

Fall 1998

## Does Personality Indicate a Proclivity Toward Negative Job Behaviors?

Victoria Leigh Cole  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds)



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Cole, Victoria L.. "Does Personality Indicate a Proclivity Toward Negative Job Behaviors?" (1998). Master of Science (MS), Thesis, Psychology, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/ayr5-mm64  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology\\_etds/529](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/psychology_etds/529)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

DOES PERSONALITY INDICATE A PROCLIVITY  
TOWARD NEGATIVE JOB BEHAVIORS?

by

Victoria Leigh Cole  
B. A. May 1996, University of South Florida

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY  
December 1998

Approved by:

---

Debra A. Major (Director)

---

Robert McIntyre (Member)

---

Peter Mikulka (Member)

## ABSTRACT

### DOES PERSONALITY INDICATE A PROCLIVITY TOWARD NEGATIVE JOB BEHAVIORS?

Victoria Leigh Cole  
Old Dominion University, 1998  
Director: Dr. Debra A. Major

This study endeavored to show that negative job behaviors can be predicted from measures of personality. It was hypothesized that the measures of extroversion and neuroticism would be positively correlated with negative job behaviors. It was further hypothesized that the measures of agreeableness and conscientiousness would be negatively correlated with negative job behaviors. Participants responded to anonymous surveys. These surveys consisted of measures of personality, job behaviors and attitudes, a social desirability scale, and demographic questions. It was found that agreeableness and conscientiousness were both negatively related to negative job behaviors and that neuroticism was positively related to some negative job behaviors. Regression analyses revealed that personality variables accounted for between 6 and 15 percent of the variance in these negative behaviors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BEHAVIORS AND INTENTIONS.....	2
PERSONALITY.....	3
THE BIG FIVE FACTORS.....	4
PERSONALITY AND POSITIVE JOB BEHAVIORS.....	6
PERSONALITY AND NEGATIVE BEHAVIORS.....	6
NEGATIVE JOB BEHAVIORS.....	8
PERSONALITY AND INTENTIONS.....	9
METHOD.....	12
PARTICIPANTS.....	12
MATERIALS.....	12
MEASURES.....	13
PROCEDURE.....	16
RESULTS.....	17
INTENTIONS TO BEHAVE ON THE JOB.....	29
DISCUSSION.....	31
CONCLUSIONS.....	38
REFERENCES.....	39
APPENDICES.....	44
A. THE NEO PI-R.....	44
B. BEHAVIORS ON THE JOB.....	48
C. INTENTIONS TO BEHAVE ON THE JOB.....	52
D. SOCIAL DESIRABILITY.....	57
E. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS.....	60
F. PARTICIPANT NOTIFICATION FORM.....	61
VITA.....	63

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis- Variance Accounted For.....	18
2. Correlations for Negative, Personality and Demographic Measures.....	21
3. Hypothesized Correlations.....	24
4. Regression Analyses for Physical Avoidance.....	26
5. Regression Analyses for Avoidance of the Work Itself.....	27
6. Regression Analyses for Defiance.....	28
7. Regression Analyses for Aggression.....	28

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

Negative job behaviors are those actions engaged in by an organization's employees that are dysfunctional for the organization and as such are a serious concern in the work place today. These types of behaviors, running the gambit from habitual tardiness to sabotage, are estimated to cost organizations in the range of \$6 to \$200 billion annually (Murphy, 1993). In addition, 33 to 75 percent of employees surveyed have admitted to at least one of the following negative behaviors: theft, computer fraud, embezzlement, vandalism, sabotage, and absenteeism (Boye & Slora, 1993; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The seriousness of negative work behaviors is emphasized by the use, in the current vernacular, of the expression "going postal," referring to the violence that has plagued the U.S. Postal Service in recent years.

Not only are negative behaviors a prevalent problem in the workplace today, their effects are felt at every level of organizational life. The presence of negative behaviors on the job affect persons individually due to co-workers' tardiness and absenteeism, the organization as a whole because of the cost of replacing absent workers and stolen and damaged property, and, in consequence, the nation, due to the profit loss of individual organizations and problems

---

<sup>1</sup>This thesis adheres to the format of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (1994).

for government controlled companies, such as the United States Postal Service. The question now becomes, "Is there a way of predicting negative job behaviors?" This study attempts to answer these questions by examining job behaviors and attitudes and their relationship with certain personality variables.

### The Relationship between Behaviors and Intentions

Unfortunately the serious problem of negative work behaviors has received little research attention (Chen & Spector, 1992). One reason for this is that employees generally confine themselves to less destructive negative behaviors, such as absenteeism and habitual tardiness (Fisher & Locke, 1992). In addition, negative attitudes are held far more often than negative behaviors are displayed (Fisher & Locke, 1992).

The relationship between negative attitudes and negative behaviors is not fully understood, but research by Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) and Pratkanis and Turner (1994) indicate the conditions necessary for predicting behavior from attitudes. One of the best predictors of behavior is a highly specific attitude, or intention to engage in that behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). That is, if a person intends to steal from the company, that attitude is a good indicator that he or she actually will steal. In addition, specific attitudes are better than general attitudes at predicting specific behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977).

For instance, willingness or intention to work overtime is a better indicator of whether a person will consent to work overtime than is her or his general attitude toward the job. Also, Pratkanis and Turner (1994) have found that as strength of an intention to behave in a certain manner increases, so does the correspondence between behavior and intention. This would seem to indicate that a strong intention to behave in a certain way will lead to behavior.

Therefore, in order to optimize the predictability from intention to behavior, the intention measure should indicate that the person considers or thinks about behaving in a certain way and be specific with regard to the behavior being examined. Because of this and because, as mentioned previously, attitudes are held more often than behaviors are displayed, it would be advantageous to examine specific intentions as well as behaviors to obtain a more complete picture of not only enacted behaviors, but also intended behavior.

### Personality

Personality refers both to a person's social reputation and to his or her inner nature (Hogan, 1992). In fact, many organizations use some type of personality assessment to hire and promote employees (Hogan, 1992). This is primarily because personality has been found to correlate with some job behaviors. According to Bentz (1985, cited in Hogan, 1992), personality tests taken years



ago predict job progress and current performance.

It is because of this successful prediction, and because personality measures can provide incremental validity beyond that provided by cognitive ability tests (Robertson, 1993; Stewart & Carson, 1995), that personality tests are so widely used in spite of recent criticisms. Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts (1996) have responded to recent criticisms that personality measures are not predictive and result in adverse impact. They have found that measures of personality are valid predictors of performance in almost all occupations and do not result in adverse impact for minority groups.

#### The Big Five Factors

From the 16 factors put forth by Cattell, Fiske (1949) used factor analysis to parsimoniously reveal five factors (Hogan, 1992). These five factors have been replicated many times, in different populations, languages, and age groups (e.g., Hogan, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1985). They are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Neuroticism or adjustment measures emotional steadiness in dealing with life's situations. Extraversion or sociability measures interpersonal dealings and can be roughly compared with outgoingness. Openness to experience is a tendency to seek out new things and new life experiences. Agreeableness measures a person's propensity to get along with others.

