-stage moderated mediation) based on self-discrepancy theory to explain the emergence of this

phenomena beyond conventionally used simple mediating mechanisms based on theories such as the self-control theory (e.g., Marcus & Schuler, 2004) and emotion-based theory (Yang & Diefendorff, 2009). Doing so enables us to simultaneously examine how multiple constructs interplay to predict CWB. In the next section, we explain why low identification with organization leads to cynicism toward work and ultimately CWB.

Low Identification with the Organization and its Consequences

Identification with the organization refers to the definition of one's self in terms of one's membership in the organization and the attachment of significance to the membership (Tajfel, 1982). In other words, identification consists of two components: "a cognitive one, in the sense of awareness of membership; and an evaluative one, in the sense that this awareness is related to some value connotations" (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; p. 328). When employees identify strongly with the organization, they see themselves as one with the organization, engage in more productive and prosocial behaviors, and are more psychologically and behaviorally present at work (e.g., Jackson et al., 2006; Johnson et al., 2010; Johnson & Saboe, 2011). Unfortunately, not all employees identify with their company and colleagues nor do they always ascribe personal meaning and significance to being an organizational member. According to self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987), employees with low organizational identification¹ perceive a lack of fit between their attributes or values with that endorsed or encouraged by the organization. This discrepancy leads lowly identified employees to experience related affective discomfort (Higgins, 1987), and their sense of

¹ What we are labeling as "low identification with the organization" is akin to weak organizational identification or weak work-based collective identity (see Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Becker, Tausch, Spears, & Christ, 2011; Glasford, Pratto, & Dovidio, 2008; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkina, & Solheim, 2009; Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010; van Knippenberg, 2000).

autonomy suffers (Ryan & Deci, 2000), which we argue parallel what is commonly defined as cynicism.

Cynicism toward work refers to callous and excessively disinterested responses to various aspects of one's job (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001), and it is typically characterized by disillusionment and distrust (Andersson & Bateman, 1997). According to Dean, Brandes, and Dharwadkar (1998), cynicism is an attitude that encompasses various negative and contemptuous beliefs about the job (e.g., "My work tasks are pointless" and "Accomplishing work activities only serves the interest of the company"). It also includes a constellation of emotions ranging from distress and shame to contempt and anger, and is characterized by behavioral tendencies and impulses to exhibit disparaging and harmful actions toward the targeted agent.

We hypothesize a positive relationship from low organizational identification to cynicism. It should first be noted that (low) organizational identification is distinct from cynicism. In particular, identification refers to the evaluation and perception of fit between one's self and the organization (Ashforth et al., 2008), while cynicism refers to a psychological state characterized by negative emotions and distrust (Dean et al., 1998). It is possible for an employee to have high organizational identification yet experience some cynicism. For example, one who identified with the organization well may find some tasks meaningful while others cynical in one's job. However, overall, we expect a positive relationship to exist between low organizational identification and cynicism due to the following reasons. First, self-discrepancy theory postulates that people are motivated to reach a condition of match to reduce discomfort such as avoiding sanctions (e.g. punishment) caused by violation of prescribed duties and obligations (Higgins, 1978). Although employees with low organizational identification perceive a cognitive and affective difference between themselves and the identity, values, and goals of the organization and

their colleagues, they are nonetheless still members of the organization with required role responsibilities to fulfill and prescribed organizational norms to obey to avoid punishment. Guided by this controlled motivation, lowly identified employees may find it difficult to derive meaningfulness from their work because fulfilling required role responsibilities helps realize the values and goals of the companies and their colleagues rather than that of their own. Second, lowly identified employees will come to see their work efforts and behaviors as being externally motivated and controlled (e.g., to avoid sanctions, see Higgins, 1978). When work activities are viewed as controlled and externally coerced, it triggers unfavorable beliefs and attitudes about the work as well as negative reactions like anger and resentment. Self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1978) predicts that individuals who experience own versus ought other (i.e., organization and colleagues) discrepancies are vulnerable to agitation-related emotions (e.g., anger, fear) and feelings of resentment, which are embodied in cynicism. Finally, it has been empirically suggested that lowly identified employees adopt a cynical attitude as a coping mechanism because cynicism allows them to take on an opposing cognitive stance (i.e., distrust, skepticism) toward their organizations and empowers them as they do so (Bolton, Harvey, Grawitch, & Barber, 2012; Maslach et al., 2001).

Taken together, we expect low identification, a cognitive evaluation of the overlap of one's self with the organization, to be positively related to the experience of cynicism toward work.

Hypothesis 1: Low identification with the organization will be positively related to cynicism toward work.

We also draw from the self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987) to predict a positive relationship from cynicism to CWB. CWB is a general term for volitional behavior that harms the legitimate interests of organizations or its constituents, such as coworkers and

clients or customers (Spector et al., 2006). It includes both proactive destructive acts and withdrawal behaviors (Dalal, 2005; Lin & Johnson, 2018). Employees may engage in active CWB like sabotaging work attempts or gossiping about the organization or coworkers in order to redress their feelings of distrust and inequity toward the organization, and passive CWB such as procrastination or loafing to re-establish a sense of control over their work environment (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006; Matta, Erol-Korkmaz, Johnson, & Bicaksiz, 2014).

Consistent with the self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987), the cynicism experienced by employees signals and reminds them of the discrepancy and distance between their actual preferred self and how they are expected to behave at work. Cynicism can be reflected in employees' everyday job tasks through both cognitive and affective reactions, and goes beyond a general cognitive appraisal of the misalignment between themselves and their organizations embodied by perceived organizational identification. We contend that this discrepancy will trigger counterproductive behaviors as a means for enabling employees to address the misalignment. First, employees who have a cynical attitude tend to be distrustful of the organization, and will be less likely to act in the interest of the organization (Andersson & Bateman, 1997). This divergence from pro-organizational and expected behaviors can potentially help them act in a way that is more consistent with their actual self. Second, due to the distrust they bear toward the organization, cynical employees are less likely to tie their personal welfare to that of the organization (Jackson et al., 2006; Johnson & Saboe, 2011). This reduces the personal costs associated with CWB for them, and removes the deterrents for behaving defiantly. Finally, the experience of cynicism coincides with negative emotions and behavioral tendencies, more specifically feelings of inequity and doubt toward the organization. Therefore, cynicism is likely to undermine employees' sense of reciprocal obligation toward the organization and increases their tendency to engage in reactive

behaviors that are destructive or disobliging, such as aggression or withholding of work effort, to get even with the organization (Andersson, 1996).

In short, enacting CWB is a potential mechanism through which cynical employees redress their self-discrepancy (Andersson, 1996; Brockner, 1988). From a cognitive perspective, exhibiting CWB can increase perpetrators' sense of control because such behavior is not rewarded or otherwise encouraged by others, thus the locus of causality clearly resides in the perpetrator. This is in line with the argument put forth by scholars (e.g., Byrne & Hochwarter, 2008; Chiaburu, Peng, Oh, Banks, & Lomeli, 2013) that cynicism is more strongly related to discretionary work behaviors than in-role task performance due to the volitional nature of the former. From an affective perspective, CWB is an emotion-focused coping strategy for acting out and purging negative emotions related to cynicism (Krischer, Penney, & Hunter, 2010). Therefore, we hypothesize that cynicism will be positively related to CWB.

Hypothesis 2: Cynicism toward work will be positively related to CWB.

