Bodankin, Moran; Tziner, Aharon

Article

Constructive Deviance, Destructive Deviance and Personality: How do they interrelate?

Amfiteatru Economic Journal

Provided in Cooperation with:
The Bucharest University of Economic Studies

Suggested Citation: Bodankin, Moran; Tziner, Aharon (2009) : Constructive Deviance, Destructive Deviance and Personality: How do they interrelate?, Amfiteatru Economic Journal, ISSN 2247-9104, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Vol. 11, Iss. 26, pp. 549-564

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/168681

CONSTRUCTIVE DEVIANCE, DESTRUCTIVE DEVIANCE AND PERSONALITY: HOW DO THEY INTERRELATE ?

Moran Bodankin [1] and Aharon Tziner[2]
[1) 2)]*Schools of Behavioral Sciences and Business Administration*
Netanya University College
E-mail:atziner@netanya.ac.il

Abstract

In recent years deviant behavior in organizations has drawn increasing attention. However, surprisingly little research has focused on constructive rather than destructive deviance. In an attempt to bridge this gap, the present study investigated both constructive and destructive deviance at work and their relationship to employee personality. Using 89 hi-tech employees, constructive and destructive (interpersonal and organizational) deviance were regressed on the big-five factors of personality. Findings show that neuroticism and agreeableness were related to both types of constructive deviance, whereas conscientiousness was associated with both types of destructive deviance. Moreover, agreeableness was connected to interpersonal destructive deviance, whereas openness to experience was connected to organizational constructive deviance. Theoretical and practical implications are suggested as well as a course for future research.

Keywords: work deviance; organizational misbehavior; personality and counterproductive behavior

JEL Classification: Organizational Behavior

Introduction

At present, workplace deviance has become an important issue in organizations and is gaining increasing research attention (Berry, Ones & Sackett, 2007; Cohen-Charagh, & Mueller, 2007; Dilchert, Ones, Davis & Rostow, 2007). The effects of deviant behaviors in the organization have economical, sociological and psychological implications. For example, the financial cost resulting from theft by employees in the United States is estimated at 50 billion dollars per year (Coffin, 2003). Moreover, employees who had been the target of such deviant behaviors have a greater tendency to resign, and develop stress related problems and low morale (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Glew, 1996). They also tend to experience low self esteem, an increase in fear and lack of confidence at work, as well as physical and psychological pain (Griffin, O'Leary & Collins, 1998). Together with these negative outcomes, deviant behaviors of employees can also be functional and constructive. For example, research shows that violating organizational norms by demonstrating deviant behaviors can serve as a source of innovation and creativity, thus contributing to the organization's competitive advantage as well as to the societal well being. (Howell &

Higgins, 1990; Howell, Shea & Higgins, 1998, Krau, 2008) Thus, workplace deviant behaviors can have both positive and negative repercussions.

1. Destructive Deviance

Robinson & Bennett (1995) define destructive deviance as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms, thus threatening the wellbeing of an organization, its members, or both. The behavior can be divided into two main categories according to its objective: behaviors that are directed toward other individuals and behaviors that are directed toward the organization. The first category, *interpersonal destructive deviance,* comprises behaviors such as stealing from other employees and informing on them. The second category, *organizational destructive deviance,* comprises behaviors such as stealing from the company and sabotaging equipment.

Destructive deviance is a "sensitive subject" among employees since the outcome of reporting them may affect their personal lives and security. As a result, employees are reluctant to report their own destructive deviant behaviors (Tziner, Goldberg & Or, 2006). Furthermore, managers avoid cooperating in researches that focus on such behaviors since such inadequate behaviors indicate organizational weakness and lack of control (Analoui & Kakabads, 1992). To overcome the problems associated with measuring deviant behaviors, we decided to ask the respondents to report destructive deviant behaviors of *others* in the organization. This approach is based on the assumption that the respondents' subjective reports will reflect their intentions and behavior, as argued in the literature (Tziner, Goldberg & Or, 2006).

2. Constructive Deviance

Galperin (2002) defined constructive deviance as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and thus contributes to the wellbeing of an organization, its members, or both. Despite the fact that these behaviors are impermissible by the managerial level, they assist the organization in achieving its objectives. These behaviors can be divided into two main categories. The first, *interpersonal constructive deviance*, is directed at individuals and comprises behaviors such as disobeying managerial orders in order to improve organizational processes. The second, *organizational constructive deviance*, is directed at the organization and comprises two types of behaviors: innovative behaviors aimed at helping the organization (i.e., finding creative ways to solve problems) and behaviors that challenge existing norms in order to help the organization (i.e., breaking rules in order to solve clients' problems).