Conscientiousness measures motivation and determination (Kosek, 1995). Each of these five scales is measured on a continuum, with a high score indicating that the respondent possesses more of the personality variable in question and a low score revealing less of that personality variable.

Because these five dimensions can be further broken down to three variables, or expanded to nine, they seem to be a basic "cognitive prototype," or midlevel form of analysis that people are predisposed to think about with regard to other people (Fiske & Linville, 1980; Hogan, 1992). Using these traits, people make judgements about others and from these people gain a "reputation" (Hogan, 1992). Therefore, the five factors seem to be the basic building blocks that people use to define one another.

It has been shown that personality tests are stable, adequate predictors of job performance and job progress. Personality has, in fact, been found to be a remarkably stable measure of individuals in general. Conley (1985) found measures of personality to be stable over five decades. Likewise, Costa and McCrae (1988) found retest stability to be quite high for a self report measure of five personality variables over a six year time span, between 0.65 and 0.75 for different subscales. In the same study, Costa and McCrae found high retest stability for spousal reports of personality and for peer ratings in a separate study (McCrae & Costa, 1987).

### Personality and Positive Job Behaviors

In addition to the job related variables of performance and job progress, the personality measures of agreeableness and conscientiousness have been found to correlate with organizational citizenship behavior (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Lingl, 1995). And the personality measures of extraversion, openness to new experience, and agreeableness all had positive correlations with prosocial behaviors (e.g., Kosek, 1995). Kosek's finding regarding openness to new experience contrasts with several studies that did not find that this personality factor related to either positive or negative behaviors (e.g., Organ & Lingl, 1995).

The positive correlations between personality and positive job behaviors look promising for establishing a link between behavior and personality. However, the other side of the coin must also be examined. Is there a similar link between negative job behaviors and personality?

### Personality and Negative Behaviors

Though not directly related to organizations, much has been hypothesized regarding the relationship between personality and antisocial or negative behaviors of children (e.g. Ma, Shek, Cheung, & Lee, 1996). Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) found that children who engaged in prosocial behaviors scored low on scales measuring psychotocism and neuroticism, while Ma et al. (1996) found that children who

engaged in antisocial behaviors scored high on these two scales. In addition, Graybill and Blackwood (1996) found that personality measures predicted childhood aggression as well as teacher ratings and self report measures. These strong positive correlations between childhood negative behaviors and certain aspects of personality combined with the findings that personality is stable over time (Conley, 1985; Costa & McCrae, 1988) suggest that adults may follow the same trend.

In fact, in adults, extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism have been found to be positively correlated with criminal behavior (Goma-I-Friexanet, 1995). The finding on extraversion is in conflict with Kosek's (1995) result regarding this measure. This could be due to the smaller sample size used by Kosek or the type of population under study. Goma-I-Freixanet used criminals with a normal control, while Kosek used college students.

Because positive behaviors were found to share many of the same correlations with personality both on (Konovsky & Organ, 1996) and off the job (e.g., Kosek, 1995) and because negative behaviors have been found to be correlated with certain aspects of personality in general, it can be inferred that the correlations found between negative behaviors and personality in general will be shared by negative job behaviors and personality.

Fisher and Locke (1992) reported several studies that attempted to explain negative job behavior in terms of job satisfaction, but were unsuccessful. Chen and Spector (1992) examined stressors and were able to find a modest, though significant, correlation between negative job behaviors and certain stressors. In addition, work with aggression and Type A behavior has found that this particular negative work behavior is correlated with Type A behavior (e.g., Neuman & Baron, in press).

Because of the serious physical and emotional costs of negative job behaviors to organizations, it is important to know if we can better predict negative job behaviors. We can start by exploring the relationship between personality and negative job behaviors.

#### Negative Job Behaviors

Fisher and Locke (1992) reported a series of studies that sought to categorize negative job behaviors. Through factor analysis and rater agreement studies, their research resulted in four categories of negative job behaviors: escape from the job as a whole, avoidance of the work itself, defiance, and aggression. These category names are based on inferred motives for the behaviors in question (Fisher & Locke, 1992). Escape from the job as a whole is physical avoidance and includes both short term (e.g., coming in late) and long term (e.g., quitting) escape and preparation for escape (e.g., looking for a way to

transfer). Avoidance from the work itself consists of ways to avoid work without engaging in direct defiance, such as trying to look busy while doing nothing. Defiance consists of actions that are aimed at resisting authority (e.g., talks back to supervisor). Finally, aggression is defined by the outward expression of anger with no constructive purpose, such as starting rumors to get revenge (Fisher & Locke, 1992).

In addition to the four categories of negative behavior, Fisher and Locke (1992) also included positive behaviors that employees might engage in to try to change or cope with a negative job situation. As the focus of this study is on negative behaviors, however, there were no hypotheses made regarding these job behaviors.

#### Personality and Intentions

In spite of the prevalence of negative job behaviors in our society, negative attitudes are held more often than negative behaviors are displayed, as mentioned previously. In fact, Fisher and Locke (1992) found that the reported frequency of the more serious negative behaviors (i.e., aggression) was too low to be analyzed. For this reason, the relationship between personality and attitudes that are most directly related to behavior, intentions to behave, should also be investigated.

In order to most accurately infer the relationship between personality and behavior from the relationship

between personality and intentions, it is necessary to heed the research concerning the relationship between behavior and attitudes (e.g., Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Pratkanis & Turner, 1994). That is, the intentions of the respondent should be specific with regard to the behaviors being examined, as mentioned previously. With this in mind and according to the recommendation made by Fisher and Locke (1992), intentions were assessed as what behaviors a participant considered or thought about performing.

Hypothesis 1. Physical avoidance or escape from the job:

- a. Physical avoidance or escape from the job behaviors will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.
- b. Physical avoidance or escape from the job intentions will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.

Hypothesis 2. Avoidance of the work itself:

- a. Avoidance of the work itself behaviors will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.
- b. Avoidance of the work itself intentions will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion

and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.

Hypothesis 3. Defiance:

- a. Defiance behaviors will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.
- b. Defiance intentions will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.

Hypothesis 4. Aggression:

- a. Aggression behaviors will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.
- b. Aggression intentions will be positively related to neuroticism and extraversion and negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness.

No specific hypothesis was made regarding openness, the remaining personality factor, because of the contradictory literature concerning this factor. Openness, was, however included in the analyses in an attempt to discover the nature of this relationship.



## METHOD

### Participants

Participants were 257 undergraduate students who were currently employed either part- or full-time. They completed surveys anonymously for extra credit.

The number of participants needed was arrived at by analyzing an effect size reported by Goma-I-Freixanet (1995) for the NEO personality scale and negative behaviors. This particular article was used because it had the smallest effect size, which, when employing the methods set forth by Cohen (1988), required the use of 190 participants.

This study employed 257 participants, however, in an effort to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis on the factors of the Behaviors on the Job scale. This is advantageous because this scale is fairly new and has not been widely used. It was necessary, however, to originally collect data from 305 participants, in order to eliminate those persons who scored highly on the social desirability scale. The exact number of original participants needed was obtained by gathering data from the first 50 participants, calculating their social desirability scores, and extrapolating to a larger sample size.