The Role of Psychological Detachment for Moderating the Indirect Relation of Low Identification with CWB

Thus far, we have proposed that low identification with the organization increases the likelihood that employees will feel cynicism toward their work, and in turn exhibit CWB. However, the likelihood that employees will process and act on their levels of low identification with the organization and cynicism with their work may vary across individuals. For example, Lai, Chan, and Lam (2013) demonstrated that job status moderates the relationship of organizational disidentification with employees' turnover intention, such

that the relation is less negative among employees with high job status. They explained that it could be because employees with a higher job status were more embedded in the organizational network than those with a lower job status. Such findings suggest that there are individual-level factors can moderate the relations of employees' low organizational identification and cynicism with their subsequent negative work behaviors. Therefore, we continue building on the premises of the self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987) to justify our perspective that psychological detachment will exacerbate the conversion of low identification and cynicism to CWB.

Psychological detachment—mentally and behaviorally disengaging from work during off-hours—involves abstaining from job-related tasks during off-job time (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Psychological detachment helps to prevent continued resource drain through diverting employees' attention away from the stressors (i.e., diversion) (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007) and to facilitate the replenishment of personal resources (i.e., regeneration) (Sonnentag, 2012). The diversion from work offered by psychological detachment helps to reinforce a boundary between employees and their organization, and is often lauded as a crucial aspect of recovery process for employees (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005; Sonnentag et al. 2010). However, the theory of micro-role transitions (Ashforth et al., 2000) suggests that psychological detachment after work may in fact indemnify and reinforce the psychological distance between employees' work and non-work domains, thus making it more difficult for employees to reengage. Based on this, we expect psychological detachment will strengthen the positive relation of low identification with cynicism.

In addition, employees' sense of having a low identification is especially salient when they are focused on self-referenced values and beliefs that are incongruent with those of the organization (Tajfel, 1982). In cases where employees are focused on more concrete information pertaining to their immediate work tasks and goals, they will be less aware of

their high-level values and beliefs and whether or not those values and beliefs are discrepant from those of the organization. Given that many jobs and work contexts place high cognitive demands on employees, it is expected that employees' default level of attention at work will be on lower-level goals rather than higher-level self-referenced information (Cropanzano, James, & Citera, 1993). It requires mental effort to think at higher, abstract levels that transcend specific work tasks and goals. As people's attention moves up this hierarchy, they engage in more meta-cognitive processing by thinking about "why" they perform the work tasks and whether and how those work tasks are consistent with personal values and beliefs (Johnson, Chang, & Lord, 2006).

Therefore, we argue that the regeneration process of psychological detachment will provide employees with the attentional resources to reflect on their organizational identification (or the lack thereof). This is a unique perspective which diverges from past research that typically argues for the benefits of replenishing resources (Fritz et al., 2010). Our distinctive stand is motivated by an understanding that resources can be evaluated in two dimensions: amount of energy and direction of energy (see Schippers & Hogenes, 2011). We contend that psychological detachment restores the amount of energy that employees have, but does not help to direct this energy in a constructive manner unless employees already possess motivation to act adaptively. In our case, employees have already made an appraisal of their organizational identification, so we argue that psychological detachment will provide replenished resources to reflect on their lack of identification, thus making it more salient and impactful.

Our stand is consistent with self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987), which notes that when there is misalignment, having additional attentional resources may cause employees to become more aware of their low identification by focusing their attention on meta-cognitive self-referenced information. In this case, psychological detachment provides employees with

sufficient attentional resources to contrast self-referenced information with the values and beliefs espoused by the organization, making any discrepancies between them more noticeable. This greater accessibility and salience of their low identification will accentuate employees' unfavorable reactions and doubts toward what is expected of them by the organization (viz., their level of cynicism). In short, because psychological detachment strengthens the partition between lowly identified employees and their organization and also regenerates attentional resources for reflecting on this mismatch, we expect that low identification will have a stronger positive relation with cynicism when psychological detachment is higher.

Hypothesis 3: The positive relation of low identification with cynicism will be moderated by psychological detachment, such that this relation is stronger when detachment is high (vs. low).

Similarly, we expect that psychological detachment will moderate the relation of cynicism with CWB. As mentioned earlier, cynicism is an attitude that involves disinterested and skeptical appraisals of one's work (Maslach et al., 2001). High cynicism coincides with desires and intentions to exhibit disparaging and harmful acts toward the targets of cynicism (in this case, one's job). We suspect that this process is strengthened by psychologically detaching. According to micro-role transitions theory (Ashforth et al., 2000), this accentuated cynicism and reinforced psychological distance offered by psychological detachment is likely to reinforce employees' self-discrepancy and fuel CWB (e.g., acting in the interest of self rather than the job to redress negative feelings related to discrepancy discomfort). For example, because CWB is detrimental for one's work, employees must feel sufficiently detached from the job to believe that the costs (e.g., interpersonal associated with their acts) of CWB will not spill back to themselves. In line with this idea, Nair and Kamalanabhan (2010) found cynicism to be positively related to unethical work behaviors only in junior

managers but not middle and senior managers. They argued that this is because middle and senior managers are more embedded in their organization. Putting it in the context of the current research, lowly identified employees who are more psychologically detached, hence whose psychological distance between themselves and their work is particularly salient, are more likely to perceive lower costs associated with CWB for themselves and enact them with little concern.

In addition, cynicism may not always lead to CWB because cynical employees may want to reduce their skepticism and distrust toward the organization instead of behaving in a deviant manner (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006). The reduction of cynicism can be achieved through greater cognitive engagement that helps employees reevaluate and resolve their differences from their organizations (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006). This is however more difficult if employees are psychologically detached because detachment strengthens the segregation between employees from their work and organization, and lowers their chances of reconciling their differences and integrating their values with those of the organization. Psychological detachment also makes it more difficult for employees to switch back to their work mode (Ashforth et al., 2000), thus increasing the likelihood of them engaging in behaviors such as procrastination, absenteeism, or loafing, all of which are passive acts of CWB as well.

Finally, employees also need to think about how they can act out these intentions in ways that minimizes personal risk and potential retaliation (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). Doing so involves a variety of cognitive-demanding activities, such as perspective taking (e.g., anticipating how others will respond to one's CWB), task switching (e.g., redirecting attention away from work activities to discretionary activities), consideration of constraints (i.e., determining the feasibility of various CWBs), and emotion regulation (e.g., channeling overt emotions like anger into discretionary CWB). The self-discrepancy theory (Higgins,

1987) posits that psychological detachment provides employees with available attentional resources and more meta-cognitive ability to think of how to establish their individuality from the work they distance from. Therefore, we expect psychological detachment to replenish resources that can then fuel their readiness and ability to enact CWB for asserting their distance from their work. In contrast, lack of psychological detachment, and thus recovery, outside of work limits employees' available resources and lessens the likelihood that cynicism will translate into actual behavior. Considering all of the above arguments, we therefore propose that psychological detachment will strengthen the link from cynicism to counterproductive behavior.

Hypothesis 4: The positive relation of cynicism with CWB will be moderated by psychological detachment, such that this relation is stronger when detachment is high (vs. low).