While destructive deviance may embarrass the employee and therefore requires indirect measuring, constructive deviance does not embarrass the employee, and hence enables direct measuring through self-reports. It is worthy of note that in the past researchers have questioned the validity of self-reports that measure deviant behaviors (Lautenschlager & Flaherty, 1990), but the literature also shows support for the reliability of self-reports (Spector, 1992). Moreover, by its very nature constructive deviance is pro-active and non-discretionary (Galperin & Burke, 2006). Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that self-reports by employees on personal constructive behaviors do not endanger reliability issues, as do destructive deviance self-reports.

There are two streams of research that explore workplace deviance: (1) destructive deviance which emphasizes its negative effects and, (2) constructive deviance which examines its positive effects. Despite the growing importance of constructive deviance in the organization, the majority of research to date focuses on destructive deviant behaviors. Few empirical studies explored the antecedents of and correlations between both types of deviant behaviors, destructive and constructive, together (Galperin & Burke, 2006). Warren (2003) argues that research on negative and positive deviant behaviors needs to unite in order to ensure that theories, conceptions and managerial recommendations are better understood, thus becoming more useful. Moreover, she emphasizes the need for *integrative* studies that explore deviant behaviors holistically (and not focus exclusively on negative deviance).

In this study we attempted to unite destructive and constructive deviances and explore the relationship between them and personal attributes. In numerous studies on counterproductive behavior, findings show that interpersonal differences play an important role in revealing destructive deviant behaviors in the workplace (Barling, 1996; Neuman & Baron, 1998; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Glew, 1996; Fox & Spector, 1999). For example, Fox and Spector (1999) found a significant correlation between characteristics of locus of control, anxiety characteristics and anger with self-reports on counterproductive behaviors. In the past decade, the Big Five received considerable effects in the organizational and industrial psychological domains (e.g. Barrick & Mount, 1991; Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2005). In addition, this model can be generalized beyond cultures and different evaluations (personal, between peers and observations), and is stable over time (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Hence, we would like to examine the predictive ability of the Big Five by Costa & McCrae (1992) namely, destructive and constructive deviances in the organization.

3. Personality Dimensions

Five higher-order personality traits were found (Goldberg, 1990; Costa & McCrae, 1992): neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness. *Neuroticism* is characterized by the tendency to exhibit low emotional adaptation and experience negative affect such as fear, anxiety and jealousy. *Extraversion* is characterized by sociability, activeness and assertiveness. *Openness to experience* is expressed by the tendency to be inquisitive, creative, independent, and non-conforming. *Agreeableness* is characterized by friendliness, warmth, adaptability and cooperation. *Conscientiousness* is characterized by responsibility, diligence, stability, precision and achievement.

4. The Big Five and Destructive and Constructive Deviance

Neuroticism

This personality dimension is closely related to negative affectivity and therefore is expected to directly relate to destructive deviance. Since negative affectivity is perceived as a main predictor of aggressive behavior according to different aggression models (Berkowitz, 1998), and since aggressive behaviors are associated with destructive deviance, it is reasonable to correlate neuroticism with destructive deviance. In addition, neuroticism was found to negatively correlate with performance in jobs characterized by interpersonal relations (Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998), a fact that indicates the non-congruency of neuroticism with interpersonal type jobs. Given these findings:

Hypothesis 1a: Neuroticism will be positively correlated with organizational destructive deviance.

Hypothesis 1b: Neuroticism will be positively correlated with interpersonal destructive deviance.

The main purpose of constructive deviance is to improve and promote the organization and its objectives. Hence, the characteristics of emotional stability, masculinity and courage will serve this purpose, while negative emotions of anxiety and jealousy will run counter to it. Consequently, we hypothesize that the correlation between neuroticism and constructive deviance will be negative.

Hypothesis 2a: Neuroticism will be negatively correlated with organizational constructive deviance.

Hypothesis 2b: Neuroticism will be negatively correlated with interpersonal constructive deviance.

Extraversion

Lee, Ashton & Shin (2005) found this personality dimension to be a predictor of both destructive deviance directed at the organization and at individuals in the organization. Moreover, since this dimension is more socially-oriented than task-oriented (Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2001), it is more strongly related to interpersonal destructive deviance than organizational destructive deviance (Liao, Joshi & Chuang, 2004; Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2005). Therefore, it is more likely to find a correlation with interpersonal destructive deviance. We would like to emphasize that although the next hypothesis has been verified in previous research, this personality dimension has not yet been measured as part of an integrative study. In order to differentiate between its predictive capabilities for both destructive and constructive deviance it is important to measure it again.

Hypothesis 3: Extraversion will be positively correlated with interpersonal destructive deviance.