### Materials

Each participant received three surveys that were coded to ensure anonymity. The first survey included the

behavior version of the Behaviors on the Job Scale. The second contained basic demographic questions, the NEO-PI(R) personality measure, and a measure of social desirability. The third survey was the attitude version of the Behaviors on the Job Scale.

### Measures

NEO-PI(R) The five factors of neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness included in the NEO have been replicated many times with different types of populations, ages, and by self reports and peer reports (Hogan, 1992) and does a "remarkably good job" of accounting for personality characteristics (Digman & Inouye, 1986; Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996; Kosek, 1995; McCrae & Costa, 1987). A meta-analysis by Barrick and Mount (1991) reported validity coefficients that ranged from .04 to .22. Barrick and Mount also reported percent of variance explained from 54% to 70% and reliability coefficients ranging from .52 to .75. This scale contains 60 items, 12 items for each personality construct. (See Appendix A for a copy of this scale.)

Behaviors on the Job Although recent efforts to construct scales to measure negative job behaviors, and the related topic of deviance, have netted inconclusive results (e.g. Raelin, 1994), reports of several related efforts to categorize negative behaviors appear promising (Fisher &

Locke, 1992). The finalized scale was factor analyzed to produce four distinct factors for negative job behaviors. These factors are: escape from the job as a whole, avoidance of the work itself, defiance, and aggression. The first factor, escape from the job as a whole, consists of five items. Avoidance of the work itself, the second factor, consists of nine items. The third factor, defiance, has seven and aggression, the fourth factor, consists of ten items. Internal consistency ranges from .65 to .80, with aggression left out because this factor had a mean of almost zero.

Respondents were asked to indicate on a six point scale how frequently they engaged in each activity. The scale ranges from "never" to "daily." (See Appendix B for a copy of this scale.)

Intentions to Behave on the Job Intentions toward negative behaviors were measured by having participants respond to whether they would consider engaging in each of the negative behaviors on the Behaviors on the Job Scale, in order to ensure that each intention is specific to the behavior and reflects a degree of intention as discussed earlier. This procedure is also recommended by Fisher and Locke (1992). Therefore, the Behaviors on the Job Scale was altered to ask respondents if they think about or consider engaging in the negative behaviors. (See Appendix C for a copy of this scale.)

### Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale Social

desirability is often an issue when persons are asked to respond to items that are, or can be, construed as socially undesirable. Because of the nature of the items on the Behaviors on the Job Scale, many of which are negative behaviors and attitudes, it is important to ensure that participants are responding truthfully to the items. One way to do this is to measure a person's tendency to respond in a "socially desirable" manner rather than truthfully.

The Marlowe-Crowne Scale is a widely used measure of social desirability. It is a 33 question true/false questionnaire with an internal reliability of .88 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). A sample item from this scale is, "I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble." If a cutoff score of "true" responses is reached, the participant's responses on the other scales are assumed to be invalid and are discarded. The cutoff score used for this research was 21, which is one standard deviation above the accepted mean. (See Appendix D for a copy of this scale.)

Demographic questions Also included were demographic questions, such as age, gender, ethnicity, type of job held, intention to remain with the company, and years of experience. It was necessary to include these types of questions because these items might covary with the

variables under study. (See Appendix E for a copy of the demographic questions.)

Notification Form Another important component of the survey was the notification form. This was especially important because the variables under study are behaviors or attitudes that a person might not want to admit. It was important that the respondent be encouraged to be completely forthcoming and equally important that the respondent be reassured that his or her responses would be entirely anonymous. (See Appendix F for a copy of the notification form.)

### Procedure

Participants responded to the measures described above by means of paper and pencil. To reduce the bias sometimes found when participants are given only self-report measures, the survey was divided into three parts which were administered one at a time. The first part included the notification form and the behavior version of the Behaviors on the Job Scale. The second contained basic demographic questions, the NEO personality measure, and a measure of social desirability. The third survey was the attitude version of the Behaviors on the Job Scale. Each participant completed and returned one section before receiving the next. This helped to ensure that participants did not compare their responses on the attitude scale to their responses on the behavior scale.

## RESULTS

Of the 305 surveys received, 42 (or 14%) were not used due to a high score on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale, a score in excess of 21 out of a possible 33. In addition, 6 were discarded because the respondents did not complete portions of the survey. This resulted in 257 usable surveys.

After culling the data, the next step was to perform a confirmatory factor analysis on the Behaviors on the Job Scale. For purposes of the factor analysis, both the negative and positive items of the Behaviors on the Job Scale were included. The six factors created by Fisher and Locke (1992) were separated into two-item and occasionally three-item sub-scales according to the strength of the exploratory factor loadings. That is, the item with the largest exploratory factor loading was combined with the item with the lowest exploratory factor loading and so on, until each was assigned to a sub-scale, as recommended by Drasgow and Kanfer (1985). This was necessary because single items and whole scales are inappropriate levels of analysis to use when performing a confirmatory factor analysis (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1996) and because this type of subscale formation helps the researcher avoid an inflation of the chi-square statistic when using the LISREL program. LISREL analysis indicated that the items on the six factors of the scale, as indicated by Fisher and Locke, explained

the factors well. That is, the confirmatory factor analysis supported the existence of the six hypothesized factors of the Behaviors on the Job scale, namely, physical avoidance, avoidance of the work itself, defiance, aggression, psychological adjustment, and constructive protest. Factor analytic results can be seen in Table 1.

---

Table 1  
Confirmatory Factor Analysis - Variance Accounted For

---

<u>Subscale Factors</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Error variance</u>	<u>R-squared</u>	<u>Reliability of Composite</u>
Physical Avoidance 1	.673	.547	.453	
Physical Avoidance 2	.568	.678	.322	.655
Avoidance of Work 1	.855	.269	.731	
Avoidance of Work 2	.776	.398	.602	
Avoidance of Work 3	.768	.410	.590	.843
Defiance 1	.812	.340	.660	
Defiance 2	.627	.607	.393	.769
Aggression 1	.811	.343	.657	
Aggression 2	.734	.462	.538	
Aggression 3	.669	.552	.448	.784

Table 1 Continued

<u>Subscale Factors</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>	<u>Error variance</u>	<u>R-squared</u>	<u>Reliability of Composite</u>
Psychological Adjustment 1	.589	.653	.347	
Psychological Adjustment 2	.554	.693	.307	
Psychological Adjustment 3	.633	.599	.401	.620
Constructive Protest 1	.767	.412	.588	
Constructive Protest 2	.969	.0605	.939	
Constructive Protest 3	.697	.515	.485	.860

---

Although the chi-square statistic was significant, the root mean square error was below 0.05 (0.0497), the non-normed fit index was above 0.90 at 0.941 and the critical N was 212.841, over the critical cutoff of 200 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1996). The LISREL analysis also gave the R-squared estimates for each of the factors, which denotes the percentage of variance accounted for by the individual subscales of each factor. The reliabilities of the composites ranged from 0.62 to 0.86.