Considering Hypotheses 1 and 2 as a set, they suggest that low identification with the organization will have a positive indirect relation with CWB via the mediating mechanism of cynicism toward work. Moreover, Hypotheses 3 and 4 suggest that this indirect relation will be moderated by psychological detachment, such that (a) low identification will be more likely to lead to cynicism, and (b) cynicism will be more likely to trigger CWB when employees psychologically detach from work when away from the office. Detaching from work can help employees recover and subsequently be more engaged on the job (e.g., Fritz et al., 2010) so long as they feel connected to their organization and work tasks. However, if they perceive a self–organization discrepancy, then psychological detachment may actually fuel CWB by strengthening the effects of low identification and cynicism.

Hypothesis 5: The indirect relation of low identification with CWB via cynicism is moderated by psychological detachment, such that this relation is stronger when detachment is high (vs. low).

The present research aims to capture the dark side of psychological detachment by exploring its moderating effect on the relationship between low identification with the organization and CWB via cynicism toward work. We used a multi-wave design (i.e., measures separated in time corresponding to causal ordering) and two diverse samples to examine our moderated mediation model. The two samples both entail high demanding jobs, thus psychological detachment and recovery are key in order for participants to achieve successful performance.

Method

Participants and Procedure

We used snowball sampling to recruit two field samples to test our hypothesized moderated mediation model. Our first sample was recruited with the support of an entrepreneur who ran a business selling educational software to universities across China. The sales representatives of this software business, hailing from 29 provinces, sent out survey links to invite psychological consultants and class counselors in universities to participate in our research (Sample 1). Our second sample was recruited with the support of the CEO of a management consulting company. We sent out survey links to all the clients of the consulting company, who came from 24 provinces in China, and invited each client to recruit several white-collar employees from their own company to participate in our research (Sample 2).

In Sample 1, a total of 243 psychological consultants and class counselors from a variety of universities participated. Participants ranged in age from 23 to 59 years ($M = 33.6$, $SD = 5.7$), with an average tenure of 92.9 months ($SD = 72.0$) in the present job. In this sample, 45% were male and 74% were married. In terms of education level, 24% of the participants reported having a bachelor's degree or below, and 76% had a graduate's degree or beyond. In Sample 2, a total of 139 white-collar employees from a variety of firms participated in this research. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 52 years ($M = 30.1$, $SD = 5.1$), with an average tenure of 60.2 months ($SD = 51.6$) in the present job. In this sample, 38% were male and 65% were married. In terms of education level, 74% of the participants reported having a bachelor's degree or below, 26% had a graduate's degree or beyond.

All variables were self-reported by participants in two waves to introduce a temporal lag, which is effective for reducing common method bias (Johnson, Rosen, & Djurdjevic, 2011; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Participants reported their low identification with organization and demographic information (i.e., age, gender, education level, job tenure, and marriage status) at Wave 1. One week later, we sent participants the Wave 2 survey. Participants had one week to complete this second survey, thus constructing an interval of one to two weeks between the Wave 1 and Wave 2 surveys. Cynicism, CWB, and psychological detachment were measured at Wave 2. In Sample 1, we sent out 965 surveys and received 449 valid responses back (a response rate of 46%) at Wave 1; and we sent out 449 surveys and received 243 valid responses back (a response rate of 54%) at Wave 2. In Sample 2, we sent out 635 surveys and received 323 valid responses back (a response rate of 51%) at Wave 1; and we sent out 323 surveys and received 139 valid responses back (a response rate of 43%) at Wave 2.

Measures

Low identification with organization was measured using a 14-item scale adopted from Van de Vliert, Yang, Wang, and Ren's (2013) psychological collectivist orientation scale. Employees were asked to rate the items according to their experiences and relationship at work. We reverse scored responses such that higher scores represent greater low identification with organization. Sample items are "What is good for my organization is also good for me" <reverse scored>, "It is my duty to defend the reputation of my organization" <reverse scored>, and "I cannot think of myself without relating myself to work colleagues" <reverse scored> (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Cronbach alphas were .85 (Sample 1) and .81 (Sample 2).

Several scholars have suggested that collectivism is synonymous with identification with a social group, where individuals who report higher collectivism perceive greater overlap between their self and the group (Jones & Volpe, 2011; Mukherjee, Hanlon, Kedia, & Srivastava, 2012). Past research has also established high correlations between measures of collectivism with identification or fit of values between employees and their organizations (Jetten, Postmes, & McAuliffe, 2002; Robert & Wasti, 2002). Nevertheless, we conducted a pilot study to compare scores from this measure with those from a direct measure of disidentification adapted from Bhattacharya and Elsbach (2002). Items from this latter scale were "The organization's failures are my successes," "When someone praises the organization, it feels like a personal insult," and "When someone criticizes the organization, it feels like a personal compliment." We administered the reverse scored identification scale ($\alpha = .83$) and the direct disidentification scale ($\alpha = .87$) to a sample of 95 employed participants enrolled in an online MBA course of a large Midwestern university (scale order was counterbalanced). Participants responded to the items via a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The scores on the two scales were highly correlated (r

= .81, $p < .01$), which indicates that scores on our focal measure reflect low identification with the organization.

Cynicism was measured using the 5-item subscale of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). A sample item is “I doubt the significance of my work” (1 = never, 7 = every day). Cronbach alphas were .90 (Sample 1) and .88 (Sample 2).

CWB was measured using a 10-item scale adapted from Spector and colleagues (Fox & Spector, 1999; Spector et al., 2006). Items were selected on the basis of the content and type of CWB, including withdrawal, production deviance, and abuse (Spector et al., 2006), and covering both organizational and interpersonal forms (Fox & Spector, 1999). We did not include sabotage and theft items because these behaviors have a near-zero base-rate in our target samples. Sample items are “Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you were not,” “Purposely did your work incorrectly,” and “Started an argument with someone at work.” Participants rated the items on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = never, 7 = every day). Because many CWBs are covert in nature and are comparable with other-reports, it was deemed acceptable to use self-reports in this case (see Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012). Factor analysis results revealed that a 1-factor solution fit the data best, accounting for 69.2% (Sample 1) and 68.2% (Sample 2) of the variance in the set of items. Cronbach alphas were .95 (Sample 1) and .94 (Sample 2).

Psychological detachment was measured using a 4-item scale developed by Sonnentag and Fritz (2007). Participants rated the extent to which they psychologically detach from work when away from the office. A sample item is “I do not think about work at all” (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Cronbach alphas were .79 (Sample 1) and .84 (Sample 2).

Results

Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and inter-correlations among the focal variables are reported in Table 1. Prior to testing hypotheses, we first evaluated the fit of the measurement model. Due to small sample sizes, three item parcels (see Mathieu & Farr, 1991) were computed for each latent construct that was measured with at least 10 items (i.e., low identification with organization and CWB). The 4-factor measurement model showed good fit in both Sample 1 ($\chi^2 = 147.58$, $df = 84$, RMSEA = .056, CFI = .97, SRMR = .045) and Sample 2 ($\chi^2 = 145.42$, $df = 84$, RMSEA = .07, CFI = .95, SRMR = .06). This model fit the data better than all other constrained models in which any two of the four factors were combined ($255.86 \leq \Delta\chi^2[\Delta df=3] \leq 767.70$ for Sample 1; $71.54 \leq \Delta\chi^2[\Delta df=3] \leq 403.76$ for Sample 2). These results provide discriminant validity evidence for the focal variables in our *a priori* model.