We argue that the characteristics of activeness and assertiveness of this personality dimension can also be linked to constructive deviant behaviors. For example, initiative and innovative behaviors can be attributed to activeness, and behaviors such as bending the rules and disobeying superiors in order to promote the organization can be attributed to assertiveness. (It is important to note that verifying these following hypotheses depends on the sociability component of this dimension being less dominant than the activeness and assertiveness ones. This is due to the fact that interpersonal constructive deviant behaviors – i.e. disagreeing with team co-workers in order to improve organizational processes – are not included in social behaviors, and are therefore less likely to be found in extroversive individuals).

Hypothesis 4a: Extraversion will be positively correlated with organizational constructive deviance.

Hypothesis 4b: Extraversion will be positively correlated with interpersonal constructive deviance.

Openness to Experience

In their study, Liao, Joshi & Chuang (2004) found that this personality dimension was negatively correlated with organizational destructive deviance despite the fact that they had not hypothesized such a correlation. Interpersonal differences in creativity and autonomy do not appear to be relevant to the degree to which a person is willing to engage in destructive deviant behaviors, neither organizational nor interpersonal (Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2005). Therefore, we are not hypothesizing a possible correlation between openness to experience and destructive deviance. On the other hand, due to the productive, autonomous and innovative nature of this personality dimension, it appears that a positive correlation with both types of constructive deviant behaviors is "a must".

Hypothesis 5a: Openness to experience will be positively correlated with organizational constructive deviance.

Hypothesis 4b: Openness to experience will be positively correlated with interpersonal constructive deviance.

Agreeableness

Salgado (2002) found agreeableness a valid predictor of destructive deviance (in general), in a negative correlation. Later, Liao, Joshi & Chuang (2004) found a positive correlation between differences in agreeableness (differences between individuals and their work group) and *organizational* destructive deviance. In contrast, Lee, Ashton & Shin (2005) found a negative correlation between agreeableness and *interpersonal* destructive deviance. Agreeableness comprises socially-oriented characteristics and therefore we find it more probable to hypothesize a correlation between behaviors that are directed toward individuals rather than the organization. Moreover, due to this dimension's social orientation, it is expected that harmful behaviors against individuals would be *inhibited*. Therefore, our next hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 6: Agreeableness will be negatively correlated with interpersonal destructive behaviors.

Past studies have employed this personality dimension to predict behaviors of cooperation in the workplace (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Chatman & Barsade, 1995). Since agreeableness is characterized by cooperation, there is no reason to hypothesize a possible correlation with behaviors that deviate from the norm in order to promote the organization that is acceptable.

Conscientiousness

This personality dimension reflects characteristics that are work-oriented, such as achievement, responsibility and methodicalness which are mainly non-personal and social. Indeed, Lee, Ashton & Shin (2005) found a negative correlation between conscientiousness and destructive deviance. Despite the fact that this dimension is work-oriented and non-personal, a significant correlation between conscientiousness and interpersonal deviance was also found in an earlier study (Liao, Joshi & Chuang, 2004). We argue that an employee with conscientious tendencies will avoid or at least minimize deviant behaviors that might harm the organization and the workers within it. This is in line with Ones & Viswesvaran (1996b), who proposed a theory according to which one of the reasons that a conscientious worker is more productive than a less conscientious one is due to the fact that

conscientious workers generally avoid counterproductive behaviors. Therefore, we should expect a correlation with interpersonal destructive deviance as well.

Hypothesis 7a: Conscientiousness will be negatively correlated with organizational destructive deviance.

Hypothesis 7b: Conscientiousness will be negatively correlated with interpersonal destructive deviance.

Due to the pragmatic nature of this personality dimension, which is characterized by precision and responsibility at the workplace, professional performance would appear to be an ample behavior for promoting the organization, and deviant behaviors, even if constructive, would be unnecessary. This is true, despite Ones & Viswesvaran's (1996b) argument that conscientious workers tend to show a level of performance that is above and beyond the requirements of the job in the workplace. This argument may lead to the assumption that "performance that is beyond the requirements" is perceived as constructive deviant behavior. However, the pragmatic, meticulous and responsible aspects point more to conservative, rather than innovative, tendencies. In addition, the non-social nature of this personality dimension is not compatible with the tendency to help other workers. Therefore, we did not expect any correlation between conscientiousness and constructive deviance.

To sum up, the purpose of this study was to examine empirically the relationships of the Big-Five dimensions of personality and the two types of organizational deviance, as stated in Hypotheses 1a through 7b.

5. Method

Participants

Data was collected from three hi-tech organizations in Israel. Ninety-five questionnaires were distributed and 89 useable questionnaires were submitted (response rate of 93.7%). Of the respondents, some 84% were male and 16% were female. Over half were married (59%), another 30% were single and 11% were divorced. The age range was 22-56 with an average age of 36.22 (SD = 7.37). Approximately 92% had a full academic education and held a university degree, another 7% had partial academic education and 1% were high-school graduates. Approximately 10% held managerial positions, 88% held workers' positions and 2% were part-time or temporary employees. Approximately 44% of the employees had been working in the organization for 6-7 years; average tenure in the organization was 5.46 years (SD = 2.37).