One possible reason for the low reliabilities of physical avoidance and psychological adjustment could be that these scales do not contain a sufficient number of items (physical avoidance has five items and psychological



adjustment has eight). Another reason could be that the scales consist of different sub-types of behaviors. For example, three of the physical avoidance items concern leaving a job permanently (e.g., quitting), while the other two items concern temporary physical avoidance (e.g., coming in late). These two types of items may, in fact, be two different types of physical avoidance, which could necessitate the use of separate scales.

The next step was to compute correlations among the negative job behaviors and the five factors of personality. The demographic questions were also analyzed to see if these measures correlated significantly with the negative job behaviors. See Table 2 on the following pages for these correlations.

Table 2  
Correlations for Negative Job Behaviors, Personality, and Demographic Measures

	Mean	SD	Physical	Avoid.	Defiance	Aggress.	Psych.	Const.	Neur.
1. Physical	1.98	.73							
2. Avoid.	2.34	.78	.426*						
3. Defiance	1.45	.48	.304*	.400*					
4. Aggress.	1.11	.23	.280*	.374*	.496*				
5. Psych.	2.11	.62	.319*	.229*	.218*	.165*			
6. Constructive	2.17	.69	.096	.127*	.290*	.103	.228*		
7. Neuroticism	34.11	8.61	.218*	.279*	.052	.057	.163*	-.106	
8. Extraversion	43.29	6.00	-.114	-.110	-.047	-.115	-.051	.244*	-.311*
9. Openness	39.62	6.32	.129*	.038	.133*	.079	.252*	.238*	.057
10. Agreeableness	43.10	6.08	-.154*	-.379*	-.280*	-.246*	-.127*	-.075	-.232*
11. Conscien.	45.84	6.17	-.213*	-.381*	-.129*	-.101	-.059	.166*	-.361*
12. Age	25.57	7.65	.022	-.231*	.057	-.048	.092	.205*	-.110
13. Current	2.98	3.67	-.034	-.128*	.082	.030	-.026	.189*	-.177*
14. Intend	4.85	7.84	-.124	-.141*	-.014	-.062	.115	.099	-.114
15. Gender	1.69	.46	-.067	-.101	-.118	-.219*	-.016	.011	.211*
16. Social	14.28	4.29	-.213*	-.346*	-.158*	-.182*	-.080	-.044	-.242*

Table 2 Continued

	Extra.	Open.	Agree.	Conscien.	Age	Curr.	Intend	Gender
9.Openness	.115							
10.Agreeableness	.284*	-.013						
11.Conscien.	.311*	-.102	.306*					
12.Age	-.024	.114	.113	.177*				
13.Current	.086	.023	.122	.163*	.489*			
14.Intend	.050	.009	-.044	.072	.280	.303*		
15.Gender	.056	.077	.130*	.049	.072	.032	-.094	
16.Social	.163*	.004	.272*	.313*	.036	.090	.035	.073

(\*  $p \leq 0.05$ , Physical = Physical avoidance, Avoid. = Avoidance of the work itself, Agress. = Aggression, Psyc. = Psychological Adjustment, Conscien. = Conscientiousness.)

The correlation matrix revealed that all four hypotheses were only partially supported. As predicted in Hypothesis 1, physical avoidance was significantly positively correlated with neuroticism, and significantly negatively correlated with agreeableness and conscientiousness. Contrary to the hypothesis, however, extraversion was not significantly correlated with physical avoidance. Openness to experience, the personality variable that was not included in the hypothesis, was found to have a significantly positive correlation with physical avoidance.

As with Hypothesis 1, neuroticism was significantly positively correlated with avoidance of the work itself, while agreeableness and conscientiousness were significantly negatively correlated with these behaviors, as predicted in Hypothesis 2. Extraversion was also not related to this variable. Unlike the results for Hypothesis 1, however, openness to experience was unrelated to avoidance of the work itself.

As stated in Hypothesis 3, agreeableness and conscientiousness were both significantly negatively correlated with defiance behaviors. However, there was no relationship between neuroticism and defiance, nor between extraversion and defiance. In addition, openness was significantly positively related to defiance. With regard to Hypothesis 4, agreeableness was the only factor that

was correlated with aggression. This was a significant negative correlation. It should also be noted that extraversion, while not significantly related to any of the negative job behaviors, had a negative relationship with each of the factors, not a positive relationship as hypothesized. The observed correlations for the hypotheses are presented in Table 3.

---

Table 3  
Hypothesized Correlations

	Agree.	Consc.	Neur.	Extra.	Open.
1.	-.154*	-.213*	.218*	-.114	.129*
2.	-.379*	-.381*	.280*	-.110	.038
3.	-.280*	-.129*	.052	-.047	.133*
4.	-.246*	-.101	.057	-.115	.079

Note: Hypothesis 1 = Physical avoidance, Hypothesis 2 = Avoidance of the work itself, Hypothesis 3 = Defiance, and Hypothesis 4 = Aggression.

---

Regression analyses were then done based upon the correlation results. The negative job behaviors served as the criteria that were predicted by personality variables and control variables. The control variables that were included as predictors were those that showed a significant correlation with the negative behavior in question, which were entered as the first step. Then, in

the second step, all of the personality variables were included in the analyses. The regression analyses were conducted to determine how much of the variance in negative job behaviors was accounted for by these variables.

For each of the regression equations, age, gender, the participant's social desirability score (social), amount of time the participant had spent on the current job (current), and the amount of time the participant intended to stay on the job (intend), that had a significant correlation with the behavior being examined were analyzed as control variables. In addition, each of the personality variables was added. For the first hypothesis, physical avoidance was the criterion variable. The only control variable that correlated with physical avoidance was social desirability. The personality variables were also added. See Table 4 for the results of the regression equation for physical avoidance.

Table 4  
Regression Analyses for Physical Avoidance

	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>dF</u>	<u>R Square</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>RSquare</u>
Step 1	Social	-.041	1,185	.002	.002
Step 2	Neur.	.121			
	Extra.	-.038			
	Open	.094			
	Agree.	-.084			
	Consc.	-.133	5,180	.077*	.079*
* $p \leq .05$					

In the second equation, avoidance of the work itself was the criterion variable. The control variables were intention to remain on the job, social desirability, age, and current time on the job. See Table 5 for the results from this hypothesis.

Table 5  
Regression Analyses for Avoidance of the Work Itself

	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>dF</u>	<u>R Square</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>RSquare</u>
Step 1	Intend	.212*			
	Social	-.188*			
	Age	-.250*			
	Current	-.108	4,180	.136*	.136*
Step 2	Neur.	.102			
	Extra.	.066			
	Open	-.010			
	Agree.	-.285*			
	Consc.	-.171*	5,175	.146*	.282*
* $p \leq .05$					

For the third equation, defiance was the criterion variable. Social desirability was the only control variable that was significantly correlated with defiance. See Table 6 for the results of this regression analysis.



