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ABSTRACT

The overall objective of the study was to develop and test a model to find out the relationship between Workplace Vigilantism, Turnover Intention, Work Mindfulness, and Change Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). In this connection, the research aim was to focus on health sector nurses of three hospitals of district Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the population which is equal to 1800. By using the simplified formula for proportions, Taro Yamane and the technique of Uma Sekaran (2012) were utilized to calculate the sample size as well as which is 317. However, 350 questionnaires were distributed due to a possible non-response rate. To avoid any biases, the probability-stratified sampling technique was used. Each hospital was considered as a separate stratum due to the inter-group heterogeneity and from each stratum, respondents were selected subject to their availability. Below is the brief information representing the name of hospitals and the number of nurses’ staff located in the district of Peshawar. The result of all three hypotheses indicated a statistically significant and positive association between workplace vigilantism, Turnover Intention, Work Mindfulness, and Change Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). The study was limited to health sector nurses with only three hospitals in Peshawar. In the future, research can have a moderating effect on perceived organizational support to strengthen the vigilante to work for the ultimate benefit of the organization.
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1. Introduction

The existence of vigilantes has always been in limelight in the workplace in different settings. Contemporary literature in the information sciences brings on record the spread of what has been referred to as “vigilantism,” “online vigilantism,” or “diligilism,” in the online global world where social media is used as a tool by certain individuals or groups to look and admonish individuals, organizations for alleged violation of rules and lawlessness (Graso. M et.al, 2020). According to a recent survey by DeCelles and Aquino (2017), a population of 2258 U.S employees inquired about workplace Vigilantes’, among them, 18% reported currently working with workplace vigilantes, and 42 reported having worked with vigilantes. They also asserted that the vigilant could summon the vision of citizens who are frustrated by the lawlessness happening around them and take it upon themselves to dispense justice in the untamed land where there is a weak government and corrupt authorities. Moreover, due to the rise of the modern state as well as its highly developed form of a system of criminal justice, there can be thinking that vigilantes are now obsolete but there are many instances when the vigilantes being private citizens not only uncover but also fight the crimes without having any authority to do so. Besides, vigilantes are different from whistleblowers and peer reporters who might also intend to change the misbehavior of their colleagues but unlike the vigilantes, they depend on the organizational reporting systems or its authorities to help them in achieving this aim, and vigilantes themselves act, take a self-appointed role within a community as jury, judge and provider of justice. Furthermore, while the fields like criminology, sociology, and political science have since long recognized that vigilantes play a role in society, however, little research has been conducted in the field of management that can explain why vigilantes emerge in organizations. Also, scholars in criminology and sociology have theorized social conditions which produce vigilantes and the outcomes of their activities on individuals and communities, yet the suggested antecedents of the vigilante emergence prevail at the societal level – historical, political or economic conditions or ineffectiveness of the judiciary and law enforcement. These antecedents are too far to explain adequately what leads the employees to become vigilantes in organizations. Such antecedents are also more likely to remain constant across different organizations which mean that organizations, as well as the employees, are exposed to the same external factors existing at the country, state, or local community level. Therefore, research is warranted to develop theories in the management field to explain the antecedents of vigilante behavior and its consequences or outcomes and different factors influencing workplace vigilantism.

Kamran (2021) highlighted that vigilante justice can be seen in the past in many countries under unsettled conditions in situations when informally organized groups have been found
in an attempt to supplement or replace the legal procedure or fill the void in the instances where there has been corruption in the institutional justice. When it happens then the victims very often become the oppressors and after this, no one can restrain them. As regards, Pakistani society, apparently frustrations and anger just need a wily demagogue to channel them. It happens to be the anger against the system which in the past has motivated people to be involved in violence. He also viewed that the vigilante is mainly concerned with the common welfare and uses force only if all the other means fail. This implies that in Pakistan the lack of normative order in terms of the unobservance of legal procedures sparks the emergence of vigilantes in society in general and in different sectors or organizations in particular. This calls for the role of academia to investigate the antecedents and consequences of vigilantism and the different factors influencing this phenomenon. There is negligible research on vigilante behavior in the Pakistani context.