Procedure

The questionnaire, built to measure the relevant variables, was distributed to the participants together with an explanatory letter. It should be noted that the structure of the questionnaire had 6 different versions. The order of the questionnaire's subsections was changed in order to avoid order effects and to enable a measurement that is least biased. The participants were requested to fill out the questionnaire and return it in a sealed envelope that was collected by the first author or passed on to her.

6. Measures

Destructive Deviance

A Hebrew version (The Hebrew version was designed, validated and used in previous studies) (see Vardi & Weitz, 2004) of the Bennett and Robinson (2000) questionnaire was used. Participants responded on a 6-point Likert scale (1=never, 6=always) on the degree each behavior was customary among the organization's employees. They were requested to report the behavior of *other* workers and not their own due to this issue's sensitivity. Had we asked them for a self report, their answers might have been less sincere, as they would have wanted to present themselves in a positive light, due to social desirability and fear of outcome (Tziner, Goldberg & Or, 2006).

The measurement comprised two factors: organizational destructive deviance and interpersonal destructive deviance. The first factor comprised destructive deviant behaviors directed at the organization (12 items), for example, "Will come late or leave early without authorization". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.86 (M=2.88, SD=0.68). The second factor comprised destructive deviant behaviors directed at other employees (8 items), for example, "An employee who informs on another employee". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.85 (M=2.73, SD=0.76).

Constructive Deviance

We used the Hebrew version (agreed upon by three translators) of Galperin's (2002) questionnaire. Participants responded on a 6 point Likert scale (1=extremely non-typical, 6=extremely typical) on the degree each behavior was typical of them. The measurement comprised two factors: organizational constructive deviance and interpersonal constructive deviance. The first factor comprised constructive deviant behaviors directed at the organization (10 items), for example, "Developed creative solutions for problems". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.90 (M=3.42, SD=0.93). The second factor comprised constructive deviant behaviors directed at other employees (5 items), for example, "Reported a wrong-doing to co-workers to bring about a positive organizational change". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.79 (M=3.26, SD=0.95).

The Big Five Personality Factors

The personality traits were measured by the short version (NEO-FFI) of the most valid and popular Big Five questionnaire by Costa & McCrae (1992). This version was translated into Hebrew by the B.I.P Institute of Psychology Ltd. Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale (1=vigorously object, 5=vigorously agree) on the degree to which they agree that each item characterizes them. Neuroticism was measured by 12 items, for example "I am not a worrier" (an item that was re-coded). Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.89 (M=2.2, SD=0.75). Extraversion was measured by 10 items, for example "I like it when there are a lot of people around me". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.90 (M=3.47, SD=0.78). Openness to experience was measured by 6 items, for example "The patterns that I find in art and nature fascinate me". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.88 (M=3.07, SD=0.94). Agreeableness was measured by 12 items, for example "I try to be courteous towards everyone I meet". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.88 (M=3.50, SD=0.74). Conscientiousness was measured by 11 items, for example "I keep my belongings tidy and neat". Internal consistency of this measure was alpha=0.89 (M=3.82, SD=0.68).

7. Results

Common Method Error

A factor analysis was conducted in order to examine the degree to which correlations between the different variable measurements were formed by an artifact of common method error. No one general factor was found, but rather three different factors emerged from the analysis which could explain the main part of the variance. Although these findings do not entirely cancel out the possibility of bias (measuring different attitudes from the same source), they do make it possible to assume that this is an unlikely explanation for the correlations found.

Hypotheses Examination

Two general dependent variables were measured in this study: destructive deviance and constructive deviance. For each variable two specific variables were calculated. Destructive deviance was calculated by: (1) organizational destructive deviance and (2) interpersonal destructive deviance. Constructive deviance was calculated by: (1) organizational constructive deviance, and (2) interpersonal constructive deviance. An overall of four specific dependent variables was measured. Each of these dependent variables was calculated separately based on the participants' responses to the questions which measured it. For each participant an average of his or her answers for each variable was calculated. The general independent variable in this study was personality; it comprises five specific independent variables which are the Big Five. Table 1 shows the simple correlations between the dependent and independent variables.