Table 6  
Regression Analyses for Defiance

	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>dF</u>	<u>R Square Change</u>	<u>Total R Square</u>
Step 1	Social	-.093	1,185	.009	.009
Step 2	Neur.	-.061			
	Extra.	.054			
	Open	.085			
	Agree.	-.308*			
	Consc.	-.043	5,180	.104*	.112*

\*  $p \leq .05$

For the fourth equation, aggression was the criterion variable. Social desirability and gender were the two control variables used. See Table 7 for the results.

Table 7  
Regression Analyses for Aggression

	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>dF</u>	<u>R Square Change</u>	<u>Total R Square</u>
Step 1	Social	-.115			
	Gender	-.244*	2,184	.069*	.069*
Step 2	Neur.	-.011			
	Extra.	-.065			
	Open	.055			
	Agree.	-.234*			
	Consc.	.042	5,179	.059*	.129*

\*  $p \leq .05$

### Intentions to Behave on the Job

Data analyses were not performed on the intentions portion of the behaviors on the job scale for three reasons. First, the average responses of the participants for the intentions version of the scale was lower than that of the behaviors version. This would seem to indicate that the participants thought about engaging in negative job behaviors less frequently than they actually engaged in the behaviors. This did not seem to be a logical finding. In addition, many participants, when asked if they had any questions about the study, stated they had assumed that the same scale was included twice in the survey in an attempt to influence their responses.

It is also possible that some participants could have become sensitized to their own behaviors and how these behaviors might be perceived by others when completing the social desirability scale. Because the Behaviors on the Job scale preceded the social desirability scale while the intentions portion of that same scale followed the social desirability scale, the intentions version may have been affected by this sensitization while the behaviors version would not have been affected.

The original purpose for including the intentions version was to increase the average of the participants' responses so that there would be sufficient variance in the negative job behavior measures. Because this was not

the case (i.e., the averages were actually smaller and many participants assumed subterfuge), the intentions version of the Behaviors on the Job scale was disregarded.

## DISCUSSION

Does personality indicate a proclivity toward negative job behaviors? The answer is a qualified yes. The personality variable agreeableness had a significant negative correlation with each of the negative behaviors. Also, conscientiousness was negatively correlated with all except aggression. In addition, neuroticism had a positive relationship with two of the negative behaviors, physical avoidance and avoidance of the work itself. Similarly, openness, though not hypothesized, had significant positive relationships with physical avoidance and defiance. This would indicate that a person who tends to be neurotic, but does not tend toward agreeableness or conscientiousness would be more likely to engage in more negative job behaviors. This is not an absolute statement because while the amount of variance in each of the negative behaviors that was accounted for by these variables, is acceptable (from 6 to 15 percent), personality does not completely explain negative behaviors. In fact, at least 85 percent is due to other factors. The most important personality factor in predicting negative job behaviors was agreeableness.

As previously mentioned, all four of the specified hypotheses were supported in part. Physical Avoidance was significantly positively correlated with neuroticism, and

significantly negatively correlated with agreeableness and conscientiousness.

Neuroticism was also significantly positively correlated with avoidance of the work itself behaviors, while agreeableness and conscientiousness were significantly negatively correlated with these behaviors. In addition, conscientiousness and agreeableness were found to explain significant portions of the variance in avoidance of the work itself.

Although agreeableness and conscientiousness were both significantly negatively correlated with defiance behaviors, agreeableness was the only important contributor explaining the variance in defiance. Agreeableness was also significantly negatively correlated with aggression and did significantly account for some of the variance in aggression.

Because each of the hypotheses consisted of multiple parts that were the same for each hypothesis and because the results of the analyses were consistent across several of the hypotheses, discussion of the analyses will be presented according to the predictor and the control variables.

Extraversion was not significantly related to any negative job behaviors. This finding is in contrast to the results of Goma-I-Friexanet (1995) who studied criminals. The relationship between extraversion and

negative behaviors does agree, however, with Kosek's (1995) research, which used a smaller, though more representative sample. The relationship found by Goma-I-Friexanet was originally hypothesized due to the fact that negative behaviors were assumed to be more prevalent in a prison population. Although the types of negative behaviors under study are all detrimental to an organization, not all would land the perpetrator in prison. Examples of this would be talking back to one's supervisor or calling in sick when one was not sick.

Hypothesized relationships were found for agreeableness with all four negative job behaviors, and conscientiousness with all variables except for aggression. However, in this case, the trend was in the specified direction. Thus, it would appear that there are significant negative relationships between the dysfunctional behaviors under study and the personality variables of agreeableness and conscientiousness. Perhaps more importantly, conscientiousness was found to be a significant predictor of avoidance of the work itself behaviors while agreeableness was found to be a significant predictor of avoidance of the work itself, and defiant and aggressive behaviors. These findings are important to the application of this research in organizations. This application could, one day, come in the form of screening tests included in applications for

new employees, especially in occupations that handle sensitive information. This type of application is necessarily a long way off, however. Much work still needs to be done in the area of negative job behaviors. Especially important is the need to identify the remaining variance in these variables because of the degree of error involved in the regression equations.

Neuroticism was found to have significant relationships with two of the four negative behaviors. As was hypothesized, physical avoidance and avoidance of the work itself were both positively related to neuroticism. However, neuroticism was not found to be a significant predictor of either of these types of negative behaviors. The hypotheses were built upon the work of Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) and Ma et al. (1996) who found that neuroticism was related to antisocial behaviors in children. However, the relationships between neuroticism and defiance and aggression were not significant. This finding is again in conflict with the research done by Goma-I-Friexanet (1995). It would appear, therefore, that while neuroticism does impact avoidance behaviors, it does not relate to defiance or aggression. This could be due to the fact that the base rate for defiant and aggressive behaviors are too low in a representative population, as opposed to a criminal population, or due to the tendency of children to outgrow some types of negative behaviors.

Longitudinal research in this area would be of benefit to the field to discover if aggressive behaviors in children tend to manifest themselves as avoidant behaviors in adults.

Although no hypotheses were made with regard to openness to experience, this variable was included in the analyses. It was found that openness to new experience was positively and significantly correlated with both physical avoidance and defiance. However, it was not a significant predictor of either. As physical avoidance measures a tendency to seek out a new place of employment, it is expected that a person who is open to new experience might more readily embrace a job change than would a person who does not seek new experiences. It could also be that a person who seeks new experiences is more confident in trying new tactics to counter an unpleasant job situation and is therefore defiant. Whether this is the reason that a person who is open to new experiences would engage in defiant behaviors is beyond the purview of this research, however.

In addition to the openness to new experience variable, demographic items were included in the analyses, though not specified in the hypotheses. The variables included in the regression analyses were social desirability, age, gender, current time on the job, and intention to remain on the job. Avoidance of the work



itself is most heavily impacted by these variables. This type of negative behavior has a negative relationship with intention to remain on the job, social desirability, age, and current time on the job. The significant predictors of these work avoidant behaviors are age, social desirability, and intention to remain with the company. Therefore, it could be said that younger persons have a tendency to engage in more work avoidant behaviors than do older persons and no one likes to admit it. In addition, those persons who intend to stay with an organization tend to engage in more work avoidant behaviors. This result seems somewhat contradictory, but it could be that those persons who intend to stay do so because they have found ways to avoid work or that persons who tend toward work avoidant behaviors will stay in an organization where such behavior is unnoticed or permitted.