The Health Services sector in Pakistan is already fragile and criticized for not delivering services as per international standards (Kurji et al., 2016). Owing to COVID-19, the flaws in the health system are further highlighted. The system due to poor control mechanisms and ineffective management failed to deliver. In this context, the role of the Workplace Vigilante seems to be of great relevance as a vacuum is created providing ample space for the vigilantes to report and punish individuals/employees for violation of organizational rules and policies. In this view, the study aims to examine such violations in the context of the health sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, to strengthen the healthcare system of Pakistan.

The overall objective of the study is to develop and test an integrated model to analyze the role of workplace vigilantism on job outcomes such as turnover intention, work mindfulness, and change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The significance of the study is a broader statement that emphasizes the shreds of evidence that clarify how and why there was a need to perform the current research study. It is a justification of the importance of the study and how the results and outcomes of the study will contribute to the literature, knowledge, theory, society, new scholars, researchers, and policymakers to take benefit from the study. To provide benefits to society, the current quantitative study was employed.

2. Literature Review

A vigilante is described as "a member of a volunteered committee organized to repress and punish crime rapidly (as when judicial processes are judged inadequate); a self-appointed doer of justice" (Bjorgo & Mares, 2019). Frequently feeling that formal institutions are inadequate, vigilantes take matters of law, justice, ethics, crime, and punishment into their own hands — a decision rather than having the legal obligation to do so. This is because
vigilantes choose to take issues into their own hands rather than comply with the law when it is required of them to do so. According to Saucier & Webster (2013), psychological theory suggests that vigilantism may be a more general phenomenon, or perhaps even a trait-like predisposition that influences people's interactions with their environment, leads them to believe that their views are morally superior and more accurate than those of others, and motivates them to behave in ways that cast them into the role of the self-appointed doer of justice (Johnston, 1996).

According to Bateson (2021) if being a vigilante is a personality feature, then it may be more common than the eccentric and extreme characters seen in fiction, as well as the real-life examples of people proclaiming themselves to be crime fighters without the formal license to do so, would imply. There may be more vigilantes present in society and organizations than is commonly believed, but this conclusion is highly dependent on how one defines a vigilante and what behaviors qualify as vigilante acts (Trotter, 2017). Organizations are systems in which many people interact and frequently disagree as well as impose ethical standards and conduct, which indicates that there may emerge vigilantes among workers who feel that the company is not adequately addressing employees' alleged misbehavior in the workplace. We explore the prevalence of what we will refer to as the vigilante syndrome in the labor force of the United States as a first step toward establishing irrefutably that workplace vigilantes do exist (Bateson, 2021).

2.1 Workplace vigilantism and employee Turnover Intention

According to Halbesleben et al., (2014). There are benefits associated with individual mindfulness for employees. Differences in individuals and their environments might affect how they react to situations involving earning additional resources or avoiding loss. The person may regain energy after the event (Halbesleben et al., 2014), which may affect the resource-related effects of awareness. Gunasekara and Zheng (2019) found that workplace vigilantism may impair the connection between individual mindfulness and job engagement. In addition, Zhang et al. (2018) found that assistance from organizations has the potential to positively influence the connection between individual mindfulness and work engagement.

There is a potential that the work states employees impact their reactions to workplace stress. Collective vigilantism, which is defined as "law enforcement conducted without legal authority by a group of self-appointed persons," is one of the work states having a significant association with individual mindfulness. are distinguished by their attentiveness and focus on present events, as well as their experiential and nonjudgmental processing of team experiences (Yu &Zellmer-Bruhn, 2018). Individual mindfulness indicates cognition at the individual
level, while team mindfulness demonstrates organizationally shared views among team members. Team mindfulness is the practice of paying attention as a group to the current events and stimuli occurring inside and outside the team. As a consequence of a decrease in task-related distractions in teams with high mindfulness, the association between individual mindfulness and recovery level is strengthened (Widiatmika & Darma, 2018). As a consequence of this decreased distraction from task activities, team members with a high level of mindfulness can discern more subtlety within the team (Morrison et al., 2014). This prevents resource-intensive processes from developing in response to irrelevant inputs, such as the display of conflict (Slagter et al., 2011). In addition, attentive teams have a less judgmental response to stress (Good et al., 2016), which decreases the chance of unfavorable reactions (Glomb et al., 2011). In this kind of team atmosphere, it is unlikely that the dispute would affect the team members (Wise et al., 2022).