Correlations among all study variables

Table 1

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Neuroticism								
2. Extraversion	.43**							
3. Openness to Experience	-.17	.57**						
4. Agreeableness	-.14	.46**	19*					
5. Conscientiousness	-.14	-.16	-.09	-.34**				
6. Organizational Constructive Deviance	-.45**	.37**	.36**	-.05	-.10			
7. Interpersonal Constructive Deviance	-.45**	.41**	.36**	-.04	-.02	.79**		
8. Organizational Destructive Deviance	.08	-.06	.002	-.08	-.35**	.19*	.20*	
9. Interpersonal Destructive Deviance	.24*	-.24*	-.06	-.31**	-.21*	.23*	.23*	.63*

Note: N = 88 Correlations are significant at: * $\underline{p} < .05$ or ** $\underline{p} < .01$ levels

Since a correlation was also found between the independent variables themselves, four multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to examine the unique contribution of each of the Big Five personality traits in explaining each of the dependent variables. Table 2 shows the result of the regression analyses.

Results of regression analyses

Table 2

Variable	Organizational Constructive Deviance	Interpersonal Constructive Deviance	Organizational Destructive Deviance	Interpersonal Destructive Deviance
Neuroticism	-0.38*	-0.36*	0.03	0.10
Extraversion	0.18	0.25*	-0.08	-0.12
Openness to Experience	0.23*	0.20*	0.04	0.07
Agreeableness	-0.27*	-0.28*	0.20	-0.37*
Conscientiousness	-0.10	-0.11	-0.48*	-0.33*

Note: N=89 .Values are standardized betas
*p < .05

As predicted by hypotheses 2a and 2b, neuroticism was found to be negatively correlated with organizational constructive deviance (r=-0.445, p<0.01), and with interpersonal constructive deviance (r=-0.449, p<0.01). In addition, in accordance with hypothesis 1b, neuroticism was positively correlated with interpersonal destructive deviance, albeit this variable did not have a unique contribution to the prediction of interpersonal destructive deviance. This may be explained by its (strong) significant negative correlation with extraversion (r=-0.434, p<0.01), hence the dimensions reduce the uniqueness of one another. Contrary to hypothesis 1a, a significant correlation between neuroticism and organizational destructive deviance was not found. It appears that although negative affectivity is an important component of neuroticism, it cannot be inferred that the two are identical. In other words, while negative affectivity is significantly correlated with destructive deviance (Skarlicki, Folger & Tesluck, 1997), neuroticism is not.

Consistent with hypotheses 4a and 4b extraversion correlated positively with organizational constructive deviance (r=0.372, p<0.01) and with interpersonal constructive deviance (r=0.405, p<0.01). However, extraversion does not have a unique contribution to predicting organizational constructive deviance, and its unique contribution to predicting interpersonal constructive deviance was only close to significant (p<0.066). Firstly, it should be noted that perhaps the small size of the sample impaired the likelihood of significance. Secondly, there were significantly strong correlations between extraversion and neuroticism (r=-0.434, p<0.01), openness to experience (r=0.567, p<0.01) and agreeableness (r=0.459, p<0.01); these dimensions were found to be significant predictors of organizational constructive deviance in the regression analyses. Therefore, perhaps they lessened the unique contribution of the extraversion dimension. Thirdly, perhaps the social component was more dominant than the extraversion dimension's active and assertive ones. For example, it may well be that the employees tended more to agree with their co-workers or supervisors (social behaviors) than to oppose them (assertive behaviors), even if it did not rightfully serve the organization. This phenomenon might explain the distortion in the findings of hypothesis 3. While we hypothesized a positive correlation with interpersonal destructive deviance, a negative correlation was in fact found (although in the regression analysis it was not found to have a unique contribution in predicting). It should be noted that since this hypothesis was already assured in previous studies (e.g. Liao, Joshi & Chuang, 2004; Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2005), perhaps the reason for this again stems from the size of the sample.

As asserted by hypotheses 5a and 5b, openness to experience was a valid predictor of both organizational constructive ($r=0.359$, $p<0.01$) and interpersonal constructive deviance ($r=0.355$, $p<0.01$). However, the unique contribution to predicting interpersonal constructive deviance was only *almost* significant ($p<0.073$). Again we argue that the sample size impaired the likelihood of obtaining significance. Regarding the existence of a (completely) significant contribution in predicting organizational constructive deviance versus an almost significant contribution in predicting interpersonal constructive deviance, we can point to the characteristics of the workplace. Hi-tech organizations, like many capitalist organizations, tend more to promote individual competitiveness than collective accomplishment. This leads us to infer that a worker would prefer to promote the organization rather than help a fellow employee, since friendly help might have a detrimental effect on personal chances of success.

As predicted by hypothesis 6 a significant negative correlation was found between agreeableness and interpersonal destructive deviance ($r=-0.311$, $p<0.01$). In addition to its significant contribution to predicting interpersonal destructive deviance, as stated in our hypothesis, two more findings emerge. We did not hypothesize that agreeableness can predict constructive deviance, but we found unique contributions of agreeableness in predicting both constructive deviant behaviors (interpersonal and organizational), with a negative correlation between them. In the past, this personality dimension was employed to predict cooperative behaviors in the workplace (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Chatman & Barsade, 1995). It appears that the similarity between the aspects of agreeableness and cooperation is sufficiently strong to produce a valid prediction. The more a person tends to cooperate with the existing status, the less likely he or she is to deviate from the norm, even if it serves the organization and its workers.