There is one additional point that should be considered with respect to the results of this study. This is the magnitude of the means of the responses that participants gave for some of the more serious negative behaviors. All of the means for the sample were below the scale midpoint of three, except for those of the constructive protest behaviors. For this factor the means for the sample centered around the midpoint of the scale. This would indicate that in spite of the prevalence of negative job behaviors in the United States and the cost

to our economy because of this, persons do not tend to admit to engaging in negative behaviors. Another possible consideration with regard to this is that the sample of university undergraduates do not comprise the population that tends to engage in these negative job behaviors. In fact, attending college to further a career could be considered a very constructive, not negative, way of handling dissatisfaction with one's job.

Although the means for the behaviors were surprisingly low, it remains that significant findings were made that can assist in the prediction of negative behaviors and the possible stemming of the losses incurred by such behaviors in the future.

## CONCLUSIONS

In sum, negative behaviors are in fact related to personality variables, specifically neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness. And of these personality variables, agreeableness and conscientiousness are the best predictors of negative job behaviors. Therefore, future efforts should be made to replicate these results and to expand upon them to account for more of the variance that remains in the effort to explain and predict these relationships.

## REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 888-918.

Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.

Boye, M.W., & Slora, K.B. (1993). The severity and prevalence of deviant employee activity within supermarkets. Journal of Business and Psychology, 8(2), 245-253.

Chen, P.Y., & Spector, P.E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65, 177-184.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Conley, J.J. (1985). Longitudinal stability of personality traits: A multitrait-multimethod-multioccasion analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(5), 1266-1282.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1988). Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(5), 853-

863.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology.

Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24(4), 249-354.

Digman, J.M., & Inouye, J. (1986). Further specification of the five robust factors of personality.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(1), 116-123.

Drasgow, F., & Kanfer, R. (1985). Equivalence of psychological measurement in heterogeneous populations.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 662-680.

Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, M.W. (1985). Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach.

New York, NY: Plenum.

Fisher, C.D., & Locke, E.A. (1992). The new look in job satisfaction research and theory. In C.J. Cranny, P.C. Smith, & E.F. Stone (Eds.), Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their

performance. (pp. 165-194). New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Fiske, D.W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources.

Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44, 329-344.

Fiske, S.T., & Linville, P.W. (1980). What does the schema concept buy us? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6, 537-543.

Goma-I-Friexanet, M. (1995). Prosocial and antisocial aspects of personality. Personality and Individual Differences, 19(2), 125-134.

Graybill, D., & Blackwood, A. (1996). Prediction of adolescent aggression by childhood personality measures: A comparison of projective procedures, self-report tests, and behavior ratings. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52(1), 61-66.

Hogan, R.T. (1992). Personality and personality measurement. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Vol.3, pp. 873-919). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B.W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions. American Psychologist, 51(5), 469-477.

Joreskog, K., & Sorbom, D. (1996). LISREL 8: User's Reference Guide. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Konovsky, M.A., & Organ, D.W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17, 253-266.

Kosek, R.B. (1995). Measuring prosocial behavior of college students. Psychological Reports, 77, 739-742.

Ma, H.K., Shek, D.T.L., Cheung, P.C., & Lee, R.P. (1996). The relation of prosocial and antisocial behavior

to personality and peer relationships of Hong Kong Chinese adolescents. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 157(3), 255-266.

McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1985). Updating Norman's adequate taxonomy: Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and questionnaires. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 710-721.

McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1987). Validation of the five factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(1), 81-90.

Murphy, K.R. (1993). Honesty in the workplace. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.A. (in press). Type A behavior pattern, self-monitoring, and job satisfaction as predictors of aggression in the workplace.

Organ, D.W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. The Journal of Social Psychology, 135(3), 339-350.

Pratkanis, A.R., & Turner, M.E. (1994). Of what value is a job attitude? A socio-cognitive analysis. Human Relations, 47(12), 1545-1576.

Raelin, J.A. (1994). Three scales of professional deviance within organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15, 483-501.

Robertson, I.T. (1993). The validity and utility of

personality assessment in occupational psychology.

European Review of Applied Psychology, 43(3), 187-194.

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

Stewart, G.L., & Carson, K.P. (1995). Personality dimensions and domains of service performance: A field investigation. Journal of Business and Psychology, 9(4), 365-378.



## APPENDIX A

## THE NEO PI-R

Please respond to the following questions about how you feel about yourself as honestly as possible.

1 = Strongly disagree or definitely false

2 = Disagree or mostly false

3 = Neutral or can't decide

4 = Agree or mostly true

5 = Strongly agree or definitely true

\_\_\_ I am not a worrier. (N)

\_\_\_ I like to have a lot of people around me. (E)

\_\_\_ I don't like to waste my time daydreaming. (O)

\_\_\_ I try to be courteous to everyone I meet. (A)

\_\_\_ I keep my belongings clean and neat. (C)

\_\_\_ I often feel inferior to others. (N)

\_\_\_ I laugh easily. (E)

\_\_\_ Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it. (O)

\_\_\_ I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers. (A)

\_\_\_ I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time. (C)

\_\_\_ When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces. (N)

\_\_\_ I don't consider myself especially lighthearted. (E)

- \_\_\_ I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature. (O)
- \_\_\_ Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical. (A)
- \_\_\_ I am not a very methodical person. (C)
- \_\_\_ I rarely feel lonely or blue. (N)
- \_\_\_ I really enjoy talking to people. (E)
- \_\_\_ I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. (O)
- \_\_\_ I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them. (A)
- \_\_\_ I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously. (C)
- \_\_\_ I often feel tense and jittery. (N)
- \_\_\_ I like to be where the action is. (E)
- \_\_\_ Poetry has little or no effect on me. (O)
- \_\_\_ I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions. (A)
- \_\_\_ I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion. (C)
- \_\_\_ Sometimes I feel completely worthless. (N)
- \_\_\_ I usually prefer to do things alone. (E)
- \_\_\_ I often try new and foreign foods. (O)
- \_\_\_ I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them. (A)
- \_\_\_ I waste a lot of time before settling down to work. (C)

- \_\_\_ I rarely feel fearful or anxious. (N)
- \_\_\_ I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy. (E)
- \_\_\_ I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce. (O)
- \_\_\_ Most people I know like me. (A)
- \_\_\_ I work hard to accomplish my goals. (C)
- \_\_\_ I often get angry at the way people treat me. (N)
- \_\_\_ I am a cheerful, high-spirited person. (E)
- \_\_\_ I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues. (O)
- \_\_\_ Some people think of me as cold and calculating. (A)
- \_\_\_ When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through. (C)
- \_\_\_ I am not a cheerful optimist. (N)
- \_\_\_ Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up. (E)
- \_\_\_ Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement. (O)
- \_\_\_ I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes. (A)
- \_\_\_ Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be. (C)
- \_\_\_ I am seldom sad or depressed. (N)
- \_\_\_ My life is fast-paced. (E)