2.2 Workplace vigilantism and employee Turnover Intention

The majority of academics hypothesize that employee burnout is at the heart of their choice to quit their employment (e.g., Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Spector, 1986). The turnover intention was connected to burnout and workplace vigilantism from political, economic, and psychological changes (McCabe et al., 2008), organization-specific factors associated with decreasing work autonomy (Spector, 1986), and individual events contributing to psychological stress (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993) This greater urge to resign is directly tied to burnout associated with emotional tiredness, depersonalization, and personal success (Maslach, 1978; Maslach & Jackson, 1986). Depersonalization is the effect of dehumanizing attitudes held by businesses toward their employees (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). It is connected to treating other people in an impersonal manner, being cruel toward other people, and experiencing emotional exhaustion. Every single one of these facets of burnout may be traced back to workplace vigilantism in some way. Alternately, personal success, the third component of burnout, has an influence on an individual's mental state as a result of the individual's dissatisfaction with their professional successes and the injustices that exist inside an organization. As a result of the fact that the three components of burnout occur in the context of emotional or psychological exhaustion and have an effect on the perspectives that workers hold regarding their jobs, burnout has the potential to lessen people's desire to continue working in their respective businesses (Chen et al., 2022). Or you can coerce him into seeking retribution. Whenever employees are fully drained, they are more likely to have low levels of solidarity with coworkers, jealousy, and a diminished sense of gratitude. This is because emotionally drained individuals are more likely to have negative thoughts about themselves. As a direct consequence of this, they have a greater propensity to either desert their organizations or turn become vigilantes.
2.3 Vigilante changed oriented behavior

Van Dyne et al. (1995) define change-oriented behaviors by combining organizational citizenship behavior with proactive activity. This limits change-oriented behaviors theoretically. Van Dyne et al. (1995) created a conceptual framework to differentiate between affiliative and challenging employee activities. This conceptual framework was implemented in the sphere of organizational citizenship. Podsakoff et al. (2009) provided further support for this viewpoint when they reviewed empirical data on citizenship. According to their results, "one important difference between OCB dimensions is whether they are affiliative or demanding in nature" (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Although participating in change-oriented behaviors such as voicing problematic beliefs may be considered an activity, the degree to which these difficulties are seen as troublesome differs widely from individual to individual (Burris, 2012). The term refers to everything else that highlights change over difficulties (Choi, 2007, McAllister et al., 2007, Van Dyne et al., 2008). Positive change-oriented constructs include leadership (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), having a voice (Burris, 2012, Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), and engaging in change-oriented citizenship action (Bettencourt, 2004, Choi, 2007, Seppala et al., 2012, Van Dyne et al., 2008). Parker and his colleagues emphasized proactive employee initiatives to achieve change (e.g., Bindl and Parker, 2010, Parker et al., 2010).

Parker and Collins (2010) categorized proactive activity as work, strategic, and person-environment fit. The study focuses on proactive work behaviors that try to effect internal organization transformation through vigilantism to restrict the study’s scope. Even though all of these are important, the study chose to concentrate on proactive work behaviors since they enable us to do so. The study observed that some research on proactive conduct alludes to the presence of positive actor intentions, but does not make this argument directly (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Given that both constructive and destructive actions might be deemed proactive, this may provide a difficulty (Spitzmuller & Van Dyne, 2013). For example, behavior that is counterproductive in the workplace, severe supervision, theft, bullying, and a vast array of other detrimental activities are proactive yet have a negative goal. To clarify any ambiguities and advance our conceptualizations, we thus do not use the term proactive. Unlike reactions to organizationally-led change programs, which were the focus of previous studies, we concentrate special emphasis on change-oriented activities undertaken by employees (Choi, 2011, Oreg et al., 2011, Rafferty et al., 2013). In light of the previously described conceptual obstacles, we put a premium on proactive, change-oriented staff actions that contribute to the growth of the firm. There is no such linked find in the literature between vigilantism and employee changed oriented behavior. As the vigilante faced many challenges
during the process of punishing wrongdoers it led to different changed behaviors. This specific study aimed to find out that link.