Tests of the Hypothesized Mediation Model

Our mediation model was tested using Process (Template 4; Hayes, 2013) after controlling for five demographic variables (i.e., age, gender, education level, tenure in present job, and marriage status). The unstandardized coefficient estimates are presented in Table 2 (Model 1). Predictors included in the mediation model (Model 1) accounted for 6.7% and 10.8% of the variance in cynicism, and 22.2% and 34.3% of the variance in CWB in Samples 1 and 2, respectively. In support of Hypothesis 1, low identification with work was positively related to cynicism ($\beta_s = .29$ and $.36$, $ps < .05$). In support of Hypothesis 2, cynicism was positively related to CWB ($\beta_s = .25$ and $.42$, $ps < .001$). Also suggested by our model is that low identification with organization has an indirect relation with CWB via cynicism, which we observed in both samples: .07 ($SE = .03$) with a 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence

interval (CI) of [.025, .156] in Sample 1, and .15 ($SE = .07$) with a 95% bias-corrected bootstrap CI of [.030, .313] in Sample 2.

Tests of the Hypothesized Moderated Mediation Model

We tested the moderated mediation model in which psychological detachment functions as both a Stage 1 and a Stage 2 moderator using Process (Template 58; Hayes, 2013) after controlling for demographic variables.² Since new interactions would be computed, the independent, mediator, and moderator variables were centered before entering into the regression model. As summarized in Table 2, this model (Model 2) accounted for 8.9% and 16.8% of the variance in cynicism, and 27.0% and 40.9% of the variance in CWB in Samples 1 and 2, respectively. The first stage interaction effect of low identification with detachment was positively related to cynicism ($Bs = .14$ and $.32$, $ps < .05$), which signifies that the positive relationship of low identification with cynicism is stronger for employees who reported high (vs. low) levels of psychological detachment (see Figure 2), consistent with Hypothesis 3. Similarly, Hypothesis 4 was also supported because the second stage interaction effect of cynicism with detachment predicted CWB ($Bs = .08$ and $.15$, $ps < .01$). Specifically, the positive relationship of cynicism with CWB was stronger when employees reported high (vs. low) psychological detachment (see Figure 3).

We used an online calculator developed by Preacher, Curran, and Bauer (2006) to estimate simple slopes. As indicated in Table 3, the relationship of low identification with cynicism was significant at median and high levels of detachment (simple slopes = .29 and

² To alleviate concern regarding our use of a psychological collectivist orientation scale for capturing low identification with the organization, we conducted a robustness check by using a subset of six items from this scale that more explicitly tap into organizational identification to run our analyses. The patterns and significance of the results remained similar, thus we report results based on the original 14-item scale in our main text.

.47 in Sample 1, and .36 and .81 in Sample 2, $ps < .05$), but not at a low level of detachment (simple slope = .11 and -.08 in Samples 1 & 2, respectively, $ps > .05$). The relationship of cynicism with CWB was stronger under median and high levels of detachment (simple slopes = .24 and .34 in Sample 1, and .41 and .61 in Sample 2, $ps < .001$) compared to a low level of detachment (simple slope = .14 in Sample 1, $p < .01$; simple slope = .20, $p > .05$, in Sample 2).³ Hypothesis 5 was supported across both samples because higher levels of detachment amplify the positive relations of low identification with cynicism at Stage 1, and of cynicism with CWB at Stage 2.

Discussion

Psychological detachment during off-work hours has frequently been demonstrated in past research to be beneficial because it prevents continued resource drain and helps employees replenish attentional resources (e.g., Lanaj et al., 2014) to buffer them from the negative impact of job stressors and demands (e.g., Sonnentag et al., 2013; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2015). This, however, assumes that employees identify with the values and goals of their company and work. What happens when this is not the case? We explored the potential negative moderating effects of resources replenished by high (vs. low) psychological detachment for employees who are not highly identifying with work, thus addressing when, why, and for whom resources can be disadvantageous. Our results from both studies revealed that psychological detachment amplified the positive relationships of (a) low identification

³ We acknowledge that the slope between cynicism and CWBs at low (-1SD) of psychological detachment is significant in Sample 1 but not in Sample 2. One potential reason is the larger number of participants in Sample 1, which made the small effect size more significant.

with employees' cynical beliefs toward their work, and (b) cynicism with employees' CWB.

We discuss the implications of these findings for theory and practice below.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

One important theoretical implication of our study is that it indicates the nature of psychological detachment by highlighting an instance where high psychological detachment may be less desirable or even harmful as a moderator when faced with certain negativities of misalignment. Specifically, our findings demonstrate that high psychological detachment during off-work hours predisposes employees with low organizational identification to experience greater cynicism toward work and to enact more CWB. This pattern of effects may have occurred because detaching from work strengthens the "mental boundary" between self and the organization/work (self-discrepancy; see Higgins, 1987) and makes the re-engagement more difficult during micro-role transitions (Ashforth et al., 2000). Meanwhile, the resources replenished from psychological detachment enables lowly-identified employees to engage in high-level meta-cognitive processing and become more aware of the separation of their self with their organization and work. It may also be channeled into the performance of CWB to establish their individuality from the organization or as a response to their cynicism toward work. In demonstrating these relationships, we respond to Sonnentag's (2012) call for studies to investigate situations where detachment may be detrimental. First, our findings uncovered a situation under which psychological detachment may have an undesirable moderating effect and in doing so help to shed light onto the complexity inherent in this construct that was often overlooked by previous research. In particular, psychological detachment may be an important recovery process in terms of diverting employees' attention away from job stressors and replenishing their resources, but whether this recovery is

ultimately beneficial or not may depend on employees' existing identification with the organization (i.e., self-discrepancy). Without proper reconciliation, self-discrepancy would become most salient with the amplified boundary and the replenishment of the amount of energy (Higgins, 1987), thus leading to even more dire outcomes as demonstrated in this current research. This perspective offers a more balanced view on the functions of psychological detachment based on theories of self-discrepancy (Higgins, 1987) and micro-role transitions (Ashforth et al., 2000). Second, our research also offers certain evidence of the classification of amount and direction of energy as argued in previous research (Schipper & Hogenes, 2011).

Our moderated mediation model also explicates a mediating pathway through which low organizational identification relates to CWB and extends the theories explaining the emergence of CWB. In particular, we build on the self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987) to show that employees develop negative and distrustful beliefs, affect, and behavioral tendencies toward their work, as reflected in cynicism. Exploring the explanatory mechanism (namely, cynicism) through which low identification with one's organization leads to CWB, contributes to the existing identity and identification literatures focusing mainly on bivariate relations (e.g., Jackson et al., 2006; Johnson & Lord, 2010; Johnson & Saboe, 2011; Johnson et al., 2012). Moreover, we extend existing research in CWB which primarily emphasizes emotion-based (e.g., Yang & Diefendorff, 2009) or self-focused cognition-based (e.g., self-control theory; see Marcus & Schuler, 2004) mediating mechanisms, and brings attention to a more balanced mechanism encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements represented by cynicism. Our dual-stage moderated mediation model, as informed by the self-discrepancy theory, also provides a contingency mechanism that helps to explain the emergence of CWB.

Moreover, our research advances theorizing in the cynicism literature. In their meta-analysis on employee cynicism, Chiaburu et al. (2013) noted that they were unable to meta-analyze the relationship between cynicism and CWB due to a severe lack of studies that have considered such relationships. In examining cynicism as a critical link between low organizational identification and CWB, we took a step toward resolving this issue. Our results also suggest that antecedents of cynicism extend beyond traits like negative affectivity (Byrne & Hochwarter, 2008) and organizational characteristics like procedural justice (Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, & Walker, 2007), and involve a more complex cognitive evaluation (i.e., low identification) of how much employees perceive their motivations to be aligned with those of the organization. These findings should hopefully open new avenues of research for scholars interested in employee cynicism.