- \_\_\_ I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition. (O)
- \_\_\_ I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate. (A)
- \_\_\_ I am a productive person who always gets the job done. (C)
- \_\_\_ I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems. (N)
- \_\_\_ I am a very active person. (E)
- \_\_\_ I have a lot of intellectual curiosity. (O)
- \_\_\_ If I don't like people, I let them know it. (A)
- \_\_\_ I never seem to be able to get organized. (C)
- \_\_\_ At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide. (N)
- \_\_\_ I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others. (E)
- \_\_\_ I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas. (O)
- \_\_\_ If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want. (A)
- \_\_\_ I strive for excellence in everything I do. (C)

(N=Neuroticism, E=Extraversion, O=Openness,  
A=Agreeableness, C=Conscientiousness)

## APPENDIX B

## BEHAVIORS ON THE JOB

Please respond to each of the following questions about how often you engage in the following behaviors at work as honestly as possible.

- |     | 1   | 2 | 3         | 4 | 5 | 6     |
|-----|---|---|-----------|---|---|-------|
|     | never   |   | sometimes |   |   | daily |
| ___ | I avoid my job by coming in late and/or leaving early. (P)                                      |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I get away from my job by quitting. (P)   |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I call in sick when I'm not really sick. (P)  |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I look for a way to transfer out of my job or situation. (P)                                    |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I look for employment in another company. (P)   |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I avoid undesirable work. (V)   |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I do as little work as possible. (V)  |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I try to look busy doing nothing. (V)   |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I let others do the work for me. (V)  |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I put off projects until the last minute. (V)   |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I take frequent or extra long breaks. (V)   |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I write personal letters, read, and/or make personal calls when I'm supposed to be working. (V) |   |           |   |   |       |
| ___ | I talk excessively with co-workers when I'm supposed to be working. (V)                         |   |           |   |   |       |

- \_\_\_ I make frequent and/or long trips to the water fountain, vending machines, or restroom to avoid working. (V)
- \_\_\_ I talk to myself on the job. (S)
- \_\_\_ I lower my aspirations or expectations to make them congruent with a disappointing job. (S)
- \_\_\_ I pray on the job when I'm unhappy. (S)
- \_\_\_ I cover my emotions by wearing a mask of impassivity or indifference. (S)
- \_\_\_ I suppress feelings of dissatisfaction. (S)
- \_\_\_ I refuse to think about job feelings at all. (S)
- \_\_\_ I seek psychological or career or job counseling.  
(S)
- \_\_\_ I use drugs or alcohol before, during, or after work because of work problems. (S)
- \_\_\_ I confront my supervisor with my problems to try to work them out. (C)
- \_\_\_ I try to persuade management to change policies. (C)
- \_\_\_ I discuss problems with my supervisor in order to get advice. (C)
- \_\_\_ After discussing it with my boss, I get more education or training to increase my promotability.  
(C)
- \_\_\_ I file formal grievances about my supervisors or co-workers. (C)

- \_\_\_ I complain to my supervisor about the work situation. (C)
- \_\_\_ I ask for a raise. (C)
- \_\_\_ I suggest to other employees that we all form a union. (C)
- \_\_\_ I use my political influence to try to change things. (C)
- \_\_\_ I talk to coworkers to see whether they will help in a protest. (C)
- \_\_\_ I see a lawyer regarding my job situation. (C)
- \_\_\_ I deliberately ignore rules and/or regulations. (D)
- \_\_\_ I fail to follow a supervisor's instructions. (D)
- \_\_\_ I refuse to attend scheduled meetings. (D)
- \_\_\_ I openly refuse to do an assignment. (D)
- \_\_\_ I ignore my supervisor and informally work with/for another boss. (D)
- \_\_\_ I resist influence from others, including the boss. (D)
- \_\_\_ I talk back to my supervisor. (D)
- \_\_\_ I sell information about my company to competitors. (A)
- \_\_\_ I leak detrimental information about my company to the press. (A)
- \_\_\_ I start rumors to get revenge. (A)
- \_\_\_ I sabotage the work of co-workers. (A)

- \_\_\_ I use physical violence against other employees and/or supervisor(s). (A)
- \_\_\_ I destroy company property. (A)
- \_\_\_ I steal supplies, tools, and/or merchandise from the company. (A)
- \_\_\_ I purposely interfere with someone else doing their job. (A)
- \_\_\_ I sabotage the work of a supervisor (try to make him/her look bad). (A)
- \_\_\_ I lie in order to get the boss in trouble. (A)

(P=Physical avoidance, V=Avoidance of the work itself,  
S=Psychological adjustment, C=Constructive protest,  
D=Defiance, and A=Aggression)



## APPENDIX C

## INTENTIONS TO BEHAVE ON THE JOB

Please respond to each of the following questions about how often you think about or consider engaging in the following behaviors at work as honestly as possible.

- |       |   |           |   |   |       |
|-------|---|-----------|---|---|-------|
| 1     | 2 | 3         | 4 | 5 | 6     |
| never |   | sometimes |   |   | daily |
- 
- \_\_\_ I think about avoiding my job by coming in late and/or leaving early. (P)
- \_\_\_ I consider getting away from my job by quitting. (P)
- \_\_\_ I think about calling in sick when I'm not really sick. (P)
- \_\_\_ I consider looking for a way to transfer out of my job or situation. (P)
- \_\_\_ I think about looking for employment in another company. (P)
- \_\_\_ I consider avoiding undesirable work. (V)
- \_\_\_ I think about doing as little work as possible. (V)
- \_\_\_ I consider trying to look busy doing nothing. (V)
- \_\_\_ I think about letting others do the work for me. (V)
- \_\_\_ I consider putting off projects until the last minute. (V)
- \_\_\_ I think about taking frequent or extra long breaks. (V)

- \_\_\_ I consider writing personal letters, reading, and/or making personal calls when I'm supposed to be working. (V)
- \_\_\_ I think about talking excessively with co-workers when I'm supposed to be working. (V)
- \_\_\_ I consider making frequent and/or long trips to the water fountain, vending machines, or restroom to avoid working. (V)
- \_\_\_ I think about talking to myself on the job. (S)
- \_\_\_ I consider lowering my aspirations or expectations to make them congruent with a disappointing job. (S)
- \_\_\_ I think about praying on the job when I'm unhappy. (S)
- \_\_\_ I consider covering my emotions by wearing a mask of impassivity or indifference. (S)
- \_\_\_ I think about suppressing feelings of dissatisfaction. (S)
- \_\_\_ I consider refusing to think about job feelings at all. (S)
- \_\_\_ I think about seeking psychological or career or job counseling. (S)
- \_\_\_ I consider using drugs or alcohol before, during, or after work because of work problems. (S)
- \_\_\_ I think about confronting my supervisor with my problems to try to work them out. (C)