**A conceptual framework based on literature**

Figure: 1 A conceptual framework based on literature

(Based on the literature and conceptual model, three hypotheses have been established)

H1: There is a positive association between Workplace Vigilantism and Work Mindfulness
H2: There is a positive association between Workplace Vigilantism and Change Oriented OCB.
H3: There is a negative association between Workplace Vigilantism and Turnover Intention.

3. **Research Methods**

The onion model from the study of Saunders et al (2007) was used to organize the current research study. This research model provides a detailed, step-by-step procedure for conducting a research study. The philosophical concept of the study is based on a positivist approach. The approach of the study is deductive as three hypotheses have been established from the literature and theory. The methodological choice of the study is to conduct a monomethod quantitative study. Accordingly, a survey questionnaire strategy was adopted to conduct primary data. According to the situation and study demand, a cross-sectional time horizon was implemented to conduct primary data in one visit.
3.1 Population and Sample

As this research aims to focus on the health sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the population for the study was the nursing staff of the public sector hospitals located in district Peshawar which is equal to 1800. By using the simplified formula for proportions, Taro Yamane and the technique of Uma Sekaran (2012) were utilized to calculate the sample size as well as which is 317. However, 350 questionnaires were distributed due to a possible non-response rate. To avoid any biases, the probability-stratified sampling technique was used. Each hospital was considered as a separate stratum due to the inter-group heterogeneity and from each stratum, respondents were selected subject to their availability. Below is the brief information representing the name of hospitals and the number of nurses’ staff located in the district of Peshawar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Medical Training Institutes (MTI)</th>
<th>Population of Nurses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lady Reading Hospital MTI Peshawar</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hayatabad Medical Complex MTI Peshawar</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Khyber Teaching Hospital MTI Peshawar</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Data Analysis

Researchers have utilized structural equation modeling's multivariate statistical technique for the current research study to estimate and evaluate causal linkages (SEM). Using the phrase "path analysis," a geneticist may examine the influence of one or more independent factors on a route map and see how they interact with one another. Structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) may be useful when trying to predict a large number of dependent variables from a big number of independent variables (Abdi, 2007).

3.3 Assessment of Measurement Model

In structural equation modeling, two models are used to analyze the data. The measurement model and the structural model. The measurement model is established when all the criterion gets achieved including validity and reliability (Hair et al, 2021). The first stage of the measurement model is to establish convergent validity. Convergent validity is about the item loadings of each variable, Average Variance Extract (AVE), analysis of discriminant validity, cross-loading of items, the test of Fornell and Larcker, and HetroTrait-MonoTrait (HTMT). Internal consistency is the composite reliability of the scales.

3.4 Assessment of Reflective Model

A reflective measurement is the first step of the measurement model. All of the constructs of the study are reflective. According to Hair et al. (2019), three main assessment criteria are required at the beginning. In this section, three criteria are necessary to establish such as internal consistency, convergent validity (indicator reliability also referred to as outer loading and average variance extracted AVE), and finally discriminant validity.
3.5 Cronbach’s Alpha, AVE, and Composite Reliability

In SEM-PLS, Cronbach’s Alpha technique is used for finding internal consistency. Due to the deficiencies in Cronbach Alpha, composite reliability is used as a more reliable way to measure internal constancy (Hair et al., 2021).

3.6 Item Loadings

The degree of consistency of the items related to each measurable variable (Hair et al., 2019). The threshold for item loading set by the experts is the value should be greater than 0.708 while the value of AVE should be greater than 0.5 (Ramayah et al., 2018).