As expected according to hypotheses 7a and 7b, a negative correlation was found between conscientiousness and organizational destructive deviance ($r=-0.347$, $p<0.01$) and between interpersonal destructive deviance ($r=-0.208$, $p<0.05$). Moreover, the unique contribution of this dimension in predicting organizational destructive deviance (beta=-0.428) was higher than the overall contribution of the five dimensions combined ($R=0.407$). This implies that the other four personality dimensions weaken the unique contribution of the conscientiousness dimension. This finding reinforces Ones & Viswesvaran's (1996b) theory. Their argument is that conscientious workers (who are pragmatic, meticulous and responsible) avoid counterproductive behaviors and tend more to present conservative and meticulous behaviors.

8. Discussion

This study integrates the two separate, albeit connected, streams in the field of *workplace deviance*: destructive and constructive deviance. The argument is that integrative studies provide a more general outlook on deviant behaviors, and produce concepts and managerial recommendations that are better understood and more useable (Warren, 2003). Moreover, this study continues a tradition founded in the past decade in which the Big Five are used as an analytic framework through which we can learn about the relations between personality and work related behaviors (Salgado, 2002). Numerous studies found that interpersonal differences play an important role in revealing destructive deviant behaviors in the workplace (Barling, 1996; Neuman & Baron, 1998; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin & Glew, 1996;

Fox & Spector, 1999). We argue that interpersonal differences predict constructive deviant behaviors in the workplace as well.

The findings of this study generate a number of resolute conclusions and several interesting phenomena. Regarding constructive deviance: organizational constructive deviance can be predicted by neuroticism and openness to experience according to our hypotheses, while it cannot be predicted by extraversion, despite our hypothesis. In addition, despite the fact that we did not hypothesize that agreeableness would be a valid predictor of organizational constructive deviance, it was, in fact, found to be one. Moreover, its unique contribution in predicting the behavior was second in magnitude after neuroticism. Agreeableness was also found to be a valid predictor of interpersonal constructive deviance although we did not hypothesize that such a correlation would exist. Again, its unique contribution is second in magnitude after neuroticism. The predictive ability of agreeableness constructive deviant behavior, can be explained by examining the "cooperative" component. Previous studies used agreeableness to predict cooperative behaviors in the workplace (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Chatman & Barsade, 1995). It appears that the more a person tends to cooperate, the less he or she tends to engage in behaviors that deviate from the norm. In addition, this study shows that interpersonal constructive deviance can be predicted by neuroticism, while extraversion and openness to experience produced almost significant contributions. We may assume that a larger sample would have sharpened the results.

Despite our hypotheses on destructive deviance, neuroticism was not found a valid predictor of either form of destructive deviant behaviors. A similar phenomenon was found in the study of Lee, Ashton & Shin (2005) whose expectations of finding a significant correlation were unsuccessful. This finding can be explained by the fact that negative affectivity is an important component of the neuroticism dimension, but the two are not identical. While negative affectivity is significantly correlated with destructive deviance (Skarlicki, Folger & Tesluck, 1997) neuroticism is not. In addition and contrary to our hypothesis, extraversion was not found to be a valid predictor of interpersonal destructive deviance. Moreover, a negative correlation was found despite our hypothesizing a positive correlation between them (albeit, the correlation was not significant). It appears that the reverse direction and lack of significance stem from the small size of the sample, since past studies found the extraversion dimension a valid predictor of destructive deviance (Liao, Joshi & Chuang, 2004; Lee, Ashton & Shin, 2005). Findings also showed, in accordance with our hypotheses, that agreeableness and conscientiousness are valid predictors of interpersonal destructive deviance. The interesting finding that emerges from this study is that conscientiousness alone can predict organizational destructive deviance more strongly than the five personality dimensions combined. This is seen by the magnitude of the Multiple R (R=0.407) which is smaller than the unique contribution of the conscientiousness dimension alone (beta=-0.432). This finding reinforces Ones & Viswesvaran's (1996b) theory which argues that conscientious workers avoid deviant behaviors and display more conservative and meticulous behaviors.

9. Limitations

As mentioned above, destructive deviant behavior is a sensitive issue among respondents. In order to overcome this problem, we asked the participants to report the behaviors of other workers in the organization and from their responses inferred their own personal tendencies. It is important to note that "others" are co-workers and the "organization" is

their workplace, to which they belong. This means that a degree of doubt still remains vis-à-vis the reliability of their responses (Tziner, Goldberg & Or, 2006). Moreover, using the questionnaire as a projective tool for their personal tendencies holds the risk of the disadvantage of an indirect and less precise measure.