For practitioners, our research indicates that recovery strategies may not be universally effective. Organizations with employees with low organizational identification may want to focus their efforts into interventions that help to increase employee identification, such as aligning values and nurturing an inclusive culture, rather than encouraging them to detach from work in order to recover. Doing so should help to prevent or reduce CWB from its root of low identification. Practitioners who are dealing with employee cynicism, which is common during times of organizational change (Reichers, Wanous, & Austin, 1997), should also be informed by our findings that one effective way to address employee cynicism is to reduce low organizational identification. This can perhaps be achieved by recalibrating and aligning motivations between the organization and the employees, and actively soliciting feedback from employees during the change process, especially those with low organizational identification, with the hope that such involvement will encourage them to think of constructive ways to reconcile their low identification instead of psychologically detaching themselves during off-work hours.

Limitations

As with any research, the present research has limitations. First, all of the focal variables were assessed via self-reports, which we did because the focal participants are in the best position to evaluate their own identification, cynicism, and psychological detachment. Self-reports of CWB may also be necessary because other people may not always witness the occurrence of CWB in cases where perpetrators act in covert ways that carry less personal risk (Robinson & Bennett, 1997). The use of self-reports may mean, however, that observed relationships are influenced to some degree by common method variance (CMV; see Spector & Brannick, 2009). To mitigate this possibility, we measured the predictor at Wave 1 and the mediator, moderator, and outcome at Wave 2. Temporal separation is an effective procedural remedy for reducing CMV (Johnson et al., 2011; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Nevertheless, we acknowledge that it would have been ideal to also separate the measurement of the mediator and outcome variables, which we were unable to do for practical and logistical considerations (e.g., attrition rates increase with the number of data collection waves). While CMV may be somewhat of a concern for the direct relationships among low identification, cynicism, and CWB in our model, there is suggestive theoretical and empirical evidence that hints at the presence of these relationships (e.g., Bolton et al., 2012; Jackson et al., 2006). Also, our main focus was on the moderating role of psychological detachment and CMV does not give rise to spurious interaction effects (Evans, 1985; Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010). Thus, we are confident in the moderating effects involving psychological detachment that we observed in the two samples.

A second limitation is our lack of a direct measure of attentional resources. We predicted that psychological detachment would play a moderating role because it prevents continued resource drainage and facilitates the replenishment of employees' attentional resources, and when employees have sufficient resources, they are more likely to be aware of

their level of identification and more likely to act on deviant tendencies that underlie cynicism. We did not, however, directly measure attentional resources, but rather inferred it from employees' level of psychological detachment. Although resources were not directly assessed, previous research confirms that high levels of psychological detachment are associated with greater resources and less depletion and mental fatigue (e.g., Johnson et al., 2018; Lanaj et al., 2014; Sonnentag et al., 2010). Nevertheless, future research that measures resources in conjunction with psychological detachment would be informative.

A third limitation is that we sampled from two occupations that involve highly demanding jobs. In Sample 1, the psychologists and counselors from a variety of universities experience high demands from resolving severe problems (e.g., suicide intervention, interpersonal conflicts), quickly responding to emergencies, maintaining security and stability, and feedback meetings with parents and students. In Sample 2, the white-collar employees from various firms (e.g., financial, real estate, and telecom) also tend to experience high demands owing to work overload, tele-pressure, and high accountability (Barber & Santuzzi, 2015). Given the high job demands in our two samples, the effects of psychological detachment that we observed likely reflect upper bound estimates. That is, the employees in our sample had much to gain from psychologically detaching. In less demanding jobs, employees may typically have larger pools of attentional resources available to them, thus reducing the impact of detachment. Most jobs, however, are highly demanding and a majority of employees report at least moderate levels of stress while at workday (American Psychological Association, 2012). Thus, our findings are likely to generalize to employees in other occupations.

Finally, this research was conducted in a single societal context (i.e., China), thus there may be concerns regarding the generalizability of our findings to alternative cultures. It is possible that certain cultural dimensions, such as power distance or collectivism, may

moderate the hypothesized relationships in our model. We do not currently know of any empirical evidence that suggests cross-cultural differences in our hypothesized psychological mechanisms. In fact, various research that examined relationships between disidentification and CWB found similar rather than different relationships between these variables in Chinese (Lai et al., 2013) and American (Bolton et al., 2012) samples. However, we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that culture may serve to moderate these relationships. For example, Abrams, Ando, and Hinkle (1998) found the correlation between organizational identification and turnover intentions to be more negative in Japan (i.e., collectivistic culture) than in Britain (i.e., individualistic culture). They speculated that employees in collectivistic cultures possess a higher need for affiliation and are thus more likely to leave an organization when they perceive low identification with it. In short, there appear to be evidences for both sides of the arguments, thus we encourage future attempts to replicate this study in alternative cultural contexts to more systematically evaluate the generalizability of our findings.

Future Research

In the present study, we explored the between-person relationship among individual low identification with organization and CWB via cynicism toward work, and the moderating effects of psychological detachment in above relationship. However, the extent to which employees' low organizational identification is salient may vary from one day to the next due to fluid interactions of employees with the organization and coworkers (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). Employees' cynicism toward work may also readily fluctuate within-person due to its volatile affective component (Dunford, Shipp, Boss, Angermeier, & Boss, 2012). Related to the within-person dynamic nature of low identification and cynicism, Conway and Briner (2002) noted that whether an employee's motivations are aligned with the

organization's is dependent on the employee's expectations and past exchanges with the organization, and that new events can occur which affect the employee's identification to the organization and daily negative emotional responses. Applied to our context, this suggests the value of taking a within-person daily approach to studying the relations of low identification with CWB via cynicism. Similarly, previous research has shown that the extent to which employees detach from work in the evening (e.g., Hülshager, Lang, Depenbrock, Fehrman, Zijlstra, & Alberts, 2014; Lanaj et al., 2014) and their level of resources at work (e.g., Gabriel, Koopman, Rosen, & Johnson, 2018; Lanaj, Johnson, & Wang, 2016; Lin, Ma, & Johnson, 2016) vary from one day to the next. Given the potential of these variables to exhibit daily variances, future research would benefit from replicating our research using experience sampling designs to capture their dynamic nature and to better determine whether our findings generalize to the daily context.

We explored the dark side of psychological detachment as a moderator by providing evidence that refueling the resources of low identified employees led to greater cynicism and CWB. Low organizational identification is but one example where employees are motivated to act in ways that run counter to organizational goals and values. Future research could explore other cases when this can happen, such as when employees perceive identification-based misfit with their work environment (e.g., misfit with their organization or supervisor; Jackson & Johnson, 2012; Johnson & Jackson, 2009). Misfit may exhibit a similar effect as disidentification because when employees perceive misfit, their competence, autonomy, and relatedness needs cannot be satisfied, thereby harming their sense of self-determination (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and prompting cynicism (e.g., Tong, Wang, & Peng, 2015) and destructive behaviors (e.g., Sharkawi, Rahim, & Dahalan, 2013). However, it is also possible that misfit functions differently from low identification because employees may perceive differences and opposites as complementary (e.g., Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, &

Stevens, 2008) and exhibit positive and adaptive reactions as a result. In addition, although we drew on the concept of “self-discrepancy” for developing our hypotheses, and represented discrepancy using low organizational identification in the current study, we acknowledge that there are various ways to operationalize and examine self-discrepancy. For example, Moretti and Higgins (1990) recommended the use of a self-esteem measure to assess self-discrepancy. Future research would benefit from exploring these alternative ways to test mechanisms of self-discrepancy.