3.7 Indicator Reliability / Items Loading

Regarding the threshold of outer loading, few studies set the range but the outer loading should be greater than 0.7, and the loading value equal to and greater than 0.708 is more reliable.
Table 2: Item loadings of the construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Oriented OCB</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Work Mindfulness</th>
<th>Workplace Vigilantism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOCB1</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCB2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCB3</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCB4</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI1</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI2</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI3</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI4</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI5</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM3</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM4</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM5</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV2</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV3</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV4</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the items of a variable that did not achieve the criteria were dropped one by one starting with the items having a low score.

3.8 Convergent Validity

The convergent validity which is also known as AVE is the outcome after taking the calculation of the outer loadings of each variable (AVE) (Hair et al., 2019). The rule of thumb for AVE should be above 0.05. Table 3 represents Cronbach’s Alpha, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

Table 3: Measurement of Convergent Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Oriented OCB</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Mindfulness</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Vigilantism</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the above, Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of all variables was found above the threshold like Change Oriented Org Citizenship Behavior = 0.717, Turnover Intention = 0.811, Work Mindfulness = 0.806, Workplace Vigilantism = 0.812. Moreover, all the values of CR and AVE were also established as per the criteria set by experts (Hair et al., 2021).
3.9 Discriminant Validity

The third stage of the measurement model is the establishment of discriminant validity. Discriminant validity is the degree to which items of each variable are strictly dissimilar from the other items of the variable (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 4: Cross Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change Oriented OCB</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Work Mindfulness</th>
<th>Workplace Vigilantism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOCB1</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCB2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCB3</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOCB4</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI1</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI2</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI3</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI4</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI5</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM4</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM5</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV1</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV2</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV3</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV4</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 is representing cross-loadings. In cross-loading, the difference between items loading across its variable is not less than 0.1. It shows that none of the item loads is below 0.1 hence discriminant validity is not an issue for the present research (Ramayah et al., 2018). The second criterion for evaluating discriminant validity (DV) is the use of Fornell-Larcker (1981).

Below mentioned table 5 represents Fornell Larcker's criteria.

Table 5: Fornell Larcker Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change Oriented OCB</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Work Mindfulness</th>
<th>Workplace Vigilantism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Oriented OCB</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Mindfulness</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vigilantism

The Fornell-Larcker criterion is the square root of the items for each variable, and these items' values should be higher than all the other bivariate correlations (Ramayah et al., 2018).

Due to certain issues in cross-loadings and Fornell Larcker criteria, another concept of detecting discriminant validity introduced by Henseler (2015) is HTMT which is the ratio of within-trait and between-trait correlations. According to the criteria of Henseler et al., (2015), the higher value of HTMT which is 0.90 leads to an absence of discriminant validity.

Table 6: HTMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change Oriented OCB</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Work Mindfulness</th>
<th>Workplace Vigilantism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Oriented OCB</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Mindfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Vigilantism</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before moving towards the structural model, make sure that all the criteria of the measurement model have been established and none of them are left. In the second phase, the researcher is more interested to establish all the criteria of the structural model (Hair et al., 2019). In the first step of a structural model, the examination of the issues related to collinearity is measured. In the second step, the examination of the coefficient of determination (R2) is established, while in the third step, the examination of the effect size of the model constructs (f2) is established, and finally to fourth step to forecast the predictive relevance (Q2) of the structural model is established.
Figure 4: Evaluation of Structural Model Path Coefficients and direct relationship

Evaluation of the path coefficient of the structural model is the second most important criterion which represents the flow of path between the variables and their relationships (Ramayah et al., 2018).

Table 7 is the showing path coefficient of the constructs.

Table 7: Path Coefficient

| Relationship                          | Original Sample (O) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Workplace Vigilantism -> Change-Oriented OCB | 0.458               | 0.043                      | 10.566         | 0.00     |
| Workplace Vigilantism -> Turnover Intention | 0.41                | 0.046                      | 8.909          | 0.00     |
| Workplace Vigilantism -> Work Mindfulness | 0.414               | 0.047                      | 8.895          | 0.00     |

The result indicates that all of the relationships between variables are statistically significant.