- \_\_\_ I consider trying to persuade management to change policies. (C)
- \_\_\_ I think about discussing problems with my supervisor in order to get advice. (C)
- \_\_\_ I consider getting more education or training to increase my promotability, after discussing it with my boss. (C)
- \_\_\_ I think about filing formal grievances about my supervisors or co-workers. (C)
- \_\_\_ I consider complaining to my supervisor about the work situation. (C)
- \_\_\_ I think about asking for a raise. (C)
- \_\_\_ I consider suggesting to other employees that we all form a union. (C)
- \_\_\_ I think about using my political influence to try to change things. (C)
- \_\_\_ I consider talking to coworkers to see whether they will help in a protest. (C)
- \_\_\_ I think about seeing a lawyer regarding my job situation. (C)
- \_\_\_ I consider deliberately ignore rules and/or regulations. (D)
- \_\_\_ I think about failing to follow a supervisor's instructions. (D)
- \_\_\_ I consider refusing to attend scheduled meetings. (D)

- \_\_\_ I think about openly refusing to do an assignment.  
(D)
- \_\_\_ I consider ignoring my supervisor and informally  
work with/for another boss. (D)
- \_\_\_ I think about resisting influence from others,  
including the boss. (D)
- \_\_\_ I consider talking back to my supervisor. (D)
- \_\_\_ I think about selling information about my company  
to competitors. (A)
- \_\_\_ I consider leaking detrimental information about my  
company to the press. (A)
- \_\_\_ I think about starting rumors to get revenge. (A)
- \_\_\_ I consider sabotaging the work of co-workers. (A)
- \_\_\_ I think about using physical violence against other  
employees and/or supervisor(s). (A)
- \_\_\_ I consider destroying company property. (A)
- \_\_\_ I think about stealing supplies, tools, and/or  
merchandise from the company. (A)
- \_\_\_ I consider purposely interfering with someone else  
doing their job. (A)
- \_\_\_ I think about sabotaging the work of a supervisor  
(try to make him/her look bad). (A)
- \_\_\_ I consider lying in order to get the boss in  
trouble. (A)

(P=Physical avoidance, V=Avoidance of the work itself,  
S=Psychological adjustment, C=Constructive protest,  
D=Defiance, and A=Aggression)

## APPENDIX D

## SOCIAL DESIREABILITY

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE as it pertains to you personally.

- \_\_\_ Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
- \_\_\_ I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
- \_\_\_ \* It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
- \_\_\_ I have never intensely disliked anyone.
- \_\_\_ \* On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
- \_\_\_ \* I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
- \_\_\_ I am always careful about my manner of dress.
- \_\_\_ My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
- \_\_\_ \* If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.
- \_\_\_ \* On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
- \_\_\_ \* I like to gossip at times.

\_\_\_ \* There have been times when I felt like rebelling  
against people in authority even though I knew they  
were right.

\_\_\_ No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good  
listener.

\_\_\_ \* I can remember "playing sick" to get out of  
something.

\_\_\_ \* There have been occasions when I took advantage of  
someone.

\_\_\_ I'm always willing to admit when I made a mistake.

\_\_\_ I always try to practice what I preach.

\_\_\_ I don't find it particularly difficult to get along  
with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.

\_\_\_ \* I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and  
forget.

\_\_\_ When I don't know something I don't at all mind  
admitting it.

\_\_\_ I am always courteous, even to people who are  
disagreeable.

\_\_\_ \* At times I have really insisted on having things my  
own way.

\_\_\_ \* There have been occasions when I felt like smashing  
things.

\_\_\_ I would never think of letting someone else be  
punished for my wrongdoing.

\_\_\_ I never resent being asked to return a favor.

- \_\_\_ I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
- \_\_\_ I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
- \_\_\_ \* There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
- \_\_\_ I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
- \_\_\_ \* I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
- \_\_\_ I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
- \_\_\_ \* I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
- \_\_\_ I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

\* Indicates that the item is reverse scored.



APPENDIX E  
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Please answer a few questions about yourself.

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Gender?    male            female

Ethnicity?      African-American      Asian      Caucasian

                 Hispanic            Other \_\_\_\_\_

Type of job you currently hold \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you been with your current employer? \_\_\_\_ yrs

How long do you intend to remain with the company you are  
currently employed by? \_\_\_\_ yrs

APPENDIX F  
PARTICIPANT NOTIFICATION FORM

Old Dominion University  
Psychology Department

You will be participating in a study that asks you about the behaviors you engage in on your job and a few questions about yourself.

In order to participate in this study, you must be employed at least part time, be 17 years of age, and be an undergraduate at Old Dominion University.

There are no known risks associated with this study. There might be, however, the possibility that you may be subject to risks that have not yet been defined. The main benefit of this study is the attainment of information about job behaviors and personality.

Participation is voluntary. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time without prejudice or loss of points.

Any information obtained about you from this questionnaire will be kept strictly anonymous, meaning we will not connect your name to the data. Your responses will be reported only in the form of averages along with the responses of other participants in this study.

In the event that you have questions regarding your participation in this study, you may contact Victoria Cole

at 683-4462 or Dr. Val Derlega, Chair of the Psychology Department Human Subjects Committee at 683-3118 at Old Dominion University, who would be glad to review the matter with you.

Investigator's Statement:

I certify that I have explained the nature and purpose of the potential benefits and possible risks associated with participation in this study. I have answered any questions that have been raised by the subject and have encouraged him/her to ask any additional questions at any time during the course of this study. I have witnessed the above signature on the date stated on this notification form.

---

Investigator's Signature

---

Date

## VITA

Victoria Leigh Cole  
 Department of Psychology  
 Mills Godwin Bldg.  
 Old Dominion University  
 Norfolk, VA 23508

## Professional Objective

An external consulting position that includes travel and an opportunity for teaching occasional courses in organizational psychology at a local university.

## Education

Old Dominion University, Ph.D. in Organizational Psychology, expected 2001  
 Old Dominion University, M.S. in Psychology, expected December 1998  
 University of South Florida, B.A. in Psychology, May 1996  
 Hillsborough Community College, A.A. in Liberal Arts, May 1994

## Publications and Presentations

Major, D., Turner, J., & Cole, V. L. (August, 1998). Effects of supervisory behaviors on newcomer relationships and socialization outcomes. Poster presented at American Psychological Association Conference, San Francisco, CA.

Barbee, A. P., Sachder, M., Derlega, V. J., Winstead, B. A., & Cole, V. L. (June, 1998). Safe sex practices in women who are HIV positive. Paper presented at the International Conference on Personal Relationships, Saratoga Springs, NY.

Cole, V. L., Bernas, K., Turner, J., & Major, D. A. (May, 1998). Parents' work and family selves. Paper presented at Conference on Feminist Scholarship in Hampton Roads Work in Progress VIII, Norfolk, VA.

Cole, V. L. (March, 1997). Supervisory behaviors that influence newcomer relationship building. Poster presented at Virginia Academy of Science, Blacksburg, VA.

Cole, V. L. (1996). Relating locus of control and sex roles to satisfaction in jobs traditionally held by women. Unpublished undergraduate honor's thesis, University of South Florida.