A second limitation stems from the fact that the study is based on self-reports. Since we are treating the measure of destructive deviance as a projective one, our entire questionnaire is, in fact, comprised of self-reports. It is worthy of note that existing evidence suggests that self-reports of deviant behaviors are valid measures (Ones, Viswesvaran & Schmidt, 1993), particularly when anonymity is assured (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Nevertheless, it is important that future studies conduct replications of deviant behaviors from different sources, such as co-workers and supervisors.

Thirdly, the ability to generalize is limited. Conducting the study in a specific sector of the market (hi-tech) did indeed enable us to invalidate external factors that are correlated with different types of jobs and organizations, but this choice creates limitations on the ability to generalize findings. The organizational population which we studied mainly comprises academic males in full-time positions. Future studies in the field of deviant behaviors should use more diverse populations.

The fourth limitation is the small size of the sample used, particularly since a large number of variables was measured. Perhaps the size of the sample impaired the "almost" significance that we received on some of the measures. This may also be the reason for the distortion found in the direction of the correlation between extraversion and interpersonal destructive deviance.

10. Implications and recommendations

Numerous previous studies examined the correlation between personality dimensions and destructive deviance in the workplace, but only few examined the connection between personality dimensions and constructive deviance. This study indicated specific correlations between different personal tendencies and deviant behavior, both destructive and constructive. Future research should examine the correlations found here in the context of the organization's culture or ethical climate. Today numerous researchers in the field of organizational behavior agree that behavior is an outcome of the interaction between personality traits and environmental characteristics, and rule out the extreme approach which stresses that either personality traits (such as personal dispositions) or environmental characteristics (such as organizational culture) separately predict organizational behavior (Chatman & Barsade, 1995). For example, the social-cognitive theory stresses that personality is state dependent because it affects the manner in which people interpret and hence respond to different situations (e.g. Mischel, 1973). In addition, past research examined the variables (deviant behavior, personality, organizational culture/ ethical climate) in two ways: by examining the correlation between deviant behavior and ethical climate (e.g. Peterson, 2002; Applebaum, Deguire & Lay, 2005) or between personality traits and organizational culture (e.g. Judge & Cable, 1997). In other words, in the past the three variables were not sufficiently examined *together* in one analytic framework. While many believe that the combination of person and state can provide a better explanation for behaviors in the workplace than explanations which are solely based on person or state separately, there are only few empirical interactive studies (of deviant behavior +

personality + culture/climate) (e.g. Trevino & Youngblood, 1990). The researcher Henle (2005) adopted the interactive approach to studying deviant behavior in the workplace. In her study she combined the environmental and personality approaches in order to examine destructive deviant behaviors. Following this approach, future studies should examine the moderating effects of organizational culture or ethical climate on personality dispositions in the context of deviant organizational behavior, destructive and constructive together.

Equally important is the exploration of the role of cultural values on the relationship of personality and deviant organizational behavior. For instance, it is plausible that extraversion links to constructive deviance in Individualistic cultures and not Collectivistic ones, (Hofstede, 1994) because the former fosters individual expression of activeness and assertiveness characteristics of this personality trait. Moreover, behaviors such as deviant behavior emanate from individual and social values (Globerson &Krau,1993).Future research should explore their impact on the relationship of personality and deviant behavior.

References

1. Analoui, F., & Kakabadse, A. (1992). Unconventional Practices at Work: Insight and Analysis through Participant Observation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 7, 1-31.
2. Appelbaum, S.H., Deguire, K.J., & Lay, M. (2005). The Relationship of Ethical Climate to Deviant Workplace Behavior. *Corporate Governance*, Bradford, 5 (4), 43-57.
3. Barling, J. (1996). The Prediction, Experience and Consequences of Workplace Violence. In VendenBos, G.R., & Bulatao, E. (Eds.), *Violence on the Job: Identifying Risks and Developing Solutions* (pp. 20-40). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
4. Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
5. Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
6. Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2003) The Past, Present and Future of Workplace Deviance Research. In Greenberg, J. (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
7. Berkowitz, L. (1998). Affective Aggression: The Role of Stress, Pain and Negative Affect. In Green, R.G., & Donnerstein, E. (Eds.), *Human Aggression: Theories, Research, and Implications for Social Policy* (pp. 49-72). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
8. Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007) Interpersonal Deviance, Organizational Deviance, and their Common Correlates: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 410-424.
9. Chatman, J.A., & Barsade, S.G. (1995). Personality, Organizational Culture, and Cooperation: Evidence from a Business Simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 423-444.