Additionally, future research could explore other antecedents that negatively predict employees’ motivation to invest their resources in constructive ways, such as factors directly related to the organizational context. This is because organizational factors serve as strong signals that convey the trustworthiness of the organization to employees (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), therefore influencing the levels of cynicism that employees experience (Chiaburu et al., 2013). For example, perceived unfairness may cause employees to experience cynicism toward their work if unfairness is attributed to a lack of integrity (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). Psychological detachment may strengthen this relationship because employees with a surplus of attentional resources may ruminate over these unfairness perceptions and experience greater distrust and skepticism as a result. Future research may also consider replicating our model using outcomes besides CWB. For example, when low identified employees have sufficient attentional resources (e.g., from high psychological detachment), they may be more likely to engage in active job searches with the goal of leaving the organization, thus increasing turnover rates.

Finally, employees can engage in different recovery activities during psychological detachment (Sonnentag, 2001, 2012), so we recommend future research to explore whether different activities undertaken during the period of psychological detachment have similar or distinct moderating effects. We speculate that engaging in typical recovery activities during

detachment, such as relaxing and bonding with family and friends, will stimulate employees with low identification to engage in self-focused thoughts, thereby exacerbating the psychological distance between employees and their organization and work. However, it is possible that some specific types of activities, such as socializing with colleagues who have high identification with the organization or low cynicism, may facilitate the contagion of positive attitudes and emotions to low identified and cynical employees, thus reducing the potential costs of detachment. Related to this notion, Fritz et al. (2010) suggested that engaging in off-work activities that concede high levels of psychological detachment may lead to an excessive segregation between employees' work and non-work roles, making it difficult for them to resume their motivation and productivity when they return to their work domain from the non-work domain. Future research may therefore benefit from unpacking psychological detachment into concrete activities to better examine and understand whether and how specific types of activities predict different degrees of detachment and uniquely moderate the relationship between low identification and CWB via cynicism. Relatedly, future research may also investigate if the construct of psychological detachment is similar to or different from other recovery mechanisms (e.g., relaxation, mastery, control; see Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). It is possible that passive mechanisms such as relaxation have different effects than active mechanisms like exercising and engaging in hobbies.

Conclusion

Psychological detachment from work is typically beneficial because it replenishes employees' resources, thereby buffering the potential detrimental outcomes of negative work events or attitudes on subsequent performance and well-being. However, our findings elucidate that for whom (i.e., those with low identification and high cynicism) psychological

detachment will act as a detrimental moderator to accentuate negative outcomes (i.e., CWB).

Our research suggests the need to take the people's identification with the organization and attitudes toward work into consideration when implementing recovery strategies such as psychological detachment. When considered alongside previous findings highlighting the benefits of detachment, our findings pertaining to the 'dark side' of psychological detachment suggest that it is potentially a double-edged sword. Our findings will hopefully inspire future research to adopt a more balanced approach when examining the effects of psychological detachment on employee outcomes, and provide practitioners with useful insights on when it is detrimental to encourage employees to psychologically detach themselves from work during off hours.

References

- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), 269-292.
- Abrams, D., Ando, K., & Hinkle, S. (1998). Psychological attachment to the group: Cross-cultural differences in organizational identification and subjective norms as predictors of workers' turnover intentions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(10), 1027-1039. doi:10.1177/01461672982410001
- American Psychological Association. (2012). *Workplace survey*. Retrieved October 20th, 2016, from American Psychological Association website: <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/phwa/workplace-survey.pdf>
- Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49(11), 1395-1418. doi:10.1177/001872679604901102
- Andersson, L. M., & Bateman, T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5), 449-469. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199709)18:5<449::AID-JOB808>3.0.CO;2-O
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. A. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1989.4278999

- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325-374. doi:10.1177/0149206308316059
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491. doi:10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315
- Barber, L. K., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2015). Please respond ASAP: Workplace telepressure and employee recovery. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(2), 172-189. doi: 10.1037/a0038278
- Becker, J. C., Tausch, N., Spears, R., & Christ, O. (2011). Committed dis(s)idents: Participation in radical collective action fosters disidentification with the broader in-group but enhances political identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 1104-1116. doi: 10.1177/0146167211407076
- Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment a study of important organizational change variables. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(3), 303-326. doi:10.1177/0021886306296602
- Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 613-636. doi: 10.1037/a0026739
- Bhattacharya, C. B., & Elsbach, K. D. (2002). Us versus them: The roles of organizational identification and disidentification in social marketing initiatives. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 21(1), 26-36. doi:10.1509/jppm.21.1.26.17608
- Bolton, L. R., Harvey, R. D., Grawitch, M. J., & Barber, L. K. (2012). Counterproductive work behaviors in response to emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediational approach. *Stress and Health*, 28, 222-233. doi: 10.1002/smi.1425
- Brockner, J. (1988). The effects of work layoffs on survivors: Research, theory and practice. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (pp. 215-255). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Byrne, Z. S., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Perceived organizational support and performance: Relationships across levels of organizational cynicism. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(1), 54-72. doi:10.1108/02683940810849666
- Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 199-208. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.012

- Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I.-S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(2), 181-197. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.007
- chology, 2nd edn (P.J. Drenth, H. Thierry & C.J. de Wolff eds),
chology, 2nd edn (P.J. Drenth, H. Thierry & C.J. de Wolff eds),
- Conway, N., & Briner, R. B. (2002). A daily diary study of affective responses to psychological contract breach and exceeded promises. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 287-302. doi:10.1002/job.139
- Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Citera, M. (1993). A goal hierarchy model of personality, motivation, and leadership. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 15, pp. 267-322). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241
- Dean, Jr., J. W., Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 341-352. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1998.533230
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611
- Dryer, D. C., & Horowitz, L. M. (1997). When do opposites attract? Interpersonal complementarity versus similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(3), 592-603. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.592
- Dunford, B. B., Shipp, A. J., Boss, R. W., Angermeier, I., & Boss, A. D. (2012). Is burnout static or dynamic? A career transition perspective of employee burnout trajectories. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 637-650. doi: 10.1037/a0027060
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 239-263. doi:10.2307/2393235
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36(3), 305-323. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(85)90002-0
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 915-931. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199911)20:6<915::AID-JOB918>3.3.CO;2-Y
- Fritz, C., Yankelevich, M., Zarubin, A., & Barger, P. (2010). Happy, healthy, and productive: The role of detachment from work during nonwork time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 977-983. doi: 10.1037/a0019462

- Gabriel, A. S., Koopman, J., Rosen, C. C., & Johnson, R. E. (2018). Helping others or helping oneself? An episodic examination of the behavioral consequences of helping at work. *Personnel Psychology*, 71, 85-107.
- Glasford, D. E., Pratto, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Intragroup dissonance: Responses to ingroup violation of personal values. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 1057-1064. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2007.10.004
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319-340. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319
- Hülshager, U. R., Lang, J. W. B., Depenbrock, F., Fehrmann, C., Zijlstra, F. R. H., & Alberts, H. J. E. M. (2014). The power of presence: The role of mindfulness at work for daily levels and change trajectories of psychological detachment and sleep quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1113-1128. doi: dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037702
- Jackson, C. L., Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: A measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 884-899. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.884
- Jackson, E. M., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). When opposites do (and do not) attract: Interplay of leader and follower self-identities and its consequences for leader-member exchange. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 488-501.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Solheim, E. (2009). To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 58(1), 105-128. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00384.x
- Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & McAuliffe, B. J. (2002). 'We're all individuals': group norms of individualism and collectivism, levels of identification and identity threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32(2), 189-207. doi:10.1002/ejsp.65
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C.-H., & Lord, R. G. (2006). Moving from cognition to behavior: What the research says. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 381-415.
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C.-H., & Yang, L. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 226-245.
- Johnson, R. E., & Jackson, E. M. (2009). Appeal of organizational values is in the eye of the beholder: The moderating role of employee identity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 915-933.