The result shows that result of direct hypotheses is positive and significant for the current
study. Workplace vigilantism ($\beta=0.458$, $t=10.566$, $p=<.05$) indicates a positive and significant relationship with change-oriented OCB. Accordingly, workplace vigilantism ($\beta=0.410$, $t=8.909$, $p=<.05$) shows a significant and positive relationship with turnover intention. Similarly, workplace vigilantism ($\beta=0.414$, $t=8.895$, $p=<.05$) indicates a positive and significant relationship with work mindfulness.

### 3.10 Coefficient of Determination $R^2$

In the structural model, the researcher should evaluate the predictive power of the model through the coefficient of determination $R^2$.

**Table 8: Result of R Square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Oriented OCB</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Mindfulness</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the values of the coefficient of determination ($R^2$). The $R^2$ value of Change Oriented Org Citizenship Behavior is 0.209 while the value of adjusted $R^2$ is 0.207 which proposed that workplace vigilantism and workplace fatigue both explain a 20% change in Change Oriented Organization Citizenship Behavior. The result showed a moderated predictive measures $R^2$ value.

Accordingly, the $R^2$ value of turnover intention is 0.168 and the adjusted $R^2$ value is 0.166 showing moderated effect finally, the $R^2$ value of work mindfulness is 0.171 and its adjusted $R^2$ value is 0.169 showing the moderated effect of workplace vigilantism on work mindfulness.

### 4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The overall objective of the study was to develop and test a model to find out the relationship between Workplace Vigilantism, Turnover Intention, Work Mindfulness, and Change Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). In this connection, the research aim was to focus on health sector nurses of three hospitals of district Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the population which is equal to 1800. By using the simplified formula for proportions, Taro Yamane and the technique of Uma Sekaran (2012) were utilized to calculate the sample size as well as which is 317. However, 350 questionnaires were distributed due to a possible non-response rate. To avoid any biases, the probability-stratified sampling technique was used. Each hospital was considered as a separate stratum due to the inter-group heterogeneity and from each stratum, respondents were selected subject to their availability. Below is the brief information representing the name of hospitals and the number of nurses’
staff located in the district of Peshawar.

The result of the first hypothesis indicated a statistically significant and positive association between workplace vigilantism and anger with proactive behavior. A prior study by Podsakoff et al., (2009) stated that vigilante in the workplace may not be appreciated by colleagues and peers which ultimately affects organizational behaviors like work mindfulness. The current study has tested the relationship between workplace vigilantism and work mindfulness and found a strong association between them. The current result supports the hypothesis that workplace vigilantism has a strong relationship with work mindfulness.

Accordingly, the current study has tested the association between workplace vigilantism and change-oriented OCB. The result shows a significant correlation between them. The current study is in line with the prior study results that constructive efforts in workplace vigilantism are to identify and implement changes concerning work methods, policies, and procedures to improve the situation and performance’ (Bettencourt, 2004). Hence, a vigilante who challenges the existing flow of activities and wants to transform the organization in light of the laid down rules and regulations but is not acknowledged and appreciated will be negatively affected. (Bettencourt, 2004).

The result of the hypothesis shows a statistically significant association between workplace vigilantism and turnover intention. The result of the study confirmed the claim of (Podsakoff et al., 2009) that Vigilante behaviors are strongly associated with an increase in state depletion and subsequent turnover intentions.

**Recommendations**

The statistical pieces of evidence of the current research study provide practical implications in the way of offering directions to the health sector employees of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa to support the one who acts as a vigilante in the workplace as his role is to identify uncivil and criminal activities just for the sake of the betterment of the organization.

Similarly, the behavior of Change-oriented OCB is also a constructive effort performed by individuals to identify and implement changes concerning work methods, policies, and procedures to improve the situation and performance. This research study emphasizes the organization to encourage the behavior of change-oriented OCB among employees to maintain and enhance the social, motivational, and psychological environment for task performance. Finally, the reward mechanism will boost the role of vigilantes to reduce the incidents of uncivil and immoral activities in the workplace.

**Future Direction**
Future direction is a continuous process to bring more improvement in a specified area. In the present research study, there is one independent variable while three are the dependent variables. In the future, research can have a moderating effect on perceived organizational support to strengthen the vigilante to work for the ultimate benefit of the organization.
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