10. Coffin, B. (2003) Breaking the Silence on White Collar Crime. *Risk Management*, 50:8.
11. Cohen – Charash, Y., & Mueller, J. S., (2007). Does Perceived Unfairness Exacerbate or Mitigate Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 666-680.
12. Costa, P.T. Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). "NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
13. Dilchert, S., Ones, D., Davis, R.D., & Rostow, J. D. (2007). Cognitive Ability Predicts Objectively Measured Counterproductive Work Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 616-627.
14. Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (1999). A Model of Work Frustration-Aggression. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 915-931.
15. Galperin, B.L. (2002). Determinants of Deviance in the Workplace: An Empirical Examination of Canada and Mexico. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.
16. Galperin, B.L., & Burke, R.A. (2006). Uncovering the Relationship between Workaholism and Workplace Destructive and Constructive Deviance: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17, 331-347.
17. Globerson,A.,& Krau,E.(1993). *Organizations and Management: Toward the Future* .Aldershot, Hants(England):Averbury.
18. Goldberg,L.R.(1990) An Alternative Description of Personality: The Big-Five Factor Structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*59,1216-1229.
19. Griffin,R.W., O'Leary, A.M., & Collins, J. (1998). Dysfunctional Work Behaviors in Organizations. In. Cooper, C.L., & Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behaviors* (pp. 65-82). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
20. Henle, C.A. (2005). Predicting Workplace Deviance from the Interaction between Organizational Justice and Personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17 (2), 247-261.
21. Hofstede, G. (1994). Culture and organizations: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival. Hammersmith, London, Harper and Collins.
22. Howell, J.M., & Higgins, C.A. (1990). Champions of Technological Innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 317-41.
23. Howell, J.M., Shea, C.M., & Higgins, C.A. (1998). Champions of Product Innovation: Defining, Developing and Validating a Measure of Champion Strength. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Western Ontario, Ontario, Canada.
24. Judge, T.A., & Cable, D.M. (1997). Applicant Personality, Organizational Culture, and Organization Attraction, *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359-395.
25. Krau, E. (2008). Work, creativity, inventions and society. *Man and Work*, 16, 46-54.

26. Lautenschlager, G.L., & Flaherty, V.L. (1990). Computer Administration of Questions: More Desirable or More Social Desirability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 310-14.

27. Lee, K., Ashton, M.C., & Shin, K.H (2005).Personality Correlates of Workplace Anti-Social Behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54 (1), 81-98.

28. Lee, K., Ashton, M.C., & Shin, K.H (2001). Personality Correlates of Workplace Anti-Social Behavior. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management Meeting, Washington, DC.

29. Liao, H., Joshi, A., & Chuang, A. (2004). Sticking Out Like a Sore Thumb: Employee Dissimilarity and Deviance at Work. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 969-1001.

30. Mischel, W. (1973) Toward a Cognitive Social Learning Reconceptualization of Personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283.

31. Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R., & Stewart, G.L. (1998). Five Factor Model of Personality and Performance in Jobs Involving Interpersonal Interactions. *Human Performance*, 11, 145-166.

32. Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.A. (1998). Workplace Violence and Workplace Aggression: Evidence Concerning Specific Forms, Potential Causes, and Preferred Targets. *Journal of Management*, 24, 391-419.

33. O'Leary-Kelly, A.M., Griffin, R.W., & Glew, D.J. (1996). Organization-Motivated Aggression: A Research Framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 225-253.

34. Ones, D.S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1996b) A Theory of Conscientiousness at work. Paper Presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

35. 34.Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F.L. (1993). Meta-Analysis of Integrity Test Validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 679-703.

36. Peterson, D.K. (2002). Deviant Workplace Behavior and the Organization's Ethical Climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17 (1), 47-61.

37. Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.B. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multi-Dimensional Scaling Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-72.

38. Salgado, J.F. (2002). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Counterproductive Behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 117-125.

39. Skarlicki, D.P., Folger, R., & Tesluck, P. (1997). Personality as a Moderator in the Relationship Between Fairness and Retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 100-108.

40. Spector, P.E. (1992). A Consideration of the Validity and Meaning of Self-report Measures of Job Conditions. In Cooper, C.L., & Robertson, I.T., *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7. New York: Wiley.

41. Trevino, L.K., & Youngblood, S. (1990). Bad Apples in Bad Barrels: A Causal Analysis of Ethical Decision-Making Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 338-78.

42. Tziner, A., Goldberg, S., & Or, R. (2006). Counterproductive Behavior at Work and Some Individual Difference Characteristics. *Journal of Management of Business and Economics*, 4, 128-139.

43. Vardi, Y., & Weitz, E. (2004), *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. Mahwah, N.J.; Erlbaum.

44. Warren, D.E. (2003). Constructive and Destructive Deviance in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 28 (4), 622-632.