- Johnson, R. E., Lin, S.-H., & Lee, H. W. (2018). Self-control as the fuel for effective self-regulation at work: Antecedents, consequences, and boundary conditions of employee self-control. *Advances in Motivation Science*, 5, 87-128.
- Johnson, R. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Implicit effects of justice on self-identity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 681-695. doi: 10.1037/a0019298
- Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Djurdjevic, E. (2011). Assessing the impact of common method variance on higher order multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 744-761. doi: 10.1037/a0021504
- Johnson, R. E., & Saboe, K. (2011). Measuring implicit traits in organizational research: Development of an indirect measure of employee implicit self-concept. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(3), 530-547. doi: 10.1177/1094428110363617
- Johnson, R. E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C.-H. (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1262-1272. doi: 10.1037/a0029043
- Jones, C., & Volpe, E. H. (2011). Organizational identification: Extending our understanding of social identities through social networks. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 413-434. doi:10.1002/job.694
- Krischer, M. M., Penney, L. M., & Hunter, E. M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviors be productive? CWB as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 154-166. doi:10.1037/a0018349
- Kristof-Brown, A., Barrick, M. R., & Stevens, C. K. (2008). When opposites attract: A multi-sample demonstration of complementary person-team fit on extraversion. *Journal of Personality*, 73(4), 935-958. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00334.x
- Lai, J. Y., Chan, K. W., & Lam, L. W. (2013). Defining who you are not: The roles of moral dirtiness and occupational and organizational disidentification in affecting casino employee turnover intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1659-1666. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.12.012
- Lanaj, K., Johnson, R. E., & Barnes, C. M. (2014). Beginning the workday yet already depleted? Consequences of late-night smartphone use and sleep. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 124(1), 11-23. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.01.001
- Lanaj, K., Johnson, R. E., & Wang, M. (2016). When lending a hand depletes the will: The daily costs and benefits of helping. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 1097-1110.

- Lin, S.-H., & Johnson, R. E. (2018). Opposing affective and cognitive effects of prevention focus on counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33, 283-296.
- Lin, S.-H., Ma, J., & Johnson, R. E. (2016). When ethical leader behavior breaks bad: How ethical leader behavior can turn abusive via ego depletion and moral licensing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 815-830.
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: a general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.647
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual (3rd ed.)*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- Mathieu, J. E., & Farr, J. L. (1991). Further evidence for the discriminant validity of measures of organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1), 127-133. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.1.127
- Meijman T.F. & Mulder G. (1998) Psychological aspects of
Meijman T.F. & Mulder G. (1998) Psychological aspects of
- Matta, F., Erol-Korkmaz, T. H., Johnson, R. E., & Bicaksiz, P. (2014). Significant work events and counterproductive work behavior: The role of fairness, emotions, and emotion regulation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 920-944.
- Mishra, A. K., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1998). Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust, empowerment, justice, and work redesign. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 567-588. doi:10.5465/AMR.1998.926627
- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Munoz, A., Pastor, J.-C., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., & Garrosa, E. (2009). The moderating effect of psychological detachment and thoughts of revenge in workplace bullying. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 359-364. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.10.031
- Moretti, M. M., & Higgins, E. T. (1990). Relating self-discrepancy to self-esteem: The contribution of discrepancy beyond actual-self ratings. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 26(2), 108-123. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(90)90071-S
- Mukherjee, D., Hanlon, S. C., Kedia, B. L., & Srivastava, P. (2012). Organizational identification among global virtual team members: The role of individualism-collectivism and uncertainty avoidance. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 19(4), 526-545. doi:10.1108/13527601211270002

- Nair, P., & Kamalanabhan, T. (2010). The impact of cynicism on ethical intentions of Indian managers: The moderating role of seniority. *Journal of international business ethics*, 3(1), 14-29.
- Neck, C. P., & Cooper, K. H. (2000). The fit executive: exercise and diet guidelines for enhanced performance. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(2), 72-83. doi: 10.5465/AME.2000.3819307
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- pp. 5–33. Erlbaum, Hove
pp. 5–33. Erlbaum, Hove
- Preacher, K. J., Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2006). Computational tools for probing interactions in multiple linear regression, multilevel modeling, and latent curve analysis. *Journal of educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 31(4), 437-448. doi: 10.3102/10769986031004437
- Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 11(1), 48-59. doi:10.5465/AME.1997.9707100659
- Robert, C., & Wasti, S. A. (2002). Organizational individualism and collectivism: Theoretical development and an empirical test of a measure. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 544-566. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00143-5
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, 6, 3-27.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
- Schippers, M. C., & Hogenes, R. (2011). Energy management of people in organizations: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 26(2), 193-203.
- Sharkawi, S., Rahim, A. R. A., & Dahalan, N. A. (2013). Relationship between person-organization fit, psychological contract violation on counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(4), 173-183.
- Shimazu, A., Matsudaira, K., De Jonge, J., Tosaka, N., Watanabe, K., & Takahashi, M. (2016). Psychological detachment from work during nonwork time: linear or curvilinear relations with mental health and work engagement? *Industrial Health*, 54(3), 282-292. doi: 10.2486/indhealth.2015-0097

- Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2010). Common method bias in regression models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods, 13*(3), 456-476. doi:10.1177/1094428109351241
- Sonnentag, S. (2001). Work, recovery activities, and individual well-being: A diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(3), 196-210. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.6.3.196
- Sonnentag, S. (2012). Psychological detachment from work during leisure time: The benefits of mentally disengaging from work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(2), 114-118. doi: 10.1177/0963721411434979
- Sonnentag, S., & Bayer, U. V. (2005). Switching off mentally: predictors and consequences of psychological detachment from work during off-job time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(4), 393-414. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.393
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 204-221. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(S1), S72-S103. doi: 10.1002/job.1924
- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. (2010). Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 965-976. doi: 10.1037/a0020032
- Sonnentag, S., Unger, D., & Nägel, I. J. (2013). Workplace conflict and employee well-being: The moderating role of detachment from work during off-job time. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 24*(2), 166-183. doi: 10.1108/10444061311316780
- Spector, P. E., & Brannick, M. T. (2009). Common method variance or measurement bias? The problem and possible solutions. In D. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational research method* (Vol. 10, pp. 346-362). London, UK: Sage.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counter-productivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(3), 446-460. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*(1), 1-39. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245
- Tong, J., Wang, L., & Peng, K. (2015). From person-environment misfit to job burnout: Theoretical extensions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30*(2), 169-182. doi:

10.1108/JMP-12-2012-0404

Vadera, A. K., & Pratt, M. G. (2013). Love, hate, ambivalence, or indifference? A conceptual examination of workplace crimes and organizational identification. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 172-188. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1110.0714

Van de Vliert, E., Yang, H., Wang, Y., & Ren, X. (2013). Climato-economic imprints on Chinese collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(4), 589-605. doi: 10.1177/0022022112463605

Van Knippenberg, D. (2000). Work motivation and performance: A social identity perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 49(3), 357-371. doi: 10.1111/1464-0597.00020
workload. In Handbook of Work and Organizational Psy-
workload. In Handbook of Work and Organizational Psy-

Yang, J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). The relations of daily counterproductive workplace behavior with emotions, situational antecedents, and personality moderators: A diary study in Hong Kong. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(2), 259-295. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01138.x

TABLE 1

Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Inter-Correlations among the Focal Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Low-identification	(.85/.81)	.20*	.25**	-.07	.02	.06	.11	.11	-.06
2 Cynicism	.19**	(.90/.88)	.49***	.07	.04	-.06	-.04	.001	-.13
3 CWB	.24***	.42***	(.95/.94)	.22**	.04	-.22*	-.13	.16	-.01
4 Detachment	.08	.07	.19**	(.79/.84)	.18*	-.11	-.11	-.05	.25**
5 Age	-.02	-.08	-.12	.02	--	-.11	.002	-.51**	.71**
6 Gender	.02	-.06	-.02	.16*	.07	--	.13	.05	-.19*
7 Education	.11	.11	-.02	-.07	-.04	-.06	--	.01	-.16
8 Marriage	.09	.01	.06	-.06	.46**	-.11	-.08	--	.43**
9 Tenure	-.04	-.13*	-.10	.03	.70**	.12	-.09	-.43**	--
Sample 1 Mean	2.93	2.86	1.53	3.20	33.59	1.55	1.76	1.26	88.74
Sample 1 SD	.82	1.29	.83	1.29	5.74	.50	.43	.44	66.40
Sample 2 Mean	3.02	3.20	2.01	3.92	30.06	1.62	1.26	1.35	58.87
Sample 2 SD	0.65	1.20	1.15	1.40	5.06	0.49	0.44	0.48	49.42

Note: Mean₁ and SD₁ are from Sample 1 ($N_1=243$) and Mean₂ and SD₂ are from Sample 2 ($N_2=139$). Statistics shown in parentheses along the diagonal are reliabilities for Samples 1 and 2. Gender is coded 1 = male and 2 = female. Marriage is coded 1 = married and 2 = unmarried. Correlations below the diagonal are from Sample 1 and those above the diagonal are from Sample 2.

TABLE 2

Hierarchical Linear Modeling Results

Predictor	Sample 1				Sample 2			
	Model 1 Cynicism	CWB	Model 2 Cynicism	CWB	Model 1 Cynicism	CWB	Model 2 Cynicism	CWB
Intercept	2.48**(.90)	1.31***(.67)	.18 (.90)	2.31***(.52)	1.77 (1.11)	-.13 (.94)	-.34 (1.10)	2.12* (.90)
Age	.003 (.02)	-.02 (.01)	.003 (.02)	-.02 (.01)	.06* (.03)	.02 (.03)	.05 (.03)	.01 (.03)
Gender	-.16 (.17)	.002 (.10)	-.19 (.17)	-.02 (.10)	-.26 (.21)	-.43* (.18)	-.25 (.21)	-.44* (.17)
Education	.26 (.20)	-.18 (.12)	.26 (.20)	-.14 (.11)	-.24 (.24)	-.26 (.20)	-.17 (.23)	-.28 (.19)
Marriage	-.18 (.22)	-.03 (.13)	-.18 (.21)	-.02 (.12)	-.02 (.25)	.50* (.21)	-.06 (.25)	.47* (.20)
Job tenure	-.003 (.002)	<.001 (.001)	-.003(.002)	<.001 (.001)	-.009** (.003)	.001 (.003)	-	<.001(.003)
Low-identification (L)	.29** (.10)	.19** (.06)	.29** (.10)	.15* (.06)	.36* (.16)	.29* (.14)	.36* (.16)	.24 (.13)
Psychological Detachment (PD)			.07 (.06)	.10** (.04)			.12 (.08)	.17 (.06)
L × PD			.14* (.07)				.32* (.12)	
Cynicism		.25*** (.04)		.24*** (.04)		.42*** (.07)		.41*** (.07)
PD × Cynicism				.08** (.03)				.15** (.05)
R^2	.067*	.222***	.089**	.270***	.108*	.343***	.168**	.409***
F	2.77	9.40	2.80	9.35	2.58	9.46	3.19	9.61
Psychological Detachment	Effects	SE	$BootLLCI$	$BootULCI$	Effects	SE	$BootLLCI$	$BootULCI$
Low (1.91/2.48)	.016	.024	-.022	.076	-.018	.066	-.206	.075
Mean (3.20/3.85)	.069	.032	.019	.149	.137	.071	.021	.321
High (4.50/5.22)	.157	.077	.054	.349	.464	.150	.200	.799

Note: $N = 243$ (Sample 1) and 139 (Sample 2). Unstandardized estimates are reported in the table (standard errors are reported in parentheses).

TABLE 3

Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects of Low-identification with Work Predicting CWB at Low, Mean, and High Levels of Psychological Detachment

Sample	Model	Level	P_{MX}	P_{YM}	Direct effect (P_{YX})	Indirect effect ($P_{YM} P_{MX}$)	Total effect ($P_{YX} + [P_{YM} P_{MX}]$)
1	Low-identification	Detachment _{Low}	.11	.14**	.154*	.016	.170**
	Cynicism	Detachment _{Mean}	.29**	.24***	.154*	.069*	.223**
	CWB	Detachment _{High}	.47***	.34***	.154*	.157*	.311**
2	Low-identification	Detachment _{Low}	-.08	.20	.240	-.018	.222
	Cynicism	Detachment _{Mean}	.36*	.41***	.240	.137*	.377*
	CWB	Detachment _{High}	.81***	.61***	.240	.464**	.704***

Note: $N = 243$ for Sample 1 and 139 for Sample 2. Psychological detachment was ± 1.29 and ± 1.40 in respective samples (i.e., 1 *SD* below and above the mean) for low and high levels of detachment, respectively. Significant tests for the indirect effects were based on bias-corrected confidence intervals derived from 1,000 bootstrapped samples (Shrout & Bolger, 2002).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

FIGURE 1

Proposed Moderated Mediation Model

FIGURE 2

Interaction Effect of Low-identification and Psychological Detachment on Cynicism

(a)

(b)

Note: High and low levels of low-identification with organization and psychological detachment represent one standard deviation above and below the mean, respectively. The top figure (a) is from Sample 1 and the bottom figure (b) is from Sample 2.

FIGURE 3

Interaction Effect of Psychological Detachment and Cynicism on CWB

(a)

(b)

Note: High and low levels of psychological detachment and cynicism toward work represent one standard deviation above and below the mean, respectively. The top figure (a) is from Sample 1 and the bottom figure (b) is from Sample 2